By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Hair Spinners' Protective Union, No. 12347; of Waynesboro Council, No. 760; and E. W. Sisley, Fayette City, Pa., for illiteracy test of immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of James J. Judge, for battleship construction in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, protests of C. H. Coburn, S. Eheman, A. Salter, I. M. Vanderberry, E. J. Kessilmeyre, Conrad L. Haessler, M. Christmas, H. F. Lamborn, W. Quinn, C. M. Snow, K. C. Russell, J. W. Lawhead, M. E. Cooke, Rembrandt P. Morris, P. S. Ingersoll, and others, against Sunday rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PALMER: Petitions of Local Councils Nos. 255 and 760, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Washington Camps Nos. 483 and 524, and McKinley Commandry, No. 16, Patriotic Sons of America; and Local Unions Nos. 268 and 768, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 106, International Union of Slate Workers, of Bangor, Pa., for repeal of the oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POINDEXTER: Petition of Legislature of State of Washington, against change in tariff without careful investigation of facts concerning same as applied to the industries of the Northwest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of Los Angeles County Osteopathic Society, against the Mann, Owen, and Creager national health bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of citizens of Illinois, against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Dry Goods Association, for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Central Federated Union, for construction of battleship *New York* in the New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Los Angeles County Osteopathic Society, against Mann, Owen, and Creager national health bureau bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Petition of the Society of Friends in America, of Providence, R. I., deploring the proposal to fortify the Panama Canal and favoring its neutralization by international agreement; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of Niagara (N. Y.) Farmers' Club, indorsing the Simmons bill (H. R. 897) regulating importation of Jersey stock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Niagara Falls Board of Trade and Republican electors of the town of Java, Wyoming County, and Wyoming County Pomona Grange, in the State of New York, protesting against the confirmation of the proposed reciprocity agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Batavia Typographical Union, No. 511, favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of H. N. Smith; Charles Jones and 9 other residents of Oakland County; Mrs. Bertha Stocking and 15 other residents of Osceola County; Allegan County Grange, Allegan County; D. C. Wells and 16 other residents of Ottawa County; Nunica Grange, No. 1329, of Nunica; James Snell and 25 others, of Delta County; P. J. Dean and 28 others, of Midland and Saginaw Counties; P. J. Haley and 20 other residents of Saginaw County; Olle Sogge and 15 others, of Grand Traverse County; and Nels W. Oleson and 8 others, of Leelanau County, all in the State of Michigan, for a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of citizens of Texas, against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Protest of Henry Feig, of Atwater, Minn., against the Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of postal clerks of the tenth division, relative to service and pay of railway mail clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Samuel C. Hayes, of Nielsville, Polk County, Minn., against reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petition of Berlin (N. H.) Board of Trade, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of National Wholesale Dry Goods Association of New York, favoring a permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: Petitions of sundry citizens of the twenty-fifth congressional district of the State of Illinois, favoring a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of merchants of twenty-fifth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against the parcels-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of citizens of Connecticut, for the eight-hour working day and for construction of battleship *New York* in the New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Dry Goods Association, for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pattern Makers' Association, for repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Hartford Board of Trade, for an appropriation of $177,000 to widen the Connecticut River between Hartford and the Sound; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WEEKS: Resolutions of National Board of Trade at its forty-first annual meeting in Washington, D. C., January 17, 18, and 19, 1911, as to legislation upon various matters of national importance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of H. E. Braemer, against repeal of tariff on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. S. Burgess and citizens of Wisconsin, against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *February 10, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

POCATELLO NATIONAL FOREST.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 9566) to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Pocatello National Forest Reserve, which were, in line 8, to strike out "is" and insert "are;" in line 10, to strike out "reserve;" and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Pocatello National Forest."

Mr. BURNHAM. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, chairman of the commission to investigate the title of the United States to land in the District of Columbia, transmitting a report on the title to lot 20, square 253, assigned to the United States in the division between the public and the original proprietors of the city of Washington (S. Doc. No. 817), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

CONSTITUTION OF NEW MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the governor of the Territory of New Mexico, transmitting a certified copy of the constitution submitted to and ratified by the people of that Territory, together with a certified copy of the statement of votes cast thereon (H. Doc. No. 1369), which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed.

SENATOR FROM WYOMING.

Mr. WARREN presented the credentials of CLARENCE D. CLARK, chosen by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1911, which were read and ordered to be filed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3982. An act for the relief of David F. Wallace; and

H. R. 30566. An act for the appointment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Decennial Census.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 5379. An act to provide for the erection of a monument to commemorate the Battle of Guilford Court House, N. C., and in memory of Maj. Gen. Nathanael Greene and the officers and soldiers of the Continental Army who participated with him in the Battle of Guilford Court House, N. C.;

H. R. 20072. An act for the relief of Hans N. Anderson;

H. R. 30890. An act to authorize the Chicago Great Western Railroad Co., a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn.; and

H. R. 31656. An act extending the time for commencing and completing the bridge authorized by an act approved April 23, 1906, entitled "An act to authorize the Fayette Bridge Co. to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River, Pa., from a point in the borough of Brownsville, Fayette County, to a point in the borough of West Brownsville, Washington County."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Quarterly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, of Westchester County, N. Y., remonstrating against any appropriation being made for the fortification of the Panama Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Berlin, N. H., and a memorial of the New Hampshire State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Frank Jones Brewing Co., of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of John P. Hale Council, No. 9, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Barrington, N. H., and a petition of Prospect Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Plymouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NIXON presented memorials of sundry citizens of Reno, Elko, and Lovelock, all in the State of Nevada, remonstrating against the enactment of proposed legislation changing the name of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service, which were referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Progressive Republican Club of ward 3, Keene, N. H., praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of Local Union No. 568, of Lincoln; of Local Union No. 1883, of Macomb; and of Local Union No. 1873, of Lawrenceville, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of McIlwain Post, No. 273, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, of Springfield, Ill., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of Capitol Lodge, No. 628, International Association of Machinists, of Springfield, Ill., remonstrating against the repeal of the eight-hour law in connection with the construction of battleships, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 683, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Burlington; of Memphremagog Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Newport; of President Arthur Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sheldon; and of Crawford Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Putney, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. JONES. I present a telegram from the secretary of the Washington Wool Growers' Association, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

NORTH YAKIMA, WASH., *February 7, 1911.*

Senator W. L. JONES, *Washington, D. C.:*

Under pending reciprocity treaty with Canada, sheep are placed on free list, dressed meats are taxed 1½ cents per pound. This affords protection to packers, but not consumers or sheep breeders. If Canadian sheep are admitted free, they will bring millions of pounds of free wool with them. We wish to protest against admission of free sheep from Canada.

H. STAILEY COFFIN,
Secretary Washington Wool Growers' Association.

Mr. GAMBLE. I present a memorial of the Patrons of Husbandry of Erwin, S. Dak., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERWIN GRANGE, No. 25,
Erwin, S. Dak., February 3, 1911.

Hon. R. J. GAMBLE, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: We, the Patrons of Husbandry, implore you to vote for the revocation of the Canadian reciprocity treaty made by our Executive and the Canadian officials. As a faithful servant of the people of this State, you are by duty bound to cause this treaty to be revoked; firstly, because its burdens fall most heavily on this and other agricultural States; secondly, because it is unjust to the people as a whole, in so far as it is an unjust and partial regulation of commerce between the States and Canada.

We will not detain you by going into details, as you have the original treaty before you. Thanking you in advance for your prompt action upon this matter, we remain,

Faithfully, yours,
J. F. WOLKOW, *Com'tmn.*
(MRS.) CLARA B. HODGES, *Master.*
F. G. LARSON, *Secretary.*

Mr. GAMBLE presented a memorial of the Hentges Clothing Co. and six other business firms of Yankton, S. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called rural parcels-post bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN presented petitions of Local Council of Walnut Cove; Emma Council, of Ashville; Local Council of Hickory; Local Council of Gastonia; Local Council of King; Bear Creek Council, of Gold Hill; Keystone Council, of Proximity; Local Council of Rockville; Local Council of Manndale; Local Council of Apex; and Jeff Davis Council, of Wilmington, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics; of Washington Camps Nos. 17, of China Grove, and 27, of Gastonia, Patriotic Order Sons of America; and of Local Union No. 1492, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Hendersonville, all in the State of North Carolina, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HEYBURN. I present a telegram from the Idaho State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

PAYETTE, IDAHO, *February 9–10, 1911.*

Hon. W. B. HEYBURN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Idaho State Grange, 3,000 strong, protest against reciprocity with Canada unless the farmer is treated as fairly as the manufacturers. We want a square deal, one that is fair to all.

D. C. MULAN, *Master.*
F. P. FRENCH, *Secretary.*
H. HARLAND, *Overseer.*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Territories.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 4.

Whereas the Territory of Alaska is settled by a hardy, active, and energetic people, numbering more than 64,000, according to the Thirteenth Census, 1910, who have in the last 10 years added in gold and fish alone more than $225,000,000 to the wealth of the Nation, and whose trade with the merchants of the United States last year amounted to more than $52,000,000, being greater than our trade with China and twice as great in value as our trade with the Philippines; and

Whereas the development of the Territory is being greatly retarded by the want of a law-making or legislative body therein, to be elected by the people:

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon (the senate and house jointly concurring), That we do hereby declare our most earnest opinion that it is necessary to the development of the Pacific coast and of the resources of, and good government in, Alaska that the Congress of the United States shall at the earliest possible date pass an enabling act creating and providing for the organization of a territorial legislature in Alaska, to be elected by the American citizens resident therein, with such powers and limitations as have been usually given to and imposed upon such legislative assemblies in other Territories; and the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Oregon are hereby requested to aid and assist in securing the passage of such a bill.

Adopted by the house January 19, 1911.

JOHN P. RUSK, *Speaker of the House.*

Concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911.

BEN SELLING, *President of the Senate.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully

compared the annexed copy of house joint resolution No. 4 with the original thereof, which was adopted by the house January 19, 1911, and concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 31st day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] F. W. BENSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 2.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent:

Whereas Congress at its last session appropriated the sum of $10,000 for a site for the purpose of erecting and constructing thereon a Federal building for the city of Roseburg, Oreg., to relieve the congested condition of the Federal offices of said city, to wit, the United States land office, the United States post office, the United States weather observatory, also the United States district forestry bureau; and

Whereas said offices now occupy separate buildings with a floor space at a great rental expense to the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Government has advertised for and has now practically selected and purchased said site for said Federal building: Now, therefore,

Your memorialists do earnestly pray the Congress of these United States (at this session) do appropriate the sum of $250,000 for the purpose of constructing such building of such a capacity as to relieve said congested condition. And that a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Senate and House of the United States in Congress assembled, and a copy thereof to each of the Oregon Representatives therein.

Adopted by the house January 19, 1911.

JOHN P. RUSK, *Speaker of the House.*

Concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911.

BEN SELLING, *President of the Senate.*

—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 2 with the original thereof, which was adopted by the house January 19, 1911, and concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 31st day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] F. W. BENSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint memorial praying that a grant of the land and buildings of the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation be made to Whitman College.

To the President and Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Oregon, prays that the land and buildings comprising the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation and Barracks may be granted to Whitman College. The reasons deemed sufficient to justify this memorial are set forth in the following statement:

The War Department has determined that the military service does not require the maintenance of a military post at Fort Walla Walla, and the troops have been withdrawn, except a few necessary caretakers, so that in future the preservation of the property will be a burden upon the Government, without any compensating benefit.

The property is, by reason of its situation and character, adapted to the needs of Whitman College, its use by the college will be the best use to which it can be devoted, and the Nation will derive the greatest benefit from the property by intrusting it to an institution, in every way worthy and capable of using it in the cause of higher education.

There is within the boundaries of the reservation a soldiers' cemetery containing the graves of a number of men who died while in the military service of the United States. This cemetery has been well kept by the officers and soldiers heretofore stationed at Fort Walla Walla, and if the prayer of your memorialist shall be granted, the trustees of Whitman College will assume an obligation to so care for this soldiers' cemetery as to show, perpetually, the respect due to our country's defenders.

Texas and Hawaii became annexed to the United States without contributing anything to the wealth of the Nation as a land proprietor and other acquisitions of territory except the Oregon country, were purchased and paid for out of the National Treasury; but more than 300,000 square miles of country, comprising the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana and Wyoming, became part of our national domain through the instrumentality of patriotic pioneers, of whom Dr. Marcus Whitman was a type and a leader. They penetrated the wilderness and wrested that country with its wealth of land, forests, mines, waters, and fisheries from the grasp of a foreign corporation and held it until the growth of public sentiment forced the Government to bring to a conclusion the diplomatic controversy with respect to its ownership by the treaty with Great Britain of 1846, whereby the American title was finally recognized and established.

The scene of one of the tragedies of American history is in the immediate vicinity of Fort Walla Walla. There a monument commemorates the lives of Dr. Whitman and his wife and a dozen of their associates, part of the vanguard of American civilization who were massacred by the aboriginal inhabitants. Our Nation loves to honor those whose names illuminate the pages of its history. For that purpose the Government has willingly expended liberal appropriations in payment for statuary, monuments, and paintings produced by the most talented artists of the world, and the granting of Fort Walla Walla as a contribution to the college founded by an intimate friend and coworker of Dr. Whitman to honor his memory, and which has appealed to the sentiment of public-spirited, patriotic citizens, bringing responses in liberal contributions to its endowment, will be heartily approved by the people at large. In return for the national aggrandizement resulting directly from the exertion, privations, and sacrifices of the Oregon pioneers, the Nation can well afford to bestow one section of land, and the buildings which it does not require for use, as a gift to an institution of learning which the people of the three Northwestern States have adopted as an object of their solicitude and pride.

Whitman College is a privately endowed, nonsectarian, Christian college, intended to supply the need of those States for such an institution of higher education. It commands the respect and has the earnest sympathy of learned people and good people in every section of the United States, and its destiny is to grow in importance as the country surrounding it shall advance in all the ways that mark the development of arts and sciences. No more fitting monument has been erected, nor to a worthier man.

The State of Washington and its citizens have paid for and donated to the United States the land comprised within two military posts, viz, Fort Lawton, near Seattle, and Fort Wright, near Spokane, each including more than 1,000 acres. These lands were purchased after they had become valuable and after they had been selected for military use, and the acquisition thereof for the use of the Government involved labor and patience on the part of public-spirited citizens in soliciting contributions of land and money and in overcoming objections of owners, and their present value is many times greater than the highest estimate of the value of Fort Walla Walla.

Adopted by the house January 23, 1911.

JOHN P. RUSK, *Speaker of the House.*

Concurred in by the senate February 1, 1911.

BEN SELLING, *President of the Senate.*

—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 4 with the original thereof, which was adopted by the house January 23, 1911, and concurred in by the senate February 1, 1911, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 3d day of February, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] F. W. BENSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CARTER presented a petition of the North Washington Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, and a petition of sundry citizens of the city of Washington, praying for the establishment of a public park bounded by Rhode Island Avenue, Second Street, T Street, and Lincoln Avenue, NE., which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRONNA presented a petition of the Book and Thimble Club of Williston, N. Dak., praying that an investigation be made into the condition of dairy products for the prevention and spread of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 12018, American Federation of Labor, of Jamestown, N. Dak., remonstrating against any change being made in the method of printing United States bonds and notes, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry business men of Galesburg, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called rural parcels-post bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented a petition of the Adams County Agricultural Association, Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 1048, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, of Carbondale, Pa., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Lumbermen's Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the preservation of the forest reservations at the headwaters of navigable streams, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of John S. Melvin Post, No. 141, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Bradford, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PAGE presented petitions of President Arthur Council, of Sheldon; Memphremagog Council, of Newport; and Crawford Council, of Putney, all of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, and of Local Union No. 683, United Brotherhood of

Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Burlington, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Wilmington; the American Flag Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Newark, and of Washington Camp No. 20, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Camden, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. ROOT presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 523, of Tarrytown and Ossining, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the printing of certain matter on stamped envelopes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Rhode Island Anti-Tuberculosis Association, praying that an investigation be made into the condition of dairy products for the prevention and spread of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of sundry members of the International Association of Machinists of Everett, Wash., praying for the construction of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wendell, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Twin City Wholesale Millinery Association, of Minnesota, praying that reciprocal trade relations be established between the United States and Canada in respect to millinery articles, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SCOTT presented memorials of the Retail Business Men's Association, the Retail Grocers' Protective Association, the Association of Credit Men, and the United Commercial Travelers' Association, all of Charleston, in the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of Washington Camp No. 6, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Crawfordsville, Ind., and a petition of Marion Council, No. 3, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Marion, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of Encampment No. 51, Union Veteran Legion of the United States, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 381, International Association of Machinists, of Syracuse; Local Councils No. 33, of Syracuse; No. 107, of Mohawk; and No. 24, of Greenwich, Junior Order United American Mechanics; of Local Unions No. 718, of New Rochelle, and No. 24, of Batavia, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America; of Local Union No. 577, Garment Workers, of Cohoes and vicinity; Washington Camp, No. 22, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Yonkers; and of the Central Trades and Labor Assembly of Syracuse, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of Amherst Grange, No. 1131, of Williamsville; Stafford Grange, No. 418, of Morganville; Sandy Creek Grange, No. 127, of Lacona; Pamelia Grange, No. 68, of Evans Mills; and Little Falls Grange, No. 611, of Little Falls, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New York, remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Celtic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club of Buffalo, the Common Council of Geneva, the Chamber of Commerce of Oswego, the Buffalo Brewers' Exchange, and sundry business firms of Rochester, Geneva, and New York City, all in the State of New York, praying for the ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of National Lodge, No. 556, International Association of Machinists, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Local Division No. 292, International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Middletown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation authorizing the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of Bela Rich Post, No. 287, of Cattaraugus; Oliver McAllister Post, No. 373, of Philadelphia; and Vander Veer Post, No. 57, of Fonda, all of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the National Wholesale Dry Goods Association of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of a permanent tariff commission, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transmission of race-gambling bets, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Gebhard Lang Council, No. 298, Catholic Benevolent Legion, of Buffalo, N. Y., remonstrating against any appropriation being made for the extension of the work of the Bureau of Education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BOURNE presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Territories, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 4.

Whereas the Territory of Alaska is settled by a hardy, active, and energetic people numbering more than 64,000, according to the Thirteenth Census, 1910, who have in the last ten years added in gold and fish alone more than $225,000,000 to the wealth of the Nation, and whose trade with the merchants of the United States last year amounted to more than $52,000,000, being greater than our trade with China and twice as great in value as our trade with the Philippines; and

Whereas the development of the Territory is being greatly retarded by the want of a law-making or legislative body therein, to be elected by the people:

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon (the senate and house jointly concurring), That we do hereby declare our most earnest opinion that it is necessary to the development of the Pacific coast and of the resources of and good government in Alaska that the Congress of the United States shall, at the earliest possible date, pass an enabling act creating and providing for the organization of a territorial legislature in Alaska, to be elected by the American citizens resident therein, with such powers and limitations as have been usually given to and imposed upon such legislative assemblies in other Territories; and the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the State of Oregon are hereby requested to aid and assist in securing the passage of such a bill.

Adopted by the house January 19, 1911.

JOHN P. RUSK, *Speaker of the House.*

Concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911.

BEN SELLING, *President of the Senate.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint resolution No. 4 with the original thereof, which was adopted by the house January 19, 1911, and concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 31st day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] F. W. BENSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. BOURNE presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 3.

Whereas there is now pending before the House of Representatives of the United States of America Senate bill 5677, providing for the retirement and relief of the officers and members of the United States Life-Saving Service; and

Whereas the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon believes it is desirable and just that such provision should be made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That our Representatives in Congress be, and are hereby, memorialized and requested to vote for and use their utmost endeavors to secure the passage of said Senate bill 5677 by the House of Representatives and its approval by the President.

Adopted by the house January 18, 1911.

JOHN P. RUSK, *Speaker of the House.*

Concurred in by the senate January 19, 1911.

BEN SELLING, *President of the Senate.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 3 with the original thereof, which was adopted by the house January 18, 1911, and concurred in by the senate January 19, 1911, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 31st day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] F. W. BENSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. BOURNE presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 2.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representative of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Twenty-sixth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent:

Whereas Congress at its last session appropriated the sum of $10,000 for a site for the purpose of erecting and constructing thereon a Federal building for the city of Roseburg, Oreg., to relieve the congested condition of the Federal offices of said city, to wit: The United States land office, the United States post office, the United States weather observatory, also the United States district forestry bureau; and

Whereas said offices now occupy separate buildings with a floor space at a great rental expense to the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Government has advertised for and has now practically selected and purchased said site for said Federal building: Now, therefore

Your memorialists do earnestly pray the Congress of these United States (at this session) do appropriate the sum of $250,000 for the purpose of constructing such building of such a capacity to relieve said congested condition. And that a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Senate and House of the United States in Congress assembled, and a copy thereof to each of the Oregon Representatives therein.

Adopted by the house January 19, 1911.

JOHN P. RUSK, *Speaker of the House.*

Concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911.

BEN SELLING, *President of the Senate.*

—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 2 with the original thereof, which was adopted by the house January 19, 1911, and concurred in by the senate January 26, 1911, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 31st day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] F. W. BENSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. BOURNE presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 1.

Whereas the State of Oregon has contributed to the United States reclamation fund a larger sum than any other State; and

Whereas the apportionment of the reclamation fund to Oregon is so inadequate as to constitute actual discrimination against the people of Oregon; and

Whereas the early reclamation of the large areas of desert land in the State of Oregon is dependent upon the work of the United States Reclamation Service; and

Whereas section 9 of the reclamation act, providing that more than 50 per cent of the reclamation fund be expended in the State contributing the same, was repealed at the last session of Congress; and

Whereas the repeal of section 9 of the reclamation act leaves the State of Oregon in position to be hurt by continuation of the present discrimination: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be memorialized to urge the immediate reenactment of section 9 of the reclamation act of the United States, and use their influence to secure an apportionment of the reclamation fund which shall as nearly as possible conform to the amount of the reclamation fund contributed by the people of the State of Oregon, and a copy of this memorial be transmitted to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of Oregon in Congress.

Adopted by the house January 17, 1911.

JOHN P. RUSK, *Speaker of the House.*

Concurred in by the senate January 19, 1911.

BEN SELLING, *President of the Senate.*

—

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, F. W. Benson, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 1 with the original thereof, which was adopted by the house January 17, 1911, and concurred in by the senate January 19, 1911, and that it is a correct transcript therefrom and of the whole of such original.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 31st day of January, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.] F. W. BENSON, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. CURTIS. I present a telegram signed by the governor of Kansas, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *February 10, 1911.*

Senator CURTIS, *Washington, D. C.:*

House and senate have passed joint resolution favoring passage of the Sulloway bill, and have asked me to inform you of this. I request your immediate attention for it.

W. R. STUBBS, *Governor.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 10536) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to lot No. 20, square No. 253, in the city of Washintgon, D. C., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1137) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 27837) to amend the provisions of the act of March 3, 1885, limiting the compensation of storekeepers, gaugers, and storekeeper-gaugers in certain cases to $2 a day, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8699) authorizing the Secretary of War to recognize William Mitchell, deceased, as having been a member of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, Civil War, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1139) thereon.

Mr. BURKETT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 9822) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to sublots Nos. 31, 32, and 33 of original lot No. 3, square No. 80, in the city of Washington, D. C., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1140) thereon.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 10349) to authorize Joseph Swift to construct an elevated trestle across Anacostia Road, in the District of Columbia, submitted an adverse report thereon (No. 1141), which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

TAXATION IN ARIZONA.

Mr. KEAN. From the Committee on Territories I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 28214) providing for the levy of taxes by the taxing officers of the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes, and I ask for its present consideration. It is an important bill in regard to taxation in Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, it was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

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

HARRY V. GATES.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 343), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Harry V. Gates, son of John F. Gates, late janitor, United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PHILIPPINE ASSEMBLY AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. LODGE. From the Committee on the Philippines, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 32004) providing for the quadrennial election of members of the Philippine Assembly and Resident Commissioners to the United States, and for other purposes, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back with amendments the bill (H. R. 31856) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1138) thereon. I desire to give notice, Mr. Presi-

dent, that I shall seek an opportunity on Monday next to ask for the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

FIREMEN'S INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. GALLINGER. From the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 10583) to amend the charter of the Firemen's Insurance Co., of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 1136) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

USE OF CERTIFIED CHECKS.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Finance, I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 30570) to authorize the receipt of certified checks, drawn on national banks, for duties on imports and internal taxes, and for other purposes. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, it strikes me that that is a pretty far-reaching measure and will result in affecting seriously the flow of actual gold into this country. I have no doubt the committee has given consideration to it, but whenever you substitute anything for gold you will find that the supply of gold on hand in the Treasury of the United States will diminish. If you take out of, say, $300,000,000 or $400,000,000, probably more than half of that, which under such a law would be paid by certified checks, those certified checks will be the subject of credits in banks, and there is no provision in the bill which requires them ever to be transferred or, rather, to be exchanged for actual gold.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President——

Mr. HEYBURN. I can not consent to the bill being considered to-day. I object, and ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. To save time, I renew the notice I gave yesterday that during the morning business I shall object to the consideration of any bills. It is not fair to Senators who have given notice of speeches.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the regular order be proceeded with.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do this to avoid any requests for the consideration of bills during the morning business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are still in order.

CHEROKEE INDIAN ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Printing I report back a paper submitted on the 7th instant by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], being a memorial from the Keetoowah Society, a corporation, on behalf of its members, who are all Cherokees by blood enrolled as of September 1, 1902. I move that the memorial be printed as a document (S. Doc. No. 816).

The motion was agreed to.

OSAGE NATION OF INDIANS.

Mr. CLAPP. From the Committee on Indian Affairs, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], I report back with amendments the bill (S. 10606) supplementary to and amendatory of an act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Nation of Indians in Oklahoma," approved June 28, 1906, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood that a certain amendment would be offered to that bill, and that it was to be submitted to certain Senators before the report was made. Being one of the Senators to whom the amendment was to be submitted, I wish to state that it has not been presented to me.

Mr. CLAPP. I knew nothing of that. The subcommittee made their report and were authorized to report the bill. My secretary brought it to me and asked me, in the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma, to present the report. If there is anything of that kind, the report will be withdrawn pending an investigation by the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Minnesota withdraw the report?

Mr. CLAPP. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota withdraws the report.

MATTAWOMAN CREEK BRIDGE, MARYLAND.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. On the 8th instant the Senator from Washington [Mr. PILES] reported from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 31239) to authorize Park C. Abell, George B. Lloyd, and Andrew B. Sullivan, of Indianhead, Charles County, Md., to construct a bridge across the Mattawoman Creek near the village of Indianhead, Md., without amendment, and it was placed on the calendar. I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 10750) granting a pension to Jennie H. Dennett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A bill (S. 10751) granting a pension to Mary Lillie Bauskett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 10752) granting an increase of pension to John H. Cline (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 10753) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Stumpff (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEAN:

A bill (S. 10754) granting an increase of pension to George M. Andrus (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 10755) for the relief of Clara D. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 10756) granting public lands to the town of Omak, State of Washington, for public park purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 10757) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BOURNE:

A bill (S. 10758) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 10759) relative to the exchange of certain properties between the insular government of Porto Rico and the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 10760) granting a pension to Bernard Klatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $300 to pay Leonard Underwood for extra services as clerk to the Committee on Enrolled Bills, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment relative to the retirement of officers of the Navy on account of disability, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOSTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $150,000 to investigate and report upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands in the valley of the Mississippi River, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $4,638.42 to reimburse the city of Topeka, Kans., for paving and repaving streets adjacent to Government property therein, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed, and with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BACON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $1,500 to place in the courtroom of the Supreme Court of the United States a marble bust, with pedestal, of the late Chief Justice Melville Weston Fuller, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

MARY E. HICKCOX.

Mr. NIXON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 342), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Mary E. Hickcox, widow of John S. Hickcox, late a folder of the United States Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his demise, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION.

Mr. CARTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 344), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, or a subcommittee thereof, be, and the same is hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time as may be necessary to report such hearings as may be had on bills and matters pending before said committee, and have the same printed for the use of said committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

INDIAN EDUCATION.

Mr. CLAPP. I present a paper treating of the extent and character of the educational work which is being carried on by the United States among the Indians. I desire to have the article printed as a document, and I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 3982. An act for the relief of David F. Wallace, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 30566. An act for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States under the Thirteenth Decennial Census, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed its consideration.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the joint resolution now before the Senate contains two separate and distinct amendments of the Constitution of the United States. The first amendment proposed is to change the third section of the first article, relating to the election of Senators, so that it shall provide for the election of Senators by the people of the several States instead of their election by the legislatures of the States. That is accompanied by an appropriate provision regarding the filling of vacancies which occur at such time as that they can not conveniently be immediately filled by an election.

The other amendment proposed by the joint resolution is to strike from the fourth section of the first article the provision that—

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

And to substitute therefor a provision that—

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

That involves two changes in the existing provision. One is to abolish the peremptory command of the Constitution directed to the legislatures of the States, requiring them, as a matter of their duty under the Constitution, to prescribe the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators, and to substitute for that peremptory command for the performance of a duty under the Constitution a reference to action which the States may or may not take under their own authority. That change is accomplished by inserting the word "as" in the new provisions. I hope I make it clear.

The present section 4 of the first article of the Constituion provides that—

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

That is the command of the Nation by the sovereign authority of the Constitution to the legislature of each State, requiring it to prescribe the time, places, and manner of electing Senators; and when they act they act in the execution of a mandate from the Nation embodied in the National Constitution. Now read the proposed substitute:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

If a State prescribes, well and good. It does it under its own authority. If a State does not prescribe, well and good. There is no mandate of the Constitution of the United States requiring the State to do it. It is a clear, distinct, and unquestionable abandonment of the requirement of the Constitution for this fundamental and essential act under national authority for the preservation of the national life.

The second change in the fourth section of the first article of the Constitution is made by omitting from that section all authority in Congress to make or alter the regulations which are prescribed. The present section reads:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chosing Senators.

The proposed substitute for the fourth section reads:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators shall be as prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

All vestige of national authority as the source of power to perform the act and of national control over the performance of it, or of national power to modify or supplement or compel conformity to national interests, disappears from the provision which is recommended to the Senate in the joint resolution now before us.

Mr. President, I am opposed to both of these amendments. I am opposed to changing the election of Senators from the legislatures to the people at the polls, and I am opposed to abandoning the authority of the National Government over the election and the constitution of the members of this branch of the Government.

Let me first state the reasons why I am opposed to the change in the manner of electing Senators.

It is not wise that the people of the United States should contract the habit of amending the Constitution. Stability in our Government is a matter of vital concern. When America set forth in her great experiment, the almost universal opinion of the world was that she would speedily encounter the disasters that all attempts at popular government had met before that day. The world knew well that the tendency of democratic government was toward frequent change; it knew well that, while all forms of government have weaknesses peculiar to themselves, the weakness of democratic government was its liability to change with the impulse and enthusiasm of the moment, and, through continual changes, to vary from extreme democracy, which men called ochlocracy, on the one hand, to oligarchy and dictatorship on the other. And since the time when our fathers framed the Constitution half a score of nations, seeking to follow the lines of our experiment, have, in varying degree, and some of them to the last degree of failure, justified such an apprehension.

But with us, Mr. President, there has been one great anchor. In our Constitution we have embodied the eternal principles of justice; we have set up a barrier against ourselves. As Ulysses required his followers to bind him to the mast that he might not yield to the song of the siren as he sailed by, so the American democracy has bound itself to the great rules of right conduct, which are essential to the protection of liberty and justice and property and order, and made it practically impossible that the impulse, the prejudice, the excitement, the frenzy of the moment shall carry our democracy into those excesses which have wrecked all our prototypes in history.

Mr. President, reverence for that great instrument, the belief of mankind in its perpetuity, the unwillingness of our people to tamper with it or to change it, the sentiments that are gathered around it—these, constituting the basis of stability in our Government, are the most valuable of all the possessions of the Nation that inhabits this rich and fertile land. Because the American people stand by their Constitution and are unwilling to yield to suggestions that it be tampered with and altered upon slight provocation, every acre of farm land, every farmhouse and barn, every stock of goods, and every manufactory in the country are of greater value. No change in our Constitution should be permitted to cast a doubt upon its permanency and inviolability unless there be the weightiest and most commanding reasons. All presumptions are against it. The great public policy of a century is against it. A heavy burden rests upon those who wish to make the change.

This is especially true, Mr. President, when a change is proposed which in any degree alters the delicate relations which exist between the National and the State Governments, or which in any degree affects or modifies any of those great compromises of the Constitution which enabled the 13 original Colonies, different in interests, in traditions, in size, in population, and in industries, to adjust their different views and to enter into a binding agreement.

Whenever a proposal is made to change the provisions that affect the relations between the States and the National Government, or to modify any of the terms of one of those great

compromises upon which the institution rests, there are special reasons for rejecting it, and a double burden rests upon those who propose it. For more than 100 years the provisions of this instrument as they are, with every sentence weighed, with every word scanned and receiving its full meaning, have been considered and clarified and determined upon by the courts. Our people have become accustomed to statutes based upon these provisions as they are. A great war has been fought to settle the most vital and important of the questions arising under this instrument as it is. The different parts have become adjusted to each other. We have come to understand what their relation is. The ship has found itself and we are free, after a century of discussion, from serious questions as to the relations of the General and State Governments.

How the field of discussion has changed! Look at the old records of Congress, and you will find them filled with animated and excited controversies which have passed away. And now I say that for us to launch into a new era of changed provisions and new questions arising from them would be justified only by the most serious and weighty reasons. Changes by amendment may seem to gentlemen who propose them simple, and their effect may seem to be unquestionable. But, Mr. President, no one can foresee the far-reaching effect of changing the language of the Constitution in any manner which affects the relations of the States to the General Government. How little we know what any amendment would produce!

One hundred and seven years ago we made an amendment relating to the election of the President and Vice President. Has that amendment produced the result which its authors expected? No; far from it. The results of action under that amendment are as different from those which were expected by its authors as our Government is different from the government of any oriental power.

Forty-five years ago we made a series of amendments, following upon the great Civil War. Have those amendments worked out as their authors expected? No. No man can open to the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution and for a moment maintain that they have accomplished what the Congress of the United States expected them to accomplish when it passed the resolutions for their submission, or what the State legislatures expected when they approved them.

We enter upon a field of doubt, of new discussions, the end of which no man can foresee, when we begin to tamper with the delicately adjusted machinery to which we have been so long accustomed and which we now understand so well.

Mr. President, there has been but little attempt here to assign reasons for the proposed change in the election of Senators. It has been left in the main to rest upon the proposition that the people of the country desire it; that there have been resolutions adopted by many legislatures; that planks have been put in many political platforms; and that as a whole the people of the country wish for the change.

I am convinced, sir, and I think I can anticipate a general agreement from the Members of this Chamber in the proposition, that the desire of the people for this change, if there be a desire, is not a very active and violent feeling. It is a rather mild assent to a proposition which is suggested to them as an appropriate remedy for certain ascertained and recognized evils. There is, we all know, a general tendency in all democracies to favor propositions which look to the extension of power at the polls. Extension of suffrage, extension of the direct power of the voters at the polls, naturally receive assent at first blush.

There is another tendency which is natural and in which we all share, and that is that when an evil is recognized, and some one suggests that such and such a provision of law will cure the evil, our interest is attracted and our support is conciliated for the proposed measure.

I submit that what the people of the country really want is to have certain evils which they recognize in the present election of Senators cured, and that they are quite indifferent about this change except as it is certified to them to be a sure cure for the evils. Whether it will be a cure or not has been little discussed and little considered by the people of the United States, and it has been little discussed and little considered by the Senate.

The evil which the people of the country wish to see cured, and which I wish to see cured with them, and we all do, consists of certain patent defects in the working of the system of election of Senators by the State legislatures.

The first of those is a defect in the execution of the law which requires them to select. It is the deadlock that exists so frequently. The inexplicable delay of the Legislature of Montana to return my friend, the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER], the obstinacy of all branches of the Democratic Party in the Legislature of New York, the reluctance of the Legislature of Iowa to follow any of its great and gifted leaders—all these cause dissatisfaction on the part of the people, and, I believe, constitute the chief reason for the assent of the people to propositions to change the manner of election.

But, Mr. President, it is not our duty to say to the people of the United States that these deadlocks come not from the consitutional provision, that they come from our statute of 1866. They can be ended forever on any day by this Congress through a simple amendment of the statute. For the deadlocks arise from the fact that our statute requires a majority vote, and everywhere among people of independence and individual will it is a difficult thing to secure a majority vote.

If we chose to-day to amend our statute so that the legislatures of these States could elect by a plurality, they would elect to-morrow. If we chose to say that in any legislature where a majority vote should not be obtained within 30 days of the beginning of the Congress in which the successful candidate was to take his seat, there should be an election by plurality, in every one there would be an election the day after the period expired. And what is more, there would be majorities obtained in order to avoid those elections by pluralities.

But we have not chosen to do it. We have fallen upon times when it seems as if not the last thing, but the first thing, that is to be done to cure an evil is to amend the Constitution of the United States. Mr. President, this very joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States will force us to abandon the majority rule and to entrust the election of Senators to a plurality, for never can the Senate of the United States maintain a working force if a majority vote is required for the election of Senators by the people of the several States.

I appeal to a universal recognition of the fact that it will not be practicable to have Senators elected under a requirement of a majority vote in case this amendment to the Constitution is adopted. In every close State the outlying parties, the irreconcilables, not occasionally or accidentally, but as a rule, poll more votes than the difference between the two great parties, and that means that, as a rule, in the close States of the Union no one is elected by a majority vote.

So, sir, we are proposing to cure this evil by an amendment of the Constitution which lands us in the same position as to the rule of majority or plurality that we would reach if we cured it as we can cure it absoultely by an amendment of our statute.

But there is another reason why the people are dissatisfied with the discharge of the functions of our State legislatures. From time to time there are rumors, suspicions, and occasionally proofs of corrupt conduct on the part of State legislatures, and from time to time a belief that State legislatures have been influenced by personal considerations or controlled by extra-official influences in the performance of their duty.

Mr. President, we are too apt in having our attention fixed upon the exceptional to forget the usual. It is true that what have long been known in this Chamber as forbidden and abhorrent forces do sometimes affect the election of a Senator, but it is only occasional, and the great body of the Members of the Senate are, and always have been, elected as the free and intelligent judgment of their State legislatures dictate.

There is no claim, sir, that I have heard, certainly there has been no ground suggested to sustain a claim, that an honest and intelligent legislature, fairly canvassing the abilities and the character of the men who can best serve their country as Senators for their States, can not make as good a choice, if not a better choice, than the electorate at large.

There has been no claim, or certainly no ground stated to sustain a claim, that the wise men who framed our Constitution were mistaken in their belief that wise and intelligent and faithful State legislatures would make the best possible choice for Senators of the United States.

No; the real ground is that, arguing from these exceptional and occasional cases, the people of the United States have been led to believe that the legislatures of their States are unfaithful to their trust in making their selections, and that they will continue unfaithful.

Mr. President, what is the remedy the people of the United States should seek, if this be true? Are they to abandon the performance of their duty in the election of their State legislatures? Are they to abandon the system, rather than reform the system? This whole proposition rests upon the postulate of the incapacity of the people of the United States to elect honest and faithful legislatures. If the framers of the resolution had made it read so that it would express the true principle on which they base it, they would have made it read like this:

Whereas the people of the several States have proved incompetent to select honest and faithful legislators in their own States:

Resolved, That the Constitution of the United States be so amended as to relieve the people from the consequences of their incompetency

by taking from the State legislatures the power to choose Senators of the United States and vesting that power in the same incompetent hands.

But, Mr. President, if the people of our States are to abandon the attempt and be faithless to the duty to elect honest and faithful legislatures, what becomes of the governments of our States? The growing complication of life, the daily increasing interdependence of all men under our highly developed social system, under which for food, for clothing, for shelter, for fuel, for health, for opportunities for business and for transportation, and at every side and on every occasion in life we are dependent on each other. In this highly developed interdependent condition day by day we grow to rely more and more on the government that is regulating all the agencies that are necessary to our lives. What government shall perform that function? If the State government is abandoned, if we recognize the fact that we can not have honest legislatures, sir, the tide that now sets toward the Federal Government will swell in volume and in power. Here is a power that can answer the demands of life.

Let me tell the gentlemen who are solicitous for the preservation of the sovereignty of their States that there is but one way in which they can preserve that sovereignty, and that is by repudiating absolutely and forever the fundamental doctrine upon which this resolution proceeds. Let them go home to their States when this session ends and invoke the patriotism of their people to make the government of their States worthy of the great duties that rest upon them and competent to preserve the autonomy of their States against that incursion of Federal power which is being continually urged, urged, urged by those who fail to find satisfaction from the governments of the States.

In my humble judgment, sir, the most vital thing to be done in the United States to-day is to strengthen the legislatures of the States. I fear the breaking down of the Government of the United States by the accumulation of demands upon it, through the gradual weakening of the State governments, through the failure of the State governments to keep pace with the continually increasing demands of our social and business life.

We have come very near the limit, sir, of what we can competently do, very near the limit of what we can do as well as it ought to be done. Our executive officers are overburdened. The business of this Congress is conducted with less and less knowledge on the part of the Members of the body in general as to what the committees have been doing. We are forced session by session to more complete reliance upon the reports of the committees, with less and less consideration from the Members of the Congress at large. Our judicial force is being overburdened and our calendars clogged, and we are looking about for ways to relieve this court and that from too heavy a burden and to prevent the law's delays.

Let us continue upon the theory that State governments are corrupt and incompetent. The time will come when the Government of the United States will be driven to the exercise of more arbitrary and unconsidered power, will be driven to greater concentration, will be driven to extend its functions into the internal affairs of the States; and then sooner or later the people of the country will reject a Government that has subjected their personal and intimate neighborhood affairs to the control of a central power in Washington, and then in the place of competent States governing their own affairs we shall go through the cycle of concentration of power at the center while the States dwindle into insignificance, and ultimately the breaking up of the great Republic upon new lines of separation.

Mr. President, there is another view of the fundamental proposition on which this resolution rests. It is an expression of distrust for representative government. It does not stand alone. It is a part of the great movement which has been going on now in these recent years throughout the country and in which our people have been drifting away from their trust in representative government. These modern constitutions which are filled with specific provisions, limiting and directing the legislature in every direction, furnishing such startling contrasts to the simplicity of the Constitution of the United States, are an expression of distrust in representative government. The initiative is an expression of distrust in representative government. The referendum is an expression of distrust in representative government.

This resolution is an expression of the same sentiment. And strangely, sir, this movement comes at the very time when the development of our country in its business and social and political life makes it all the more necessary that we should depend upon representative government. We have gone far, far away from the days of the old New England town meetings. I doubt if some of the Senators coming from States of small population realize how far we have gone in the great industrial communities of the East and the Middle West from that condition in which direct democratic government is possible.

Mr. President, this whole series of expressions of distrust, the detailed limiting constitutions, the initiative, the referendum, the amendment of the Constitution, which is now before us, are all an expression of that weakness of democracies which it is the function of the Constitution to guard democracies themselves against.

Mr. President, what is to become of the State legislatures if we follow the principles of this resolution? If you rob them of power, of dignity, of consequence, what will be the personnel of the State legislatures? We have had illustrations. The boards of aldermen in some of our American cities, originally bodies of high consideration, filled by citizens of consequence and of high standing among their fellows, have dwindled and sunk to insignificance and worthlessness, as power after power has been taken away from them. Once begin the progress in that direction by taking the first step based upon the principle of this resolution and you will find the members of our State legislatures growing less and less competent, less and less worthy of trust, and less and less efficient in the performance of their duties.

You can never develop competent and trusted bodies of public servants by expressing distrust of them, by taking power away from them, by holding them up to the world as being unworthy of confidence. Honest men, good men, self-respecting men, men whose standing in their community makes it desirable for the public service that they shall go into our State legislatures, will never subject themselves to be ranked in bodies suspected and discredited and deprived of power.

Mr. President, this resolution providing for an amendment is not an expression of confidence in the people; it is an expression of distrust in the people. It is not progress; it is a slipping back. It is not an improvement on our system of government; it is an abandonment of our system of government.

The true remedy for the evils that we see is not to abandon our duty, but to perform it. Sir, there is no weaker course for men to take than to endeavor to make up for the failure to do their duty by changing the form of the duty. This is a proposition that the people of the several States who have stayed away from the polls, who have been deaf to the considerations of public interest, who have allowed personal favoritism to supplant their desire to select the best public servants, who have been bought to cast their franchises, as the people of Adams County, Ohio, were bought, instead of curing themselves and performing their duty in the election of their State legislatures, shall try another way to select Senators of the United States. It is a proposition that the people who can not elect honest men from their own neighbors can elect honest men to the Senate of the United States.

Sir, what vote ever cast by an American citizen can be cast with a stronger probability that it is well informed than a vote for a member of his legislature? He is a neighbor; he is a man whom he has known all his life; he knows all about him. How can the men who are unable or unwilling to perform the duty of making a selection of an honest and faithful legislator from their own vicinage improve upon their performance in the selection of a candidate in a State-wide election of candidates whom most of them know very little or nothing about, except what they get from the newspapers?

Sir, apart from that, it is never possible to cure neglect of duty by changing the form. There is but one safety for a popular government. No matter what constitutions you have or what statutes you enact, sooner or later you come to the polls; and if you do not have virtue and public spirit there, your government goes down.

I press upon the Senate now the duty of saying that it will not give its assent to any attempt at an evasion of that duty by the people of the United States. The pathway lies clear before them under the Constitution. If they will do their duty, the Constitution needs no amendment. If they do not do their duty, you can amend the Constitution a thousand times without any utility. Here, if anywhere, the truth ought to be told; here, if anywhere, should be found men with the courage to say to their own constituents: "The trouble in the election of Senators of the United States is not in the Constitution; it is with you; it is because you are not doing your duty." If there be no voice found in this land with authority and power to reach the minds of our people with such a message, then we are caucusing over idle words when we talk of an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. President, it is wholly unnecessary to abandon the attempt to elect honest legislatures. The whole purpose of re-

lieving and remedying the evil which has led to this agitation for an amendment to the Constitution can be accomplished, and it is in process of being accomplished, without an amendment. We are to-day in a condition of affairs political, social, and business which is but temporary. The enormous increase in the productive capacity of mankind, followed by an enormous increase of wealth, an increase which always in the beginning is congested before the processes of distribution are fully at work, is in active operation. The necessity for a readjustment of the relations of government to the great properties that constitute and continually create wealth, to the great enterprises through which that wealth is gained and is continued—the necessity for a readjustment of the relations of government to these new conditions has led to a control over our State legislatures in many cases which is abnormal, which is to be condemned, and which has been the cause of practically and substantially all of the evils that underlie the desire for a reform. That control has been exercised in part through a form of political organization which grew up under simpler conditions and is in many respects outgrown by our people, and in part by the direct application of the wealth which was seeking to save itself from destruction in the readjustment of conditions to influence the action of legislators.

I say that condition is temporary. I say the process of relieving it is going on, and is going on all over this land. I think it has been proceeding longer in the Southern States, and then in the Western States, and now in the Eastern States. With many of the expedients for the readjustment I do not agree; with many of them I do agree. Of this I am certain, that, altogether, they exhibit the strivings of a great democracy adjusting itself to new conditions, and they are bound to result in a successful accomplishment. The pendulum will swing to and fro. Experiments will be tried and abandoned. Experiments will be tried and found successful here, and needing modification there; but ultimately we shall come back to a new adjustment under the new relations, having all the competency of popular government that existed before the great increase of wealth in our generation.

Mr. President, the proposers of this joint resolution ask that we shall make one of the first steps in this great experimental process, the irrevocable step, of amending the Constitution of the United States. Ah, Mr. President, that is an inconsiderate proposal. It is hardly worthy of grave and experienced legislators. The time may come, after all these experiments have been worked out, when it will be found necessary to amend the Constitution. I do not believe it will; I am confident that under the broad terms of that instrument, which has been sufficient for all the growth and change of a century and a quarter, the process of reform which has now begun will go on to a successful end in comformity to the Constitution as it is. But, if I am wrong, if at some time or other it becomes needful to amend the Constitution for the purpose of remedying evils, let us amend it after the experiment, and not at the beginning; let us do it as the result of that experience which brings wisdom, and not as the result of those conjectures which lead to continual change.

Mr. President, there are specific reasons against this change. The first and great reason in my mind is that it is inconsistent with the fundamental design of the Senate. The purpose of the Constitution was to create in the Senate a body which would be as unlike as possible to the other House. It was to be a body more secure in tenure, different in the manner of its election, different in its responsibility, more conservative, more deliberate than the other House, which responds year by year to every movement of the public mind and the public feeling. As the limitations of the Constitution were set up by the American democracy to protect them against themselves in every impulse to violate the fundamental rules of justice, so the Senate was established by the Constitution to protect the American democracy against itself in the legislation which was required under the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution realized that the weakness of democracy is the liability to continual change; they realized that there needed to be some guardian of the sober second thought, and so they created the Senate to fulfill that high and vitally important duty. Mr. President, this change tends to decrease the difference between the Senate and the lower House. It tends to make the two more alike; it tends to make the function of the Senate less distinctive, and to reduce the benefit which the Senate can render to the public service.

There has been a restiveness in the country at times, Mr. President, over the delay of the Senate; but when you examine the statutes and when you talk with your fellow citizens wherever you may go throughout the country, of whatever calling or condition in life, you will find that America has suffered not from too little but from too much legislation; not from too much consideration, but from too hasty and inconsiderate action; and if you will probe down into that universal consciousness of the people that is never wrong, you will find that there rests a conviction which proves beyond the possibility of doubt that in the delay, in the long-drawn discussion, in the deliberate and unhurried action of the Senate, it has during all its existence performed its duty to the Government and to the people of the United States.

This change would tend to decrease the peculiar quality and character of the Senate which has enabled it to perform its duty.

The change proposed would interfere with one of the great compromises of the Constitution and would lead the minds of our people up to the point where they look over into the constitution of the Senate—and let me say to the gentlemen who are here as Senators for States with but a few thousand or few hundred thousand people, States with 84,000, with 124,000, with 300,000, which have the same representation as Illinois, with her five millions and nearly six, Pennsylvania, with six millions and nearly seven, and New York, with nine millions, that they can not afford to put these great industrial communities in an attitude where they feel that the honorable obligation of the great compromise of the Constitution has been taken away.

This change, sir, would prevent the Senate from having the benefit of the service of a large class of citizens who are specially qualified by character and training to render a peculiar kind of service specially needed for the purposes of the Senate, men who by lives of experience and effort have attained the respect of their fellow citizens and who are willing to undertake the burdens of public office, but are unwilling to seek it; men who will accept the burden as a patriotic duty, accept it doubtless with mingled feelings of satisfaction at the honor and dissatisfaction with the burden, the disturbance of life, the abuse of the press, the controversies about performance of duty, but who never would subject themselves to the disagreeable incidents, the labor, the strife, the personalities of a political campaign.

Mr. President, I do not mean to say—I beg that no one who hears me will for a moment think that I consider that such men as I have described are any better or more useful to the public than the men who are younger and full of the energy of life and the willingness for strife. No; if we can have but one class, then let us have the young and the vigorous; but, Mr. President, we are not confined to the choice of one. We can have both, and it was the purpose of the creation of the Senate that it should contain men who should be the elder statesmen and who should answer to the universal appreciation of the dignity and deliberate judgment involved in the title, Senator.

This change will exile from the floor of the Senate men who answer closely to many of the greatest names in the glorious history of this body. Still you approach nearer and nearer to identity with the lower House, to identity with those functions that it is necessary the lower House should perform, identity with those characteristics that it is necessary the lower House should have and which ought not to be duplicated here, else our usefulness will greatly disappear.

Mr. President, this change would take the direct responsibility of Senators for their actions from the States legislatures to the people at the polls. The members of the State legislature—I am talking about an honest and faithful State legislature, such as I know our people can have if they do their duty—are familiar with the incidents and the difficulties of legislation. They know how necessary it is that in order to accomplish beneficent results mutual concession shall be made. They know how impossible it is that any one man, or any one locality, or any one State can have all of its own way. When Members of this body have to explain to the State legislature the reasons for their action, they meet minds that are competent and trained for the appreciation of their explanation. The people at large have far less understanding upon the subject that I am now speaking of than their legislature, and the inevitable result of such a change as this will be to increase the unyielding opposition of the position of one State and its Senators to the position of other States and their Senators. It will largely do away with the benefit of discussion and comparison of views and mutual concessions and that fair and open-minded yielding to the argument of our fellows, which is the essential of good legislation. This will cease to be a deliberative body if every Senator has to convince, to explain to the great body of the people of his State every act he performs and every concession he makes.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary to demand or to provide for a reform in the constitution of the Senate upon the theory that the existing system has failed. I grant you that occasionally

bad men are sent to the Senate; occasionally a man is sent here who would not have been chosen by a fair and honest choice of the people of his State; but, sir, they find their level and they find it in innocuous insignificance here. I undertake to say—I am so young a Member of this body that I can say it—the basis of my experience and my observation has been so largely formed while holding executive positions and not as a Member of this body—I undertake to say and to maintain here or anywhere that never in this world has any institution of government wrought out more successful results than the provision of the American Constitution for the selection of Senators of the United States. Exercising a power more varied than any other deliberative body in the world; sharing in the legislative and executive and judicial functions; with control over the laws providing for the raising and the expenditure of revenue, through its constitutional power of amendment; with control over the appointments to offices by the necessity for its confirmation; with control over foreign affairs, through the necessity of its consent to the ratification of treaties; with the function, that highest of all judicial functions, constituting it the court for the trial of impeachments, after a century and a quarter of life, I declare to you and to my countrymen that the Senate of the United States has performed its duty loyally, faithfully, and competently, and has furnished to the history of its country a line of illustrious names and a record of great achievement which furnish one of the most convincing proofs the world has yet had that popular government through representative institutions is a possibility among men.

Mr. President, when we consider the multitude of failures that line the pathway of history, when we consider the multitude of difficulties that stand in the way of successful government, let us pause before we abandon the character and the constitution of a body which has proved itself and been proven as has the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, one of the illustrations of the dangers of intermeddling with this delicate relation between the States and the National Government established in our Constitution is found in this joint resolution. The gentlemen who fathered this joint resolution have found that they could not make this change without going on and proposing another amendment striking at the relation between the States and the National Government at a vital point. The interdependence of these provisions of the Constitution is well illustrated by this joint resolution. The danger of tampering with one cog, one spring, one lever, one wheel of this delicate machinery is well illustrated by the fact that in the same breath that the committee reports a resolution for a change in the manner of electing Senators it reports a resolution to revolutionize the relation between the National Government and the States. I say "revolutionize" advisedly, sir. The theory of our Constitution was that regarding all matters within the limit of the Constitution the relation of the National Government should be a direct relation between the Government and the people; that it should operate upon the people. It was that these Senators who are about me are not ambassadors from a foreign State, but they are officers of the United States; that their primary obligation is not to any one State, but it is to the common good of the commonwealth of the United States. And the theory of the Constitution was that the National Government should be invested with all the powers necessary for the preservation of its national life and the execution of its national powers and the performance of its national duties, so that it would not be dependent in any respect upon the will or pleasure of any State. That was the fundamental change from the Confederation to the Union under the Constitution.

So the Constitution, after providing that the Members of the House of Representatives should be elected by the people and that the Members of the Senate should be elected by the legislatures, provided that the times and places and manner of holding elections shall be prescribed.

As I have already said, it is a peremptory command, so that the duty is performed as a duty under the Constitution of the United States and not at the will or pleasure of the State itself. They provided that when the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives have been prescribed by the legislature of a State, in performance of that duty under the National Constitution, the Congress itself may at any time by law make or alter such regulations.

Now, I submit that the proposed substitute, which takes out of the Constitution the peremptory command resting upon the legislatures of the States, and which takes out of the Constitution the right of the National Government to make or alter regulations for the selection of the Members of the Senate, revolutionizes the relations between the Government of the United States and the government of the States. We no longer have, if this amendment is adopted, the power of self-preservation and self-perpetuation.

James Madison, of Virginia, was the great advocate of the provision which gave to the Government of the United States the power, in the last resort, and, if ever need be, to control and direct and require the elections which were to determine the constitution of both bodies of its National Legislature. Now, sir, we are about to abandon it, if this resolution is adopted.

Mr. President, the provision which is now to be wiped out of the Constitution was the basis of the Federal election law.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARTER in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. ROOT. I will yield; but I shall conclude in a very few minutes, and I shall prefer that the Senator would wait.

My memory goes back far enough to remember the condition of affairs in the State of New York when the Federal election law of 1868 was first applied. For several years while it was in force I happened to be the district attorney of the United States for the southern district of New York and to be charged with the enforcement of it. I beg to assure my colleagues in the Senate that the application of that Federal election law broke up a condition of corruptions in the elections in the city of New York which made the election of Senators and presidential electors a mere matter of the dictation of one man. Ballot-box stuffing, false counting, repeating in large parts of that city were the rule rather than the exception, and it was only the application of the Federal election law of 1868 which made possible a reform in those conditions and led the way which the State of New York itself followed by its own enactments designed to continue the honesty of elections produced by the application of the Federal law.

I do not know, sir, that the time will ever come—I hope it never will—when it will be necessary to apply another Federal election law to prevent the creation of Members of this body from being a shame and a disgrace, but I protest against robbing our Nation of the power to exercise such control over the selection of the men who are to constitute its Government.

I am deeply sympathetic, Mr. President, with our friends from the South, who are dealing with the difficult problem of adjusting the relations between the white and the black populations of their States. I look back over our history and realize that mistakes have been made in the attitude of that part of the country where I was born and bred and where I received my first ideas of the political policy of our country. I would not now like to see an attempt to stretch out the hand of Federal power and interfere with the progress of our friends in the South toward the solution of that difficult and embarrassing problem.

But, Mr. President, I must protest with all the energy of which I am capable against our country's robbing itself of the power to do it if it need be.

Freely conceding to our friends of the South the manifold shortcomings of my own people in the North, they must not think hardly of me if I say that from time to time things are done in some parts of the South that the States ought to prevent, and if they do not that the country must prevent the moment they touch the Constitution of our Government.

It is true that in the State of New York we can not afford to be without the safeguard always standing back of our political procedure of power in the Nation to compel purity, fairness, honesty. No State can afford it; no State, North or South, can afford it; and, above all, loyalty to the Nation can not afford it.

Mr. President, it is true that this resolution would leave in the Constitution that provision which makes each House the judge of the elections and qualifications of its Members; but, sir, it would rob this House of the power to require the regulations regarding the elections of Members to be such that we could exercise the power of judging of the elections.

Sir, we found it necessary in 1842 to change the method of electing Congressmen. We found it necessary in 1866 to reach out our hand and change the methods by which the State legislatures were electing Members of the Senate. With that experience before us, will gentlemen tell us that never in the long process of time is it possible that it will be requisite for the National Government to reach out its hand and in order that the election of Senators shall be so conducted as to make it possible to perform the duties of government in judging of their election to control and direct and modify the regulations under which they are elected?

It is true, Mr. President, that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments will still remain in the Constitution, but, so far as those amendments affect the exercise of the power of the

States or of the individual voters in the States to constitute a Member of this body, the second part of this resolution would rob the Government of the United States of the power to make those preliminary dispositions regarding elections necessary for the enforcement of the amendments.

There has been some discussion here as to whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] proposed the granting of a new power to the National Government over the elections in the States or whether the resolution proposed by the committee provides for taking away an existing power.

Let me state what I think it is. As the Constitution now stands, Senators are elected by legislatures whose proceedings are under the control and regulation of the National Congress. The resolution proposes to transfer the power of election from the legislatures to the popular electorate without extending to the new electorate that power of national control. The Sutherland amendment proposes to carry over to the new body of electors the same control which the present Constitution attaches to the existing power of electors.

Now, Mr. President, we are told that that is too high a price for the South to pay. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY] has said to us:

> Notwithstanding the suggestions of the Senators from New York and Montana, the day may be far distant, if it will ever come, when any political party will again find it expedient to attempt to enact Federal laws for the supervision of elections. But this optimistic hope furnishes no safe reason for extending the power of the Government as to the enactment of such laws, and I would not be dealing in frankness with our Republican allies, who are supporting us in this measure, and for whose patriotism and earnestness in the support of it I have the profoundest respect, if I did not say to them that in my judgment the extension of the power of the Federal Government, as required by the Sutherland amendment, is a price greater than the South is willing to pay for the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people. I have no hesitancy in saying that it is a price greater than it should pay.

Mr. President, I beg leave to say to the Senator from Mississippi and to his Republican allies, from a heart full of sympathy with all measures of conciliation between the two parts of the country, that the time has not yet come when the people of this Nation are entering the market place to buy from them or from any of them the right to preserve and protect by the exercise of our own national power the Government of the United States under its Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSTON obtained the floor.

Mr. DEPEW and Mr. BACON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DEPEW. For a moment only.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Certainly.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

Mr. DEPEW. I gave notice yesterday that I would to-day ask the Senate, at the conclusion of the speech of my colleague, to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 23000) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes. I find that many Senators want more time to examine that measure, and I therefore ask that it be made a special order for next Thursday, immediately after the morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to be made the special order for next Thursday, February 16.

Mr. BAILEY. Pending that I would like to know what the bill is.

Mr. DEPEW. It is the bill to provide a civil government for Porto Rico. It is really a new organic law for that island.

Mr. BAILEY. Of course, so far as this side of the Chamber is concerned, I leave that to the Democrats on the committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, with the permission of the Senate, will again state the request for unanimous consent presented by the Senator from New York. The Senator requests that the bill (H. R. 23000) to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes, be made the special order for next Thursday, the 16th instant, immediately following the routine morning business.

Mr. KEAN. The special order will not interfere with appropriation bills?

Mr. DEPEW. No; of course not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It being understood that the special order will not interfere with appropriation bills. Is there objection?

Mr. BORAH. Does that interfere in any way with the order with reference to the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that it will not in any sense interfere with the rights of the unfinished business.

Mr. KEAN. Or appropriation bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Or appropriation bills. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and such an order is entered.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BACON. I desired to ask the junior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] a question, but unfortunately he has left the Chamber, of course not knowing that I intended to ask him the question, or he would doubtless have remained. I desired to ask him a question that I think ought to be asked at this time, and the answer to it ought to be in the RECORD. I extremely regret that the Senator is not present.

Mr. TILLMAN (to Mr. BACON). Well, ask it anyhow.

Mr. BACON. I will state the question I wanted to ask, and the Senator can take some other time to answer it when he has the information as to what it is.

Mr. DEPEW. My colleague has been making a long and exhaustive speech. I think he has simply gone down to get a little lunch, and that he will be back here in a short time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I would not desire to trespass upon the time of the Senator, even if he were here, at any length, but in the very strong and forceful speech which the Senator made, and to which we have all listened with the greatest interest, it being a most impressive speech, he said with very great earnestness that there were some things which were done in the South, which, if the Southern States did not themselves correct the National Government must correct. That was a very strong expression, but one which was not definite in specification as to what those things are.

For us to sit silent, Mr. President, would indicate that we recognized that there are some things done in the South which ought not to be done and which the Southern States ought to prevent from being done, and which if the Southern States do not prevent from being done the National Government ought to prevent from being done.

I desired to know what those things are in order that we might have proper information. I will not press the matter now, in the absence of the Senator from New York, but I desire that the same RECORD which carries that statement by the learned and distinguished Senator shall carry the fact to the Senate that the statement is challenged. We want to know what it is.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I ask to have laid before the Senate the report in regard to the election of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER].

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Alabama would not object to speaking on the measure that is now before the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama, however, asked that the matter to which he is going to speak be temporarily laid before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I shall ask to have it laid aside when I conclude.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays the following business before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. Table calendar No. 11, Senate report No. 942. Report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections relative to certain charges relating to the election of WILLIAM LORIMER, a Senator from the State of Illinois, by the legislature of that State, made in obedience to Senate resolution 264.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senate witnessed the hurdle race for first place between three Senators in the opening of this case.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], fresh from an election in that State, with the smoke of battle still on his garments and fire flashing from his eyes, having in his mind, no doubt, former elections, when the fair fame of his State was smirched by the slimy conduct of "blocks of five," but where now, happily, no corruption exists, all is pure and serene, and every official represents the sound, sober, well-founded judgment of an intelligent and virtuous electorate; he got in the first blow, and well sustained his reputation for zeal and eloquence that has given him so many oratorical victories in the Senate.

Close upon his heels came the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], with tomahawk and scalping knife, the Pocahontas blood in his veins surging and throbbing at the sight of the auburn locks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER], and seemingly intent to add one more magnificent scalp to the tent pole of his wigwam.

A little later came the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD], and whilst his entry was slightly delayed he made up in speed and energy what he lacked in start, and his path through the law and facts of this case was as fast and furious as that made by a frightened herd of buffalo rushing furiously over the plains of South Dakota, trampling down everything in front, and leaving only desolation, dust, and death behind.

Now let me review the swift remarks of these Senators.

SENATOR BEVERIDGE.

The Senator from Indiana says:

Miss Vanderveer, Dennis, and Kirkpatrick saw the money received by White and saw it was in large denominations.

Dennis, White's associate, did not say he saw White with "unusual amount of money or bills of large denominations." He stated he saw White pay some bills—accounts. He said he could not say whether White had any substantial sum of money. Those paid might be about $200. (Record, p. 262.)

Kirkpatrick did not say he saw a large sum of money with White the latter part of June, 1909. Kirkpatrick did not see the money in the envelope left in the safe of his employer by White—which was marked $800 by White—but stated he saw some fifty and twenty dollar bills. (Record, pp. 223–224.) Miss Vanderveer, White's bookkeeper, says she saw White with some money at his office about June 17 or 18, but did not count the money. That he paid her $50.50. (Record, p. 272.) She states she had a list of the parties he owed and the amounts, but had no idea how much they footed up, and had no impression as to the amount. "There were several accounts, but mine was the largest." (Record, p. 273.)

White never did account for the money he says he received. It was a material thing to do.

The Senator from Indiana says:

But Link repeatedly testified under oath at various times that he had received some sums of money under the same circumstances, and at the same times and places where his fellow members received theirs.

Link says he received no bribe money for his vote or because of his vote for LORIMER, and no witnesses contradicted him on that question. (Record, pp. 301, 302.)

The Senator from Indiana states that the third-degree methods of the State's attorney to force testimony from the witnesses is immaterial—

unless the Senate believes that they were "compelled" or "driven" to this repeated perjury by the conduct of the State's attorney.

Link testified that under great pressure he told the State's attorney that he would go before the grand jury and lie if he had to, but he didn't want to, and that then he told the story that the State's attorney wanted him to tell. (Record, p. 298.)

The Senator from Indiana states:

Upon this point the testimony convinces me that "four members of the general assembly which elected Mr. LORIMER" who "testified to receiving money as a consideration for their votes" actually did receive such money.

No four men confessed to any such thing, and no witness testified that he received money as a consideration for his vote except White. Link denied it specifically (record, pp. 301, 302), and Beckemeyer (record, p. 235), and Holstlaw (record, p. 198).

The Senator from Indiana and also the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] say:

On important points Broderick refused to testify, on the ground that it might incriminate himself.

Broderick never at any time refused to testify because "it might incriminate himself," but did testify on every question and to everything that the committee or counsel asked him to testify on, except to give the names of his witnesses that were present when Holstlaw was in his place, and who were to be used in his defense in Sangamon County. (Record, pp. 563, 567, 570.) At first he declined to say whether or not he had written a letter to Holstlaw, but in answer to Senator FRAZIER he stated he had not written such a letter to Holstlaw. (Record, pp. 567, 568.) The only thing he refused to testify to was the disclosure of the names of witnesses to the interview with Holstlaw, which he intended to produce in another case wherein he was a defendant.

The Senator from Indiana says that—

The testimony is overwhelming and conclusive that four members were bribed and that three of their fellow members paid them their money.

White is the only witness who testified that he was bribed to vote for LORIMER. Link, Beckemeyer, and Holstlaw swear they were not bribed to vote for LORIMER. Browne, Wilson, and Broderick swore that they never bribed or paid anybody anything of value to vote for LORIMER or because he or they had voted for anyone for Senator.

The Senator says:

While Shephard and Clark did not confess, and Luke, who is dead, could not confess, the evidence convicts them of having shared the plunder at the same times and places, from the same hands, and for the same consideration as their fellow members, who repeatedly testified to having received it and who were afterwards shown to be in possession of it.

There is no evidence in the record that Shephard, Clark, and Luke were ever paid anything by anybody in connection with the election of LORIMER. Shephard and Clark denied emphatically that they ever received any money from anybody for any purpose at any time or place. (Shephard, record, p. 329; Clark, record, p. 365.)

The Senator from Indiana says—and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] makes the same statement:

Luke's wife testified that along about this time Luke came home and showed her $950 in bills of large denominations, without saying where he got it. The committee declined to permit testimony as to Luke's statement concerning this money and his visit to St. Louis.

The committee did not refuse to let Mrs. Luke testify, but heard her testimony in full. (Record, pp. 494, 495, 496.) In answer to the prosecution Mrs. Luke stated that her husband went to St. Louis after he received a telegram. She stated she did not see anything he brought back with him; did not see large sums of money; did not see $950 in his possession after his return from St. Louis. Mrs. Luke testified that she saw $950 in her husband's possession before he went to St. Louis; that she did not discuss with him anything in reference to where he received it and knew nothing about the money, except that she saw him with it, and did not remember the time she saw him with it, except that it was before he went to St. Louis. (Record, pp. 495, 496.)

The Senator from Indiana says:

Still, without this excluded testimony, the evidence, taken altogether, shows that Luke got his money in the same amounts and from the same sources and in the same places at the same time that the confessed bribe takers got theirs.

This is a clear misstatement of the testimony of Mrs. Luke and of the entire record. White testified that he got his money in St. Louis and that Luke was in the city at the same time. Mrs. Luke testifies that the $950 which she saw with her husband was in his possession some time before he went to St. Louis.

The Senator from Indiana says:

That Shephard admits that he was in St. Louis when Wilson was there, and that he visited a safe deposit bank which he had rented in St. Louis the same afternoon that he met Wilson at the hotel.

This is a clear misrepresentation of Shephard's testimony. Shephard stated he ran over to St. Louis for some packing for his machine, and did not know that Wilson was there until he met Luke on Fourth Street, who asked where Shephard was going, and Shephard stated he was going to Locust Street to the safe-deposit bank of the Mercantile Trust Co. Luke then informed him that Wilson was in town, and asked Shephard to go with him. Shephard declined, but stated if he had time he would call on him later. Shephard stated he then went to the safety vault and clipped some coupons from some bonds he had there. It was afterwards that he called on Wilson. (Record, pp. 321–322.)

The Senator tries to create the impression that Shephard first visited Wilson and then went to the deposit vaults, while the reverse is true, as shown by his own testimony in the record.

There is not evidence in this record or elsewhere, except in the imagination of the Senator from Indiana, that Shephard did not go to St. Louis for packing, and that his visit there was a lucrative one, or that his meeting with Wilson was different than that as stated by Shephard himself. (Record, p. 321.)

The Senator says Browne and Wilson made a long and uncomfortable trip. That statement that it was a long or uncomfortable trip for Browne and Wilson to St. Louis is not supported by any evidence in the record. The testimony in the record shows that St. Louis was the common and most convenient place to get at from central and southern Illinois. (Link, record, p. 288; Clark, record, p. 359; Shephard, record, p. 332; Browne, record, p. 609.)

The Senator says:

Clark bought diamonds during the session which he paid for after it adjourned.

Why did not the Senator tell the big sums in "bills of large denominations" that Clark paid for those diamonds? The record shows that he paid $105 for two small diamonds. His salary as a member of the legislature was $2,000, and allowances for stationery and other things between $50 and $100 more. He was also police magistrate in his city, the former capital of Illinois. If the expenditure of $105 for unnecessary things will convict a man of conspiracy and receiving bribes, and so forth, what legislative body in this country could retain any of its members?

SENATOR OWEN'S ERRORS.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] says that—

The investigation was not searching and complete as it should have been. The jack-pot conspiracy was not investigated. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 666.)

The subcommittee authorized the Chicago Tribune, who had brought the White story and was diligent in establishing it, to act as prosecutor, and named the Tribune's attorney to present the evidence and cross-examine the witnesses, and every witness named or suggested by the Tribune or its counsel was called by the committee. The members of the committee had no personal knowledge of who should be called and had to rely on those making the charges to suggest them.

The Senator says Broderick promised Holstlaw money to vote for LORIMER.

Holstlaw did not swear that Broderick had promised him money if he would vote for Mr. LORIMER. At the top of page 198, record, the attorney for the prosecution asked the following question of Holtslaw:

Mr. AUSTRIAN. Pursuant to that talk, did you vote for Senator LORIMER the next day?

A little further down Mr. Holstlaw answered:

No, sir; I intended to vote for him anyway. I had made up my mind to vote for him before—

Referring to the conversation had on the evening of May 25.

The Senator from Oklahoma says:

His testimony is obviously insincere and untrue.

He did not see the witness or hear him testify and knows nothing about him except what appears in the printed record, and there is nothing in that to show that Broderick was insincere or untruthful.

The Senator says Beckemeyer entered into a corrupt agreement with Lee O'Neil Browne.

Beckemeyer denied in most emphatic language that he ever entered into any corrupt arrangement to vote for LORIMER or into any arrangement by which he was to be paid anything for his vote for Senator or because of his vote for Senator. Here is what he said before the committee: That when Browne requested him to vote for LORIMER he demurred, but Browne then showed him a list of Democrats who were going to vote for LORIMER, and he then told him that if they were going to vote for LORIMER, he would vote with them. (Record, p. 225.)

He also testified that no money or other thing of value was paid or promised him to vote for LORIMER, and that he did not know or believe that he would be paid anything afterwards for so doing. (Record, p. 235.) And again, on page 256, that nothing was said to him about money previous to his vote.

The Senator said that:

Beckemeyer received $900 from Wilson for his vote for LORIMER.

No witness testified that Beckemeyer received $900 from Wilson on account of Beckemeyer's vote for Senator. He says he received the money, but he never anywhere said that it was for his vote for LORIMER.

There is nothing in the record to show that Link ever got any money to vote for LORIMER or because he had voted for LORIMER. Link testified that he never received anything to vote for LORIMER or because he had voted for LORIMER. He testified to exactly the reverse in every place. (Record, pp. 278, 287, 301.)

The Senator from Oklahoma says that—

White accounted before the committee for the money he received from Browne and Wilson, $1,900. The fact is that he presented bills which he had paid before the committee aggregating only $300 or $400. (Record, p. 192.)

The only witness who swore that the letter from Wilson to Beckemeyer, dated June 26, 1909, was dated back was Beckemeyer. He stated that he destroyed the envelope on receiving it. This would have shown when it was mailed. Wilson denied that it was dated back. All things are presumed against a spoliator.

The Senator from Oklahoma says that—

The first Browne jury was hung and the second acquitted him, but that Erbstein was indicted for bribing the jury in the second trial.

Erbstein was not indicted for bribing the jury, but for bribing one juror—McCutcheon. He was tried, and, by the unanimous verdict of the jury, acquitted in five minutes after the jury left the courtroom, January 20, 1910.

White did not testify that Link stated he got $1,000 or that White got $1,000 for voting for Senator. The quotation in the speech of the Senator from Oklahoma is taken from the Chicago Tribune story written by White. The quotation is from the story of White printed in the Tribune, as shown by the reference to page 11, and is not found in his evidence.

SENATOR CRAWFORD.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] says:

Mr. LORIMER was compelled to have 103 votes.

A quorum of each House was present and 202 votes were cast, 102 was a majority, and that only is required by the Constitution. Why does the Senator add one more in this case?

The Senator says:

On August 9, 1909, De Wolf, who was known to be a poor man without money, bargained for a piece of real estate and make a cash payment of $600 on it.

De Wolf had been sheriff of his county and had saved money (record, p. 344,) as he explained in detail and to the satisfaction of every one who heard him, on his real-estate transactions (pp. 339, 340, 341, 342, 343) stating that he never received anything for voting for LORIMER (p. 345).

The Senator says:

Link confessed to receiving money designated as Lorimer money.

Link did not so confess at any time or place, and on all occasions swore that he never received any Lorimer money and never so stated to anyone. I would like the Senator to point out the evidence.

The Senator from South Dakota says:

Shephard, Luke, and Clark might as well have admitted it, because the evidence as to their guilt is overwhelming.

There is no evidence in the record to sustain that statement, except White's, and Senator CRAWFORD says he is a vile creature and can not be believed.

The Senator says:

Clark, after his vote for LORIMER, bought two diamond rings.

This statement is more important in what it omits than what it contains. It follows the statement of the Senator from Indiana in omitting to state the amount paid for them, namely, $105.

The Senator says that—

Wilson, pursuant to an appointment, met White, Beckemeyer, Link, Clark, Shephard, and Luke, and in the bathroom, etc.

No witness testified that Shephard met Wilson by appointment, and Shephard swears that he had no appointment with Wilson, and did not know that Wilson was in St. Louis until he met Luke on the street while Shephard was on his way to the safety deposit vault to cut off some coupons. (Record, pp. 321, 322.)

The Senator says:

White, Beckemeyer, Holstlaw, and Link are self-confessed criminals. They are contemptible people.

I readily grant that.

All who saw them agree with the Senator from South Dakota on that point, and they also agree that their testimony can not be relied upon or believed.

The Senator from South Dakota says:

To my mind the attempt of counsel for Mr. LORIMER to overcome the testimony produced to show that these votes were corruptly cast for him * * * miserably fails of its purpose, and its only tendency is to further confirm and corroborate the proof that LORIMER was not elected.

Well, this is a corroborative fact that I am satisfied the committee entirely overlooked. Any lawyer who attempts to show that evidence against his client is false only confirms the proof of his client's guilt. We are certainly getting into a very rare atmosphere of virtue when the fact of a man having counsel who impeach false testimony against him tends to show his guilt.

The Senator from South Dakota says:

He (White) was maintaining expensive offices in East St. Louis, one a real-estate and insurance office and the other a collection agency.

No witness testified that the offices occupied by White were expensive or otherwise.

The Senator says:

He (White) was doing no business in either.

The record does not sustain the statements made.

The Senator says:

The conduct of the witnesses upon whom Mr. LORIMER relies, as well as their manner of testifying, confirms the impression that they are just such men as one would expect to find giving and receiving bribes.

Only a party who was present could have observed the conduct of the witnesses and their manner of testifying, but the learned Senator who delivered the speech certainly did not do either, as he was not on the committee and was not present at the hearing.

We all know that the Senator is a gentleman of extraordinary mental ability, but we had never suspected that he could, with his X-ray eye, look across a part of South Dakota, count as nothing the distances and spaces of the great States of Iowa and Illinois, penetrate the chamber where the witnesses were

being examined before the subcommittee, and distinguish their "conduct and manner" of testifying. If the Senator had not himself delivered this sentiment in the open Senate, we should be inclined to believe that the words had been put into his mouth by some profane and designing man who was present.

The Senator says that LORIMER received about one-third of the Republican vote, showing he was not acceptable to the Republicans, and not having been a candidate in the primary there was no popular demand to support his candidacy, and that he does not think he really represents the will of the people of Illinois.

The Senator informs us, however—

> If the people of Illinois want him and will give him popular approval in a primary, I think he might be entitled to a seat in the Senate; otherwise not.

So the Senator gives us his real reason of opposition. He was not chosen in a primary. Had LORIMER received an honest legislative majority of 50 votes he would still be ineligible unless he had the approval of the popular vote in a primary. There is yet no such constitutional requirement, however much we need it.

Now, Mr. President, I have only discussed these matters simply to show that the Senate can not rely upon the accuracy of statements, made in haste, even by distinguished Senators.

I shall not review the evidence in detail. That has been done so well by Senators who heard the witnesses, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE], that I think it unnecessary for me to do so; but I shall call attention to a few facts which I think worthy of the attention of the Senate.

TAINTED VOTES.

The Senators do not agree on the number of tainted votes in this case. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] finds 10 such, namely, Beckemeyer, Browne, Broderick, Clark, Holstlaw, Link, Luke, Shephard, White, and Wilson. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] finds the same number, but not the same men, for he includes De Wolf and leaves out Wilson to make the number. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] goes one better and finds 11, adding the name of Griffin and omitting De Wolf, but his colleagues can not stand Griffin. Only one of these three Senators includes the name of De Wolf or Griffin, but together they find 12 tainted votes. Not a single one of the Senators heard the evidence or saw the manner, bearing, and demeanor of the witnesses.

If every one of these votes were excluded from the count, LORIMER would still have a majority. The committee are almost unanimous that all the precedents are that a quorum being present the man receiving a majority of the untainted vote is elected. All of these Senators, however, state that the number of tainted votes is not material and that one or more is sufficient to unseat Senator LORIMER.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER], who did hear all the evidence and saw the witnesses, finds only seven tainted votes, the four men who confessed to receiving money and the three who they alleged gave them the money.

The Senator says as to this question, amongst other things:

> This being true—that is, the evidence failing to show that Senator LORIMER was guilty of any corrupt practices or the knowledge of such—the question then arises were bribery or corrupt practices used by others in his behalf to influence votes for him? And, if so, were enough votes thus tainted with fraud and corrupt influence, when eliminated, to reduce his vote below the legal majority required for his election. * * *
>
> The testimony taken by the committee satisfies me that members of the legislature were paid money for voting for, or in consequence of having voted for, Senator LORIMER. One senator and three representatives admitted under oath before this committee that they were paid money, and the admissions and the acts and circumstances of the transactions satisfy me that they received it as a bribe for or in consequence of their votes for Senator LORIMER.
>
> The four self-confessed bribe takers implicate three other members of the legislature who voted for Senator LORIMER as the persons who bribed them. The testimony satisfies me that the three alleged bribe givers were guilty of that offense. To my mind, the man who bribes another is as corrupt as the one who is bribed, and by his corrupt act of bribery he demonstrates the fact that he is none too honest to receive a bribe if offered him.
>
> While the proof is not clear or conclusive that the three alleged bribe givers were themselves bribed or corruptly influenced to vote for Senator LORIMER, when I take into consideration their corrupt conduct as bribers of others, together with all the facts and circumstances surrounding this case, I can not bring myself to agree with the majority of the subcommittee that their votes are free from taint or corruption. These three votes added to the four confessedly bribed would make seven tainted votes. Eliminate them and the vote received by Senator LORIMER was less than a majority of the votes cast.

It appears, therefore, that the Senators from Indiana, Oklahoma, and South Dakota, amongst themselves, were able to extract from the dead print of the evidence five more corrupt members than the Senator from Tennessee was able to find from living witnesses.

The subcommittee was unanimous in the agreement that there were only two questions in the case.

First. Whether Senator LORIMER himself was guilty of bribery or corrupt practices, or knew of or sanctioned them; and if so, he should be unseated.

The subcommittee was unanimous in finding such not to be the case.

Second. If enough members of the legislature voting for him were bribed or influenced by corrupt practices, that deducting their votes from the total received by him it would reduce his vote below the legislative majority required to elect.

The subcommittee was unanimous as to the law, and only one dissented as to the facts.

I think that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER] erred in his conclusion, even should we concede his finding of seven corrupt votes.

Upon the final vote, resulting in Senator LORIMER's election, 202 votes were cast.

Lorimer received	108
Hopkins and Stringer together	94
Total	202

If seven votes were cast for LORIMER and purged from the the ballot, it would leave—

Lorimer	101
Hopkins and Stringer	94

Leaving LORIMER seven majority, a quorum of both houses still having voted. But the Senator from Tennessee evidently thought that the seven votes deducted from LORIMER votes should be arbitrarily added to the other candidates, to do which would have resulted in a tie.

I think in this he errs, for if the men who confessed to receiving money are to be believed as to that fact, which was strongly contradicted, why should they not be believed when uncontradicted? Link, Beckemeyer, Holstlaw, all swore that when they voted for LORIMER no money or other thing of value had been promised them. Therefore, even if the Senator's theory is correct, these voters were not seduced from the support of Hopkins or Stringer by bribes, and their votes, therefore, certainly could not be added to the anti-Lorimer vote, and he would still have a vote of 105.

If the theory of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] prevails, that any corruption invalidates an election, two corrupt men in any legislature could prevent the election of any man to the Senate, one swearing that he had paid the bribe and the other admitting that he had received it.

DISPOSITION OF CORRUPT VOTES.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER] has presented such an able study of the law and the precedents and has reached such a convincing conclusion as to what disposition should be made of corrupt votes, that I shall content myself by quoting and agreeing heartily with his conclusions. He says:

> The status of an illegal vote is just as it would have been had the voter been absent at the time of the election. The same rule must apply in either case. It is a just and fair rule that excludes the illegal votes, thus allowing those entitled to vote to determine the election. * * * The theory of the law is, and this investigation was based upon the claim, that the corrupt voters had lost their right to participate in the election of a Senator. It would be a novel doctrine that a voter if bribed to vote for a candidate and he does so vote, although the vote is illegal, to say that it is to be given to the opposing candidate. The effect of such a theory may be stated in this way: The corrupted vote is illegal and should not be counted for the candidate who received it, notwithstanding that it is illegal and should not be counted, still it should be credited to the candidate for whom it was not cast or intended to be cast.

It did not in this case require 101 votes to elect. A quorum of each house was present and voting, excluding the seven or even 12 votes claimed to be tainted, and all that was necessary was for Mr. LORIMER to receive a majority of the remaining honest votes, and this he did.

BURDEN OF PROOF.

It has been suggested that when it was shown that one or more corrupt votes were cast in the election of Senator LORIMER, the burden of proof was shifted and the onus was then on Senator LORIMER to establish the integrity of every vote cast for him.

The law presumes every man innocent until the contrary appears, and this presumption is stronger with respect to sworn officials discharging their duty honestly than it is as to private citizens. Is it possible that one corrupt vote by one member of the legislature shall put every other member, whose integrity has never been questioned and against whom no charge is made, upon the stand to prove his innocence? It is inconceivable to me that any proof showing that one legislator acted corruptly should cast a suspicion upon the integrity of every other member of the legislature.

In the hearing the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER] called attention to this, saying that—

He indulged the presumption that the members of the legislature who voted for LORIMER did not do it as a result of bribery, and that that would be presumed unless the contrary appeared.

And Mr. Austrian replied:

That is the presumption that the law gives them.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEYBURN] said later on upon the hearing that—

There would be no dissent as to the lack of presumption in favor of corruption or corrupt practices * * * and the burden is on those who charge otherwise.

And Mr. Austrian replied:

That is the burden we are trying to carry.

Here is a distinct admission by the attorney most largely interested in the prosecution of this case, a man of ability and zeal and fully familiar with the law and the facts. Is it possible that he should have assumed an unnecessary burden?

HOLSTLAW.

Holstlaw swore on the stand that when he got $2,500 he deposited it in the First National Bank of Chicago, the same day he received it from Broderick, to the credit of the Holstlaw Bank, of Iuka. This was his first testimony. Thereupon, the counsel for the prosecution asked him, "Do you mean the First National Bank or the State Bank of Chicago?" and the answer was, "Pardon me, I believe it was the State Bank." But afterwards he again, on page 201, testified that he deposited it in the First National Bank. He evidently was in doubt where he deposited this money. The deposit ticket is lithographed by the counsel for the prosecution, and two very curious facts are observed. The first is that the name of the Holstlaw Bank is not spelled correctly, and the second is that it has the stamp of the note teller on it. Now, this may not mean anything to persons not familiar with banking, but those of us who have had experience in that line would say that such a deposit slip would prima facie show that the $2,500 was used in paying a note to the bank. It may be said that whether he deposited or paid a note makes no difference whatever, but it does make a vast difference whether his story is correct or false.

Mr. PAYNTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to make the suggestion, Holstlaw claimed he made out the deposit slip himself. The name "Holstlaw" is misspelled.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; that is correct. It was testified that he had himself written the deposit slip, and yet the name "Holstlaw" is spelled wrong.

Holstlaw testified that the State bank was the correspondent of his bank; that they made frequent deposits and drew checks against them. I am inclined to think that if the truth were fully shown it would be that Holstlaw bank owed the State bank a note of $2,500, and Holstlaw went to Chicago, took that amount of currency and paid this note. There is no evidence to show that Broderick knew of his coming. Holstlaw swore that he had not advised him what day he would be there. (Record, p. 210.) Broderick swears that he did not know that Holstlaw was in the city until he went down to his place of business at the usual time in the morning and found him there. Now, if this be true, and it is absolutely uncontradicted, it is hardly reasonable to suppose that Broderick would have had $2,500 in his pocket at all. Business men in cities do not carry such a sum around with them, keeping it overnight on their persons.

Then, I am inclined to think that if Broderick is half the man painted by the Senators who attack this report, and if $2,500 had been given him to pay Holstlaw, taking no receipt therefor, he would never have given it up, but kept it himself. Broderick certainly appeared more credible on the stand as a witness than Holstlaw, who was shown to have perjured himself in regard to another transaction.

ACTION OF LEGISLATURE.

In 1909 there were 64 Democrats in the house and 13 in the senate. Sixty Democrats voted for Shurtleff for speaker. These include all but four of both factions of the party. So far as I know, the idea never occurred to anyone that these Democrats had been bribed to vote for Shurtleff, but that they were simply exercising their choice between two Republican candidates.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] thinks that the conspiracy was formed between LORIMER, Browne, and Shurtleff at that time. If so, Browne took not only his own faction but nearly all the Democrats into the conspiracy, and yet LORIMER was not a candidate for the Senate until 10 days before his election—many days, weeks, and months after the election of the speaker.

When LORIMER was elected he received 30 votes of the Browne faction and 17 votes from the Tippitt faction, including Tippitt himself, and the votes of six Democratic senators who belonged to neither faction. So that LORIMER received 23 Democratic votes not of the Browne faction, or nearly one-half of the whole Democratic vote that had been cast for him, and he would have failed of election had not this vote been so cast. Only 47 of 64 Democrats in the house voted for LORIMER. The conspiracy of the Senator seems to have weakened.

Is it possible that these men are to be denounced and charged with corruption because, having no chance to elect a Democrat, they chose between Republicans? I should be sorry to see such a presumption established in this case. It would raise a question as to the election of my honorable friend from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], who I believe incapable of corrupt conduct, who received the vote of every Democrat in the legislature of his State. It would also put me in a delicate position, because I received the vote of every member of the legislature, Democratic as well as Republican.

WHY NOT PUNISHED IN ILLINOIS.

The present Senate of Illinois is composed of 34 Republicans and 17 Democrats, and has taken some notice of this case, as it should have done; and, we are told by the press, a resolution was offered to expel Holstlaw, presumably for his corruption in the furniture deal or perjury in reference thereto. Evidently they could not have expelled him for being bribed by Broderick in this case, for in that case they would have included in the expulsion Broderick, who is alleged to have paid the bribe and who still retains his seat unchallenged.

The Illinois House consists of 82 Republicans and 68 Democrats, and no one of these has been bold enough to move to expel Lee O'Neil Browne or Wilson, which they should do if they are the bribers it is here argued they were.

With these alleged convincing proofs of the guilt of 12 men, all punishable under the laws of Illinois, with the governor hostile to LORIMER, and all the machinery of justice in the hands of the prosecutors, not a man has been convicted, although the election of LORIMER occurred in May, 1909, and the alleged facts have been in the possession of the prosecuting officer for more than a year.

Browne has been tried and acquitted by a jury and reelected to the legislature, along with Wilson and Broderick. The vote in November, 1910, after all these trials and this evidence in Chicago, where it was most exploited, was, for senator, twenty-seventh district:

Broderick, Democrat	8,018
Scouten, Republican	3,349
Scattering	881

And in the twenty-sixth representative district, also in Chicago:

Hagan, Republican	17,829
Anderson, Republican	14,014
Wilson, Democrat	30,021
Prohibition and Socialists jointly	17,666

And in the thirty-ninth district, near Chicago:

Lewis, Republican	10,687
Scanlan, Republican	12,727
Lee O'Neil Browne, Democrat	14,083
Doyle, Democrat	9,879

The only men that have been repudiated by the juries and people of Illinois are White, Beckemeyer, Link, and Holstlaw, the star witnesses upon whose evidence we are asked to unseat Mr. LORIMER.

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS.

A pamphlet containing about 123 editorials, headed "Comment on the Lorimer case," has been laid on my desk, and doubtless on the desks of other Senators, to enlighten us on the law and the facts of this case and the proper vote to cast on it.

I will give a few sample extracts for the information and guidance of Senators. The first refers to the action of the subcommittee. Speaking of the action of the subcommittee and their reports to the general committee this intelligent editor says:

An equal number of jackasses could have accomplished as great a triumph of judicial wisdom.

This is an argument why we should vote against Senator LORIMER.

The second is in another editorial:

A Senate committee has just exonerated Ballinger, and it is in order to whitewash LORIMER.

That is an appeal to reason.

Third, I read:

This is the way honest people will look at the matter all over the country, and it would be well for the Senate to go slow on the whitewashing business. But LORIMER is a Republican and a high-tariff man; the money paid for his election was Republican money, and hence the prospect of his being ousted by a Republican Senate is slim.

I hope so.

Senators are not inclined to scrutinize too closely the methods by which others of their number obtained their seats.

That is a valuable suggestion.

The old guard of special privilege deem it a sacred duty to stand by one of its number, right or wrong.

Of course, this conclusion has been made possible by the failure of the Illinois court to convict anyone in connection with the affair. There are some things concerning which one may be convinced, but which we can not produce legal proof to sustain.

This is a suggestion that we get away from the proof.

There are too many Senators who owe their seats to the same influences that placed LORIMER in the Senate to make his removal expedient.

These are the arguments that are sent gravely to Senators. If such a paper should be sent to the judges or jurors on any decent court in the United States, the parties sending it would be promptly committed to jail.

Mr. GAMBLE. May I ask the Senator from Alabama who is the compiler of the publication from which he has just read and whose imprint appears thereon?

Mr. JOHNSTON. There is no authority in the world given for this. It is just headed "Comment on the Lorimer case," and there is no evidence to show who got it up or, so far as I know, by whom it was circulated.

Mr. GAMBLE. My attention has never been called to it, and I asked the Senator simply for information.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am just saying that the Senate will try this case on the law and the facts. If this paper, sent in here to influence their votes, had been sent to the jurors or judge of any decent court in the United States the party sending it would have been promptly committed to jail.

The whole fabric of the case rests—

First. Upon the testimony of Charles A. White, a self-confessed scoundrel, who was contradicted by many witnesses, and whose manner and bearing upon the stand was such that six of seven members of the committee entirely disregarded his unsupported testimony.

Second. Upon the testimony of Beckemeyer and Link, who, taken before a grand jury, first swore that they never had received any money, were either indicted or threatened with indictments for perjury, and then changed their stories.

Third. The testimony of Holstlaw, another confessed perjurer.

These men were flatly contradicted by Browne, Wilson, and Broderick, men whose bearing on the stand was infinitely superior to these vile creatures.

I think I can show that there is not a member of the committee who would not have believed Browne in preference to Beckemeyer, Link, or Holstlaw.

So far the testimony of the first three men has been contemptuously not believed whenever it was given before a jury in Illinois, and now six of seven Senators seeing and hearing them do not believe that any weight should be given to it. The subcommittee were almost unanimous that those men were not only base, but utterly unworthy of belief. I not only have a reasonable doubt of the truth of their stories, but I have no reasonable doubt of their testimony being utterly false.

Senators are asked to exclude a man from the Senate upon the testimony of the most corrupt scoundrel I have ever seen.

The people of Alabama know that I heard all the evidence in this case, saw the witnesses, marked their bearing and conduct, and they know I had better opportunity to consider and weigh the evidence than they; they know, too, that I have not been accustomed to be driven from the path of duty as I saw it, or to be turned aside from my convictions by popular clamor or newspaper criticism; if they believed that some other gentleman would be here in the place I occupy. The people of Alabama are a brave, intelligent, and law-abiding people, and they expect my vote in this case to be cast as a juror according to the law and the evidence and under my oath as a Senator. They shall not be disappointed.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In common, Mr. President, with every Senator upon this floor, I listened with pleasure to the engaging remarks of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] on perhaps the greatest constructive, or, as he thinks, destructive, proposition now or for some years before the American Congress.

Every step of human advance, Mr. President, has been resisted by a certain type of mind, perfectly sincere, no doubt, which saw in that advance great dangers. There is hardly a good proposition that is embedded in our Constitution that did not create sinister forebodings.

So everyone who is in favor of the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people to-day, as James Wilson, acknowledged to be perhaps the ablest mind in the Constitutional Convention, was in 1787, or as James Madison was, is met now by a multitude of fears as to what the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people would accomplish to the framework of our Government, the preservation of our liberties, and the development of our destiny.

And I suppose, Mr. President, that in the whole Senate, and indeed in the entire country, no man could be found who more ably and artfully could gather together these forebodings of disaster and paint in somber colors upon that melancholy background a more grewsome picture to make us afraid than that distinguished Senator to whom we have just listened.

And however much, Mr. President, I might myself like to paint with a silver lining the cloud which he has cast over us, I would not attempt with any poor abilities of my own that happy task.

But as the Senator proceeded, so far as I was able to detach myself from the spell of his oratory, I noted down some of the points that he made with such fervor, and I shall hope to somewhat illumine his portrayal of despair, not with any thoughts or words of my own, of course, but with what I think everybody will recognize as the accepted facts of undisputed history.

The first point made by the Senator from New York, a point to which he attached such importance that time and again he reverted to it, was that all scholars at the time the Constitution was adopted recognized that the great danger of a democracy was the people's unstability, uncertainty, and changeableness. He said that one of the chief concerns of the fathers in view of the wisdom of the whole world upon this subject, was to guard the people against themselves, so as to prevent those mutations which had wrecked the other democracies of history.

But, Mr. President, what is the fatal defect of that argument? When I mention it every Senator here, whether he is for or against this proposition, will admit it. The ancient, medieval, and other democracies that had flourished before our Constitution was adopted were small, compact in area, limited in numbers.

Take Venice. Take a still better and the most notable illustration of ancient times, Athens. All the electors of Athens could be assembled within the sound of the human voice, and it was due to this fact that popular oratory developed in Greece to a higher point than it ever had before or has since. It was to this natural circumstance that skill in swaying an immediate multitude became the greatest art of that illustrious period. Not Phidias with his divine talent for sculpture was a greater master of the principles of art than were the great speakers of ancient Hellas.

And so it came about that they did influence that democracy as a crowd is swayed. It was to this that Milton referred in his immortal lines—

> To the famous orators repair,
> Those ancient, whose resistless eloquence
> Wielded at will that fierce democratie,
> Shook the arsenal, and fulmin'd over Greece.

But that is not true with us. The people of Athens were fewer than the people of the city of Washington—its electorate smaller still. Does the Senator from New York mean, in making a comparison with the mutabilities of democracies, to put Greece or Venice on the same basis as this Republic, with its thousands and thousands of miles of frontier on two oceans and its almost hundred million inhabitants?

Does he think that this mighty Nation, with a continent for its home, can be compared with the handful of electors who made up those democracies, whose mutabilities so alarm the Senator, even across thousands of years?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Oh, no.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bacon	Crane	Gore	Root
Beveridge	Crawford	Guggenheim	Scott
Borah	Culberson	Heyburn	Shively
Bourne	Cullom	Kean	Simmons
Brandegee	Curtis	La Follette	Smith, Md.
Briggs	Depew	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Bristow	Dick	Money	Smoot
Brown	Dillingham	Nelson	Stephenson
Bulkeley	du Pont	Oliver	Sutherland
Burkett	Fletcher	Overman	Swanson
Burrows	Flint	Owen	Thornton
Burton	Foster	Page	Warner
Chamberlain	Frazier	Paynter	Watson
Clapp	Frye	Percy	
Clark, Wyo.	Gallinger	Perkins	
Clarke, Ark.	Gamble	Piles	

Mr. BACON. I desire to announce that the continued illness of my colleague prevents his presence in the Senate. It is not necessary that I should announce it at each roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was citing, Mr. President, illustrations of democracies which had existed down to the time of our Constitution, which gave rise to the fear voiced by the Senator from New York, even in this twentieth century, that democracies were uncertain and unsafe, and that this liability to uncomfortable change on the part of these democracies was one of the great problems which confronted the framers of the Constitution.

I had cited, for instance, the democracy of Athens, the most notable in the history of the world—its physical limitations, the fact that its electorate was smaller, perhaps, than the population of this city; that all of them could be gotten together within the limit of the human voice; that it was due to that that the great art of oratory developed there as it never had developed anywhere else; and that the changes of that democracy, like the changes of Venetian and other democracies, were due to the fact that they were a crowd that could be immediately appealed to.

But does the Senator from New York think that they are any parallel to this vast democracy which covers a continent and numbers now almost a hundred million people? No demagogue in the sense of the Greek orators can reach all the American people at one time or even a small fraction of 1 per cent of them. The American millions are not to be swayed as an audience is swayed in a political meeting.

It has been noted by the acutest students of our institutions from the days of De Tocqueville down to the time when Bryce illuminated them by his great book that while perhaps one city, or even one State, of the Union may become unduly excited for a month, or even a year, yet it is impossible to get all of the States unduly excited at the same time for a month or a year.

True, they all do get in earnest about fundamental things, and they stay in earnest. But the American people are not lightly changeable; they are not changeable at all without cause; they are wisely steady.

The very fact of the greatness of our numbers, of the extent of our domain, absolutely obliterates the causes that produced the changes in the ancient democracies to which some of the debaters in the Constitutional Convention referred, and which, after a century of our development, the Senator from New York has echoed, in belated terror, to-day.

There are other circumstances that make our vast American democracy different from those others, to which I shall refer as I go on. But first I want to call attention to a passage from Wendell Phillips, with which I am sure the Senator from New York, with his great erudition, is familiar. In one of his noblest addresses Wendell Phillips was speaking of these very objections and answering them.

He referred to the democracy of Athens, and called attention to the great fact that although it lasted only 90 years, yet in that brief period it produced the age of Pericles; it gave to the world the greatest thinkers almost of all time, and, as Phillips said in his immortal apostrophe, it lighted the fires of intellect upon the mountain peaks of human thought which have illuminated the world from that day to this.

Even those democracies are not to be sneered at by anyone, not even by the Senator from New York. It would be well if the much-vaunted stable governments of the world to-day could make such a contribution to human thought, to art, to political science, as did those very changeable democracies of the past.

But, Mr. President, they are called changeable; and we are solemnly warned against all democracy because of that. But such instability as they displayed was due to their limited area and small numbers. Is it just to compare Athens or Venice or the others to this vast democracy, which has no parallel in history, but which does have a splendid imitation in Europe to-day? I call the attention of the Senator from New York to the experience of that Republic on the point of stability. I, of course, refer to France.

Since the time of the second Napoleon France has been a Republic, and all said by her enemies to the contrary notwithstanding, France, except ourselves, is the greatest example of a democracy now in the world. In spite, Mr. President, of the repeated prophecies of disaster to France by the enemies of republican institutions, in spite of the fervent desires of French monarchists who wish to get back their position and power, history records that the democracy of France, its electorate of peasants and business men, has grown steadier and steadier as the years have proceeded.

To the confounding of her enemies, more and more stable grows the Republic of France because it rests, as James Madison said he thought the election of our Senators should rest, upon the solid foundations of the people's will. So the great fear now raised—a hundred years too late—does not apply that we are in danger of the uncertainties of a democracy if we give the people a larger control of their own Government.

The Senator from New York says that in the establishment of the Senate of the United States the great consideration in the minds of the fathers was stability. I grant that to be true. But what kind of a stability? An intelligent stability, based on reason and faith in the people, or a stability based upon an obstinate determination to negative all human advance? Since when was such attitude of mind considered stability?

I quote again from James Madison, and chiefly because the Senator from New York used that great authority to sustain the second proposition of his address, with which I do not wholly disagree.

It is well known to everyone that the really great intellects of the Constitutional Convention were not for the present method of electing Senators. That was Dickinson's amendment, and has anybody ever heard that Dickinson was one of the great constructive minds of that convention?

James Wilson, James Madison, and others of that stature were. Most of the great men of that time, I believe, were from the first down to the compromise, in favor of the election of Senators by the people. James Wilson, in one of the ablest addresses made before that convention, said that not only should Senators be elected by the people, but they should be elected by senatorial districts and not from States, in order that this should be truly a government of the people.

The Senator from New York relies on James Madison as being the author of the provision giving Congress a reserved power over the election of Senators. If he has such faith in Madison as to that provision, why has not the Senator equal faith in Madison as the proponent of the election of Senators by the people, which is involved in this resolution before us?

Madison said that he thought it would be better if the Senate should rest directly on the solid foundation of the people rather than on the pillars of State legislatures. I think I quote Madison's exact words. Why did the Senator from New York forget them if he has such faith in Madison's wisdom?

Stability! Mr. President, where is stability to be found? Is it to be found in an oligarchy or is it rather to be found in the minds and consciences of an instructed and patriotic people? Are not the people themselves competent to choose their servants? If they are wise enough to choose members of a State legislature, are they not wise enough to choose a Senator of the Nation?

Suppose a legislature acting as the people's agent selects a man as Senator—and such things have occurred—whom the people do not want to serve them here as Senator, yet the people could not negative that unwelcome act of their agent. What would be said if an agent of a principal were to select a servant of whom the principal disapproved, and yet the principal be utterly without power to disapprove the agent's action in selecting that servant of his principal? Absurd.

Mr. President, what was the history of this provision concerning the election of Senators? So far as the Senator from New York went, he gave it correctly. But I think he will agree with me that inadvertently he left out some notable and vital facts.

If I am wrong about it, I want any Senator to correct me. The theory upon which the election of Senators by legislatures finally was agreed upon was this, and this only: That the members of a legislature should be absolutely free to choose the wisest, the bravest, and the most virtuous man in that Commonwealth as a Senator of the United States from that State.

The theory was precisely the same as that upon which the election of Presidents by the college of presidential electors was based. That theory was that these electors, whom the people should elect, would get together and select the best man in the whole country for wisdom, learning, courage, and uprightness to be the Chief Magistrate of the Republic.

And now I come to an exceedingly important fact. It was supposed that these legislatures were to make this ideal choice of Senators and this college of electors was to achieve this exalted selection of a President regardless of political parties. Political parties at that time did not exist in the sense in which they now exist. The partisan germs were there, and the far-sighted Washington, realizing what those germs might develop in the mad partisanship of a later day, gave a great part of his farewell address to warning us against the danger of party and of faction.

But in the sense in which we now understand political parties—the convention, the campaign committee, the great election machinery of the present day, which has evolved our "party managers"—were not in existence or in contemplation at the time those provisions were written into the Constitution.

Mr. President, there was not any political convention in this country until 1838. Jackson's day witnessed the development of the political convention, and it was devised to take the place of the outworn caucus system, which was a form party management had taken for some years preceding.

So these legislatures, utterly aside from their other business, with no reference to political issues in their States, with no reference to local questions upon which they would be called to legislate, but acting absolutely separate from all that, were supposed to select the best man who could be found to be their Senator here.

But the evolution of parties has ended all that. It did not have its basis in human nature, in the first place. What is the situation to-day? Political parties, Mr. President, elect a legislature, and that majority in that legislature is not supposed, nor even permitted, according to the original theory of the Constitution, to select the best man in the State, regardless of all other considerations. No. It must select a man of the party which elected the legislature.

The development of parties, when great issues that create parties pass, and when the parties are kept alive only by the inertia of their victories or defeats, created that not altogether fortunate type, the "party manager"—the party "boss." So it comes to pass that Senators actually have been and are and will be the selection not even of the best men from the party chosen by the partisan majority in the legislature, but the man selected by the "party managers" or "party manager."

The party boss has become more potent than the legislature, or even the people themselves, in selecting United States Senators in more than one State.

Will anybody deny that that has occurred? Will anybody deny that that is occurring now? In the Senator's own State the vast majority of one party, according to popular report, which we have not heard denied, is acting in support of one man because the party managers have selected him.

Therefore, do conditions to-day apply to the theory upon which this Senate was constituted? Do they not, on the contrary, Mr. President, absolutely negative them?

The Senator asked what is the purpose of creating the Senate, and he answered his own question by saying that it was to get a steadier body of men, a wiser body of men he might have said; and he might still have gone further and still have been within the literal statements of many Members who spoke upon this subject in the Constitutional Convention. But the Senator did not go further; he did not quote all the reasons given for constituting the Senate of "steady" men.

So I will repeat sentences that every Senator will recognize with reference to the Senate—sentences from the debates on the Senate in the Constitutional Convention.

It was said, for example, that the Senate should represent the property interests of the country. It was said in debate that the Senate should be composed of men of higher social standing. It was declared finally that it should be the representation of the aristocratic element in our Government. Everybody knows that it was copied after the House of Lords. But does that theory hold now?

That idea was advanced in 1787 because the men of property who were in that convention, and who had taken part in our Government such as it was before, were men of considerable wealth. If the time was not so late I would refer to some of the eminent men from New York, whom I believe, except Alexander Hamilton, were very heavy landowners.

But will any Senator seriously go to the American people to-day with the proposition that the Senate of the United States ought to represent "the aristocratic element" in our Government, or to represent the money of the land, or to stand for the private property in the Republic? That theory has passed away during this great historic period of enlightenment.

Property needs no special representation in government. All that property needs is honesty on the part of its owners. No person will so defend property and property rights as the great masses of the people themselves, who have little or no property.

Mr. President, when war breaks out and the Nation is in danger and all property in peril of chaos and destruction, who then are its defenders? Who carry the muskets and serve the shotted guns and charge willingly to death for the institutions under which that property exists and is preserved? It is the people themselves. It always has been the people themselves.

Mr. President, when the Revolutionary War was being fought there was, I believe, only one man of great wealth in the field, George Washington. The great commercial interests of Manhattan Island in the heavy majority were Tory in their sympathies. It was the ragged Continentals who fought the war that gave us our liberty and laid in their blood the foundations of the Nation.

Robert Morris gave of his wealth. A patriotic Jew, Simons, I think his name was, of Philadelphia, gave his all to the cause of liberty, and a grateful Republic permitted him to die afterward in New York a pauper.

So when it is said that the Senate must represent the property of the Nation as contradistinguished from the House, which represents the population of the Nation, I say that a hundred years of the progress of human rights has utterly demolished it. I say it has been burnt out by the flames of the flashing guns of human freedom from Yorktown to Appomattox.

Property, whether individual or corporate, has nothing to fear but everything to hope by trusting to the people. It is from the people that all wealth comes, and it is the people who always have been its defenders. It would be a wiser policy to-day, as a mere selfish proposition, if the wealth of the country were to show more faith in the people of the country.

Indeed, Mr. President, I think that just this is what is occurring—slowly coming about perhaps, but still visible. One of the most hopeful signs of our vexed social and industrial problems, to my mind, is this: That the ablest and wisest among the "captains of industry," as they are called, and masters of finance are coming little by little, yet more and more, to take the people into their confidence. When they do that frankly and entirely the people will respond not with hostility, but with hospitality, if these men's proposals are honest and sound.

So the theory that the Senate was to be composed of men of property, as one man said in debate in the Constitutional Convention, men of exalted social standing, that it was to be to the American Government what the British House of Lords was to the English Government, has utterly passed away.

Take the House of Lords to-day. What is occurring in Great Britain itself? Is the power of the House of Lords increasing? Are not the English people the very models of the world's intelligent conservatism? And upon whom do they lean, the weakling Lords or the stalwart Commons, who draws their commissions from the people and are responsive to the people themselves?

The Senator referred to this provision in the Constitution as one of the great compromises. It is not necessary to go into that. It was not one of "the great compromises," as certain well-known compromises are called, although it was one of the compromises. It was a great compromise in this, that it was the point—the rock, I should say—upon which the Constitutional Convention nearly foundered.

I recall to the Senate what all of you know, of course, better than I do a scene which occurred in that Constitutional Convention when the wiser minds, like James Madison and James Wilson and those great intellects whose thought has illuminated our history even to this day, were confronted with the proposition now in the Constitution.

They would not yield it until they saw that the smaller States would not agree to ratify the Constitution unless they did; and Belden—I believe that was his name—of New Jersey, actually threatened the convention that New Jersey would withdraw and form an alliance with a foreign power if the smaller States could not have their way. I think this is substantially correct; but if I am in error, some erudite Senator will set me right, I hope. Since we are going into historical origins, that little matter might be mentioned. If I had time, I should mention still others.

The Senator says that the Senate is supposed to be composed of "elder statesmen." This is in the same vein that he said the Senate was to be composed of the conservative classes, the steadier minds, the "elder statesmen."

Mr. GALLINGER. In part, he said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well; in part. Let us say in part, although I think the Senator from New York did not say "in part." But no matter. Let us examine the origin of the term "elder statesmen." Did anybody in the Constitutional Convention utter that phrase? No. Where did it come from? What did it come from? What did it mean?

Did the Senator from New York invent the term "elder statesmen?" Alas, no. Yet all peoples have heard it during this decade. It has made an impression on all of us and on the world. Since when? Since six or seven years ago when we constantly read about the wisdom of the "elder statesmen" of the Japanese Empire. That was its origin.

What were those "elder statesmen?" Members of the Japanese Chosi Clan. There were and are two great clans in Japan, the Samurai, the warriors, and the Chosi Clan, or the statesmen—hereditary warriors and hereditary statesmen. All the latter, I believe, or most, at least, are nobles trained to

statesmanship, observing scrupulously their class tradition, and so far as world politics is concerned governing at least with precision of action if not with profound wisdom.

That is the origin of the term "elder statesmen;" and it does fit into the theory so often voiced on the floor of the Constitutional Convention that the Senate should represent the aristocratic element in our Government. It does fit into the ancient theory announced anew by the Senator from New York.

But, Mr. President, if the "elder statesmen" of Japan, if the Chosi Clan, does, under the theory of that Empire, do it good service, would not that clan be an anachronism in the American Republic in the twentieth century? "Elder statesmen," Mr. President!

The Senator from Massachusetts the other day showed that the Constitution was adopted by men mostly under 45 years of age. Nobody else dared, nobody else ever does dare, a revolution. I may be wrong, but I think I now remember, with my mind going fleetingly over it, that the Declaration of Independence was signed chiefly by young men. Everybody knows that most wars are fought by the youth of the land. But among these may be elder statesmen in the sense of thought.

I want to refer to some in the history of this body. It is a great roll call that I am going to indulge in—Henry Clay, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Charles Sumner, Oliver P. Morton, and the other mighty of our past.

Will anyone say that Daniel Webster was in this Chamber merely by the wisdom of a legislature, although legislatures were freer to act in those days than they are in these days, as I shall show?

Did Henry Clay come to this body because of the discriminating care of the Legislature of Kentucky? Is that why Charles Sumner was here, or Oliver P. Morton?

Or is it the historic fact that Clay, and Webster, and Calhoun, and Sumner, and Morton, and all the great men whose names and genius have made this body illustrious, came here because they represented to the point of personification the thought, conscience, and purpose of the people of their States?

John C. Calhoun—I will be supported by the Senators from that State who are here—was more the State of South Carolina, better personified the common people of South Carolina than the Legislature of South Carolina itself. Daniel Webster was not put in the Senate by the legislature over the will of the people, but he was put here by the legislature obeying the will of the people of his State. That is true of Charles Sumner; that is true of Oliver P. Morton; that is true of every great man who as a Senator of the United States has shed renown not only upon this body but upon the whole Nation for all time.

I was surprised the other day when I heard a man of the extreme erudition of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] intimate that the great statesmen in this body had been chosen by the discriminating wisdom of legislatures, when the historic fact is known by everybody from schoolboy up to scholar that the greater minds that have been sent within these walls have been sent here because of the will of the people bearing upon their legislatures until their legislatures had no other thought but to send them here, and if their legislatures had done anything else they would have been punished by the people's disapproval, anger, and contempt.

The Senator from Massachusetts the other day spoke about direct elections of Senators giving us nothing more than Congressmen at large. Has that been the history of the wisdom of the people in this and other countries in selecting their public servants? Which body has given to the world the great names of England in statesmanship, oratory, and thought, the House of Lords or the House of Commons?

I ask the Senator from New York whence came Pitt the elder? Whence came Pitt the younger? Whence was the public origin of Burke, and Fox, and Gladstone, and O'Connell, and Disraeli, and all those others of that splendid constellation of English statesmanship that has preserved and enlarged the liberties of the United Kingdom and thrown the lines of the British Empire around the world? Every one of them came from popular elections.

Could a State legislature have done better than to have selected Charles James Fox, the most accomplished debater, perhaps, any English-speaking people ever has produced? Could a State legislature have improved upon Edmund Burke? Was not O'Connell sent by the people of Ireland, eloquent as an orator, learned as a scholar, great as a lawyer, wise as a statesman? Yet all these men were given their places in English public life by the direct vote of the people.

I know it will be said that the electorate of England in that time was limited compared with what it is to-day, but to whom is it due that the English people now have universal manhood suffrage? To Gladstone. That was his great reform, and then came his others of cheap postage and the humane land laws of Ireland, which latter the conservatism of Great Britain said were nothing short of socialism.

Yet Gladstone was the product of popular election from his earliest days to the close of his brilliant career. Could a State legislature have done better than to have selected Gladstone? And Disraeli came in the same way.

If I had time I would refer to the rising British statesmen who bid fair to rival in the stature of their ability, their courage, their energy, and their devotion to the English people the great sons of England's past. Every one of them has come from the votes of the people, and they are devoted, in turn, to the people.

Yet the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New York say, "Oh, Gladstone, he was nothing more than a congressman at large," because he was elected by the people. Burke, away with him, say they; he was a congressman at large because he was elected by the people. Charles James Fox, discredit his genius in debate; what does he amount to? He came from the humble English electorate. Disraeli, nothing more than a congressman at large.

Why, Mr. President, the laws of England—I had almost said for centuries, but I will not go that far, because I want to be strictly accurate—have rested upon the wisdom, the patriotism, and the courage of the House of Commons. And it has been due to that fact that England has made steadier progress to enlarge human rights than any other fact except one, one of which we must soon take note, and that is the fact that England has guarded the purity of her elections with a sternness that no people ancient or modern has done.

Is property imperiled in Great Britain? Has it been for a hundred years? Mr. President, in my reading of books and of the speeches of those who in this country pretend to fear the advance of popular rights, I have read time and again that England is the place where property was most secure, where conservatism was most steady and intelligent, where radicalism was checked until it ripened. Yet her laws of property and of political rights all are passed by the House of Commons, elected directly by the people. That electorate is universal.

Does that suggest to Senators that perhaps there is, after all, nothing so much to fear from the people if they elect their Senators? Does it suggest to Senators that possibly the American people may return to this body men who in their day may approach the great ones whom the English people have sent to the House of Commons?

The Senator from New York asked the question—I think I quote his words correctly—how can the people better choose a Senator than can the legislature? The answer is so clear that I am sure the Senator from New York himself will agree to it. The members of a legislature are chosen, to use the not quite American phrase—yes, I guess it is, too—by the people of the vicinage, the voters of the locality. Everybody who has anything to do with American politics knows that legislatures are chosen by localities—and for local reasons.

There is not a man here who does not know of cases where a legislative district has returned a man because of a question of street improvement, or because of a local law that the people of that district wanted to get through, or some other purely local consideration——

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If the Senator will allow me to finish my statement, I will gladly yield. Or a legislature is elected upon a question exclusively local to that particular State, which one party or the other takes up, and which is of no concern to the Nation.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wanted simply, Mr. President, to inquire of the Senator from Indiana if it is not a fact that whenever a senatorial vacancy is about to occur the legislature is elected largely with a view of filling the vacancy with the choice of the people of the State as expressed through the legislature.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; and I was coming to that. The Senator is quite right, and I think the Senator will acknowledge what I am going to say.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very glad the Senator is not going to overlook that fact, for it is a fact.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I am not. I put down my notes hurriedly—but I am not going to overlook that point. Assuming it to be true, as it often is true, that it comes about when there is a senatorial vacancy that the parties so act that that enters into the election; it also is true that very frequently there are local issues affecting the State itself, having nothing whatever to do with those national affairs upon which a Senator must pass and for attending to which he should be chosen. Is not that true?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I apprehend that may be true in some States. I believe it was true in the Senator's own State.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; and it has been true many times in all States. That is a frequent occurrence. It is also true in the Senator's State, and always will be true and increasingly true. So if the people could express their will on the question of the representation of the State in this body, the result would be one way; but, having at the same time to choose upon a party issue which has nothing to do with national legislation, they have got to express their will another way. Thus it is, Mr. President, that our present system by development, not anticipated by the fathers, almost always is putting paradoxes up to the people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is it not equally true that those local differences would find expression in a popular election? If the Senator were a candidate and some other man were a candidate, would not their views on those local questions be demanded, and would not the vote give expression to the feeling of the people on those subjects?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from New Hampshire gives me another very good argument that I had not thought of. I am grateful. They might, or they might not; but assuming that they might, it follows that the Senator has been selected because of his expression of an opinion upon a purely local State question, having nothing whatever to do with his duties as a national legislator for attending to which he is supposed to be elected Senator. Is not that true? Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. My query——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I answered your query.

Mr. GALLINGER. My query was directed to the election of Senators by the people, and the point that has troubled me is whether the Senator is going to get rid of his local issues in the event of the election of Senators by the people.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all. I do not want to get rid of them; they ought not to be gotten rid of; but they ought not to be mixed up with election of a United States Senator. I would have the people vote upon their local issues as local issues, and upon their Senator as a Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. But they vote upon the Senator because of the position he takes on those local issues.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If that is true—and sometimes it is—then the Senator has given me the best argument I have ever heard advanced for the direct election of Senators by the people, because, according to the Senator's proposition, the people would select a Senator, no matter how unfitted he might be, because he had a certain view upon a local question that absolutely was alien to his duties as a Senator here.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Pardon me just a moment. You asked a question. The Senator is not elected here to put through a local issue of New Hampshire; he is not elected here to cast his vote or to do his work because he has an opinion upon some momentary fancy local to the State of New Hampshire; he is dealing here, he is here, just what the Constitution calls him—not a Senator of New Hampshire, but a Senator of the United States from New Hampshire.

And he is dealing with what? With the local question that might have arisen in his State election? No; with all the foreign affairs that affect this Government and that run out on lines across the waters of the world and to every Cabinet of every country. He is dealing as an arbiter of the foreign destinies of the Republic; he is dealing as the highest judge established by any Government on earth; he is dealing as a legislator in a forum which is the only place where free speech now exists on all the globe; he even tries a President.

And yet the Senator would have us say that this man, clothed with these mighty powers unprecedented in the history of human government, ought to be selected because he has a certain opinion upon some local question in his State.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator entirely misapprehends, or else he purposely misrepresents, my position—one or the other.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am taking the converse of the Senator's proposition. The Senator asked me whether or not it was not true that a Senator's position on some local question might affect his election. I say, yes; and that is the very thing we want to avoid.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator's argument was that in the election of members of the legislature local questions entered into the controversy; that men were elected on those issues rather than on the question as to who should be Senator from the State; and my query was whether or not, if the election was by popular vote, the position of the candidates on those local questions would not be sought, and whether the votes might not be cast in that case just as much as in the other, along the lines of those local questions.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And I say, yes, as Senators now are elected; but not so much, if at all, if Senators were elected by the people.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is all I said. I agree with the Senator's eloquent words about what a Senator ought to be and what he ought to represent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not say what he ought to be; I say what the Constitution makes him.

Mr. GALLINGER. Exactly. He ought to be that, if the Constitution makes it so.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course. The Senator stated——

Mr. GALLINGER. And I have always contended that we were Senators of the United States and that we ought to look to the interests of the Nation, perhaps, primarily, but not forgetting the interests of our State at the same time.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course.

Mr. GALLINGER. I absolutely agree with the Senator from Indiana on all those points.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course; and the Senator, I say, in stating that very pertinent interrogation, furnishes, I think, the best argument I have ever heard for the election of Senators by the people which is——

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let me repeat it, because I am going to take this thing up, now that the Senator has mentioned it.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to remark that I have never furnished an argument in favor of the election of Senators by the people. This is the first argument I have ever heard that has appealed to the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That one appeals to me. Thank heaven, then, for its source. Now, the Senator having made his argument for it, I would be glad if the same process might go on——

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is all right. I am glad to have the Senator interrupt me, as he knows. Let us enlarge upon this a little bit. The Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] asked, How can the people better choose their Senators than can their legistures? The legislatures, he says, are elected by men taken from the vicinage, from the neighborhood, of the voters.

First, I answer that the members of the legislatures often are elected, as every Senator in this Chamber knows, in various localities because of local considerations peculiar to those localities. But the situation is not now as it was when the Constitution was adopted. When the Constitution was adopted that was true, too; but at that time the theory was that the members elected on account of local considerations would get together, absolutely aside from their local legislation, and would canvass the State for the best man for Senator, without regard to party or local considerations or anything else except preeminent fitness.

At the present time, however, the various members in the Legislature of New York, for instance, or in New Hampshire, or in any other State, are elected because of the conditions existing in a locality, and do not get together to select the best men for Senators, regardless of all other considerations, as the Constitution contemplated they should.

But, being members of political parties, which, in the sense they new exist, did not then exist, vote, not even for the best man in the State without regard to party, not even necessarily for the best man in the party, but for the man determined upon by party managers, and that frequently has been so in our larger States.

Second, take the case suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], where there are issues purely local to the State of New Hampshire, affecting the rest of the country not at all, and the people elect their legislature upon those issues. The Senator knows that that occurred in more than one State without regard to national legislation at all; yet that legislature, being bound by party lines, votes for some person who perhaps may have been named at the primaries or by a convention of that party, because, as the Senator says, of his expression on this local question. Is that a wise way to select a Senator who must deal not only with every domestic law of the Nation, but with all the foreign affairs of this great and growing Republic?

Suppose, on the other hand, the people should vote on the local issue affecting New Hampshire; that they should first vote on that, and on that alone elect their legislature, and at the same time could vote directly for a man to represent them in Washington. What they were voting on would be clearer

in their minds, would it not? They would not be involved in two different things at the same time, would they?

I have in mind now a State west of the Mississippi River, where the law provides that the candidate for Senator shall be put at the head of the ticket. The people can then directly vote on that, regardless of any local issue. I am not now referring to the Oregon plan, and do not care to go into that this afternoon. I intend to speak on the main proposition before us—the election of Senators by the people—and I am answering the Senator as to why it is that the people can select Senators better than the legislatures can select them.

The next point that I jotted down from the remarks of the Senator from New York—and to me it was curious—was this: He asked, What is to become of our legislatures if we take from them the power of electing our Senators? Why, Mr. President, we should then relieve our State legislatures from this alien and unnatural power and let our State legislatures attend to their proper business.

That is what is to become of them; and contemporaneous experience shows in at least two States in this Union at the present moment, and in many others since I have been a Member of this body, that the business of the people of the States to be transacted by their legislatures has been interfered with because they were called upon to do the illogical thing of electing a Senator of the United States.

The Senator admits that the provision as to State legislatures was already framed when this idea that they also should elect Senators was hit on. The idea as to what the duty of the State legislatures should be was thoroughly understood before the provision that they should elect Senators was put in the Constitution. That is true, is it not?

The legislatures were not framed chiefly for the purpose of electing Senators; the legislatures were framed for taking care of the domestic legislation of the State. That is true, is it not? And the election of Senators by these legislatures was added to that as an extraneous duty and, as the Senator from New York has said, as a compromise.

So, when the Senator asks what will become of the legislatures if you take away this power, the answer is both historic and immediate, we shall relieve them of the power that finally was thrust upon them as an expedient and let them attend to their proper business of legislating for the concerns of the people of their Commonwealths.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. It occurs to me that too much stress is being laid by the Senator, and has been laid by other speakers and writers, upon the fact that the election of Senators, where there are long contests, interferes with the work of the legislature. As a rule, where there is a prolonged contest, as in New York at the present time, and as we have had in my State on one or two occasions, a single ballot is taken each day. It occupies but a little while, and then the legislature goes along in the transaction of its other business, and very little time is wasted or mischief done. That has been my observation.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, Mr. President, to answer the Senator in two ways, first, I would not have laid so much stress on that if it had not been for the query, which rather surprised me, what was to become of our legislatures if we do not permit them to elect Senators of the United States. I had not thought of it up to this time and was surprised by it.

Now, as a matter of fact, for a second answer, the Senator in the case from Montana some years ago, that he very well remembers, will recall that in that case it appeared that the time of that legislature was taken up for a long period in trying to elect a Senator, and that when they were not balloting they were caucusing and consulting and conniving, and they were giving up their time to this immediate problem rather than passing the laws of the State. That is true. It is only human nature.

Again, consider the excited condition of the legislative mind. Suppose it is true that the general assembly meets and takes only an hour out of twenty-four in balloting for Senator, nevertheless it comes to be the pressing question on their minds. That is what they are thinking of. They are not thinking of the bills to be passed. No; but "Who is going to win this contest?" It is just under conditions like those that bills get through that ought never to get through.

The attention of most men is taken by the imminent conflict and not by their immediate duty. That is human nature, is it not? It interferes with their work, and, what is more, in case there is corruption, it furnishes the opportunity not only for corruption in the election of the Senator, but for corruption in passing the people's laws.

So that when the people vote for a legislature under the circumstances cited by the Senator from New Hampshire they are not voting upon single and simple issues, but upon composite and complex issues which have nothing to do with each other.

The Senator from New York gave an illustration, to which I wish to call the particular attention of Senators. He asked, Are legislatures to be strengthened by stripping them of power? "Take a city council," said the Senator, "does it grow in dignity, strength, and virtue by diminishing its prerogatives?"

Well, take a city council, Mr. President. Suppose a city council were given the power to select the mayor. Is that any different in principle from the selection of a Senator by a legislature? And yet will anybody be heard to say that under our present development of free institutions we ought to give a city council the power to select the mayor? If mayors were selected as in Germany, perhaps yes—there might be a question. But here—what does the Senator say?

Suppose the city council of New York should choose New York's mayor, on the theory that the city council could select a wiser man than could the people of New York. Does anybody in New York believe that the selection would be wiser? The time has been there when the city council was selected by a lawless local political organization, which is notorious not only throughout the Republic but throughout the civilized world—and I am not sure that this is not true even now.

Mr. GALLINGER. As well as the mayor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As well as the mayor; but the mayor, being responsible to the people, has, in recent years especially, more and more responded to them.

The Senator from New Hampshire says "as well as the mayor." The Senator from New Hampshire has been kind enough to ask me a question or two, for which I am obliged to him, and I will ask him a question myself. Does he think that the city council of New York or the city council of Chicago could better select the mayors of those cities than could the people?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, my answer to that would be that I am not quite sure as to whether it would be wise or not. I think I have in mind the election of mayors in some cities not a thousand miles from my own home where the city council could not have done any worse, if it had tried, than the people did.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Possibly; but will the Senator answer the question: Would he, on the whole, taking one year with another, say that the mayor had better be selected by the city council than by the vote of the people?

Mr. GALLINGER. I would not say so.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Neither would I; and yet the illustration has been advanced by the Senator from New York that a city council is not strengthened by taking away its power—therefore, of course, strengthened by giving it more power. I make the power analogous to that of the legislature electing a Senator and apply the argment of the Senator from New York, and ask, Would it be better for a city council to select a mayor than for the people to select the mayor? No, Mr. President.

Yet, if the people can better be trusted to select a mayor than can a city council, why can not the people be better trusted to select their Representatives to sit for six years in this body, with greater power than any mayor has, instead of a city council, because a State legislature is a State council, is it not? Indeed, some of the States still call the State legislature the "State council."

So, taking the illustration of the Senator from New York in support of his question, "What is to become of our State legislatures if you take away this power," I asked the Senator whether it is better to have a city council select the mayor than to have the people select the mayor, and the Senator from New Hampshire, with his accustomed frankness, says, "No; he does not believe it would."

Upon this point, Mr. President, the Senator from New York says let us strengthen the State legislatures; let us not insult them by taking away their power by reducing their prerogative. Do the legislatures themselves object to this? No, Mr. President; the very legislatures whose self-respect the Senator thinks will be lowered by providing that Senators shall be elected by the people have petitioned for this change. I have forgotten how many now, but almost a majority, perhaps more. I will ask the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] or the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] how many of the State legislatures have petitioned for this amendment.

Mr. OWEN. I think 31.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Thirty-one—many more than half the legislatures of this country, acting under the right of petition, which is one of the most solemn rights that comes down to us from Magna Charta—have prayed us to grant them this very

relief which the Senator from New York says will derogate from their self-respect and power.

If the legislatures of the States themselves are the petitioners, Mr. President, surely the legislatures are estopped from saying that we are robbing them of a power which they ask to be taken away from them and which the history of the Constitution shows was given them only as a last expedient in the shape of a compromise.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I do.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, including those States where the primary law in effect puts the nomination of Senators in the hands of the people, 37 States have acted favorably on this matter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, 37. That is still more. The Senator from New York spoke wisely about the weakening of State governments. He referred to the fact that duties are coming to us by a natural process, because the State governments more and more are failing to discharge their duties.

Could a better reason have been given, Mr. President, for relieving those State governments of this extra burden? Why are they falling behind? There are two reasons—mingled economic and political reasons. One is that many of the greater affairs with which States formerly dealt are now economic national affairs, and the States can not deal with them properly.

The trust question, the transportation question, the distribution question—all these fundamental questions affect all the people of the United States as a whole instead of some of them as States separately. Another reason is this very question of the election of Senators, an extraneous duty, that takes their time and their attention from their immediate business.

So if it be true, as the Senator says, that State governments are falling behind, that they are growing weak because of nonuser of their powers, why not relieve them of this extra power which they petition to be relieved of?

The Senator spoke about the people staying away from the polls, I suppose, as a kind of argument why they ought not to be intrusted with any more power. Mr. President, that is a serious question. I suppose there is no other purely political question that has so engaged the thought and attention of students as the curious fluctuations of a popular electorate, and the reason, I believe, has, by the consensus of the most learned opinions, been agreed upon.

The people stay away from the polls to the extent that they do, Mr. President, because they understand that after all their voting they have mighty little to do with the laws; that after all their voting they have mighty little to do with the election of any officer who is elected by their legislature.

Scores of years of wire pulling in legislatures, with which the people are thoroughly familiar, refusal to pass needed laws until after years of agitation for them, until the popular demand becomes so insistent and irresistible that even the interests that profit because those laws do not exist can no longer prevail—all the experience so familiar to legislation, is one reason why the people are no longer interested.

So it comes to be said, and that, too, by intelligent people—and I am coming to the intelligence of the masses in a minute—"What is the use? The caucus fixes who is to be nominated; conventions, run by bosses, say who is to be nominated by both parties; I can not vote for whom I like; it will have no influence with the laws." That is the reason, Mr. President, why the people's voting is falling off.

But where the people understand that they themselves can take part in legislation; that they themselves can vote for a Senator, for example; that they themselves under that system, which started in older countries than ours, can cast their vote upon a specific law, I observe that history shows that they come to the polls in greater abundance. Mr. President, if you want to encourage the negligence of the great privilege and duty of voting by the people just continue to take away from them more of their participation in government.

The Senator from New York says that this proposition comes because of evils in legislatures in connection with the election of Senators by those legislatures. Mr. President, partly; but it comes from a reason far deeper than that. It comes from the natural growth of the democratic idea. It comes by an increasing determination of the people to choose their own servants, to make their own laws.

The Senator says this is a part of a movement against representative government. If it is, Mr. President, it is a movement against representative government because, in the people's opinion, representative government no longer represents the people. The common voter is asking the question: Whom does representative government represent?

It is true that this is a part of a great movement. How great? As great as two or three States? Yes. As great as a great section of the Republic? Yes. As wide as the Nation? Yes; and more than that, it is a part of a movement as wide as the world.

Who would have said three or four years ago that Turkey by this time would have a constitution, a chamber of deputies, and the beginnings of a republican government? Who would have prophesied, after the experience of Alexander the First in Russia, that the time would arrive within less than half a century when even that autocracy would have the beginnings of republican government? What mind would have been so wild as to prophesy that the idea of the people ruling themselves would penetrate the Orient, overthrow the ancient dynasties of Persia, and establish a parliament there?

Who could have believed 75 years ago that the most ancient monarchial people in the world but one, Japan, would have by this time as complete a voting system, almost, as that of Great Britain? It is a part of a movement, a movement wide as the world and deep as humanity, and it did not begin yesterday.

No; it did not begin, even, with the ringing of the Liberty Bell or with the Bill of Rights or with Magna Charta. It began when the idea first lodged in the human mind that the people ought to rule themselves. We have been in advance of that idea. Within the last few years England has overtaken and passed us. Switzerland is far ahead in her democratic institutions. So is France. No! the present phase of this world-wide and history-old movement is not a wild fancy of an excited populace, but another step forward of the deliberate and intelligent advance of all humanity.

The Senator from New York spoke of the pendulum swinging. There is the very mistake. This is no pendulum-swinging affair. This is a historic movement. The pendulum does swing in the case of a political phase that does not have its roots in the ongoing of things; but never in all time was there a swinging back of the pendulum in a historic movement of the people's advance.

Did the pendulum swing back from the time the Declaration was signed and the agitation of the years before that brought it into existence? No; the movement went on until Yorktown.

Did the pendulum swing back in the great agitation for our present constitutional form of government, which was toward a greater national unity and the resting of the Government upon the shoulders of the people themselves? No; it went on, not only till the Constitution itself was adopted, but has gone ever since. It always will.

Did the pendulum swing back in the period of Garibaldi, the soldier, and Cavour, the statesman, in Italy? No. It went on until Italy was unified, and instead of the servants of a few paltry princes there was a people of citizens. Did the pendulum swing back in the great human historic movement of the unification of the German people?

The Senator mistakes. This is not a pendulum swinging affair. It is not a passing passion. It is a great historic advance of the people, the continuance of the march which they began in the years of the heroic past.

The Senator speaks of changes in the Constitution. Everybody knows, as all writers on the history of our institutions set forth, that there have been mighty changes in our Constitution. It has vitality. It is not a dead thing. It is not a petrified form. Those changes have come by judicial interpretation and by practical administration.

The hour is so late or I should give several examples, but I will give one now, and that is The Legal Tender cases. The Constitution gives Congress the right to *coin* money. The Congress issued promissory notes, the legal tender of the Civil War. Does anybody believe that the power to *coin* money that was understood, when the Constitution was adopted, to be gold and silver and the smaller coins, involved the issue of paper promises to pay?

Well, that question was taken to the Supreme Court, and in the Hepburn case the Supreme Court said, no, in answer to Mr. Potter's wonderful argument, which I suppose never really has been refuted.

And then the Supreme Court changed, and in The Legal Tender cases the court said that not because we have power to coin money, but for reasons of power that we could deduce from many sections, or from the whole Constitution taken together, we had the power to do this.

That was considered by the law journals of the time to be absolutely revolutionary. If the hour was not so late, I should give—and I think I shall take occasion hereafter to give—a good many notable illustrations, some of which, I think, the Senator from New York has enlarged upon elsewhere, where the

Constitution has grown and changed by interpretation and administration, and therefore has been made responsive to the needs of the Nation.

But here is a case where it can not be enlarged by interpretation, where it can only be changed by amendment. Senators seem to think that we are tearing the Constitution to tatters. Oh, no; we are obeying its plain letter. The fathers foresaw that amendment would be necessary, and provided how it could be done. Then when we follow this plain method prescribed by the Constitution itself, are we designated as iconoclasts?

Mr. President, there is great fear of the people. The Constitution and the people! we hear, as though they were hostile forces. Well, Mr. President, what about the Constitution and the people? The Constitution was made for the people, made by the people; the people were not made for or by the Constitution. The Constitution is the people's instrument. The people are not the Constitution's instrument. The Senate is the people's servant, the Nation's servant, not their master. The people and the Nation are not our servants, and the Constitution ought to be changed whenever the people say it should be changed, because they made it and it is for them.

I challenge any man to have more reverence for that great instrument than I have, for men of my blood have fought for it on fields of blood. I have no greater reverence for anything else on earth than for it, except one, and that is for the intelligence and the conscience of the combined millions that make up the American people themselves.

There has been all through this debate, Mr. President, a profound distrust of the people. Of course you can not make any argument against this amendment to the Constitution except upon the distrust of the people. And to-day we heard what was said on the floor of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, that the people were not sufficiently informed for this and that and the other.

I want to repeat to the Senate an opinion given me by one of the greatest men that ever I knew, a man whose memory we all revere, to whose wisdom we all look up, even the older Senators, sitting at his feet like Saul at the feet of Gamaliel—Senator Platt of Connecticut—upon that subject. He was commenting upon speaking in his own State before the people there and speaking here, and he said to me, in substance—

> I do not tremble when I rise to address my colleagues in the Senate, but I do tremble when I speak to a group of farmers or working men in Connecticut, because my experience is that they are thoroughly informed on all the questions, economic as well as political, upon which I can address them.

The fact is, Mr. President, due to the spread of education or the time that the farmer and the laborer and the salaried class have to read the news and reviews, the ordinary audience in this country, and especially in the rural communities, and the working and salaried classes, are better informed than their average servant in Congress. They are posted, and any man who goes among the people, not once or twice in the year in some notable speech, but all the time, mingling with them, will find that out. Senators make a profound mistake of fact when they imagine that the people are not intelligent and thoroughly informed.

Mr. President, one of the reasons that has been stated time and time again why it was not safe to trust the election of Senators to a direct vote of the people when the Constitution was adopted is because it was said the people were not informed at that time and were liable to be excited. As the Senator from Kansas pointed out yesterday, there were no means of communication in those days. People were separated, scattered apart.

But to-day San Francisco is nearer New York than Washington was to Pittsburg when the Constitution was adopted. The whole country is knit together by a network of living intelligence. Newspapers, magazines, books go everywhere, and Senators have simply made a profound mistake of fact when they doubt the intelligence of their constituents and of the people of the whole Nation. You can select from almost any community men who are as well up, even on the economic problems of the hour, as the average Senator here.

I know of one little crossroads in Indiana, at the juncture of three rich farming counties, where more serious reviews, both American and foreign, are taken than by a like number of people in the Back Bay district of Boston. I know farmers who take not only more popular magazines, but more serious English quarterlies and our own serious reviews than the average Senator in this Chamber. They read them, too. They study them. And they get the books referred to in the articles. So the people are intelligent enough. The people are informed. The Senator should not be alarmed about that.

The last point the Senator made on this particular question was to warn us that the amendments to the Constitution heretofore made have not worked as they were intended. That is true, Mr. President. It is fortunately true, as I think the Senator from New York will be the first to assert. I am going to give him one illustration and ask him if he does not agree to it. I myself am a believer in Providence over all that we do in the end. The Senator cited the fourteenth amendment. I cite it, too, and especially the last provisions—

> Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

When that amendment was passed—I am going to relate a circumstance now which I am sure is within the memory of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW]—it was supposed to refer only to the freedmen—colored people who had been slaves—and there at once began to be interpretations of it, a critical one, where the word "person" was applied not only to the freedman, but to corporations. One of the cases was the famous San Mateo case, I think it was—I am speaking on the spur of the moment, and if that is not the case where this question was considered, I hope some Senator will correct me. But I think that was the case.

Anyhow, in the case I have in mind, a former Senator from New York made the great argument before the Supreme Court of the United States. Roscoe Conkling, after he went out of the Senate, made that argument. It did not seem to alarm Mr. Conkling in making that great argument which influenced the decision of the court, that amendments to the Constitution had not worked as they were intended to work. I believe the argument was made, and, if not, I am sure that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. DEPEW] can correct me, because he knows all about that case, that the last part of the amendment referred to corporations as well as persons, and therefore no law could be passed which would take from a corporation its property without due process of law or deny to any the equal protection of the laws; that that covered corporations just as much as it did the colored people.

It was argued on the other side that the history of the amendment showed that it grew out of and was for the purpose of protecting the individual freedman. That was the issue, was it not? When Conkling came to answer that he closed his argument in something like these words:

> It may be true, your honors, that this amendment was not intended by its framers to have such a broad application as its words justify. But no matter, a greater wisdom than theirs was at work—

Then Conkling recited these wonderful lines so applicable to his contention—

> The hand that rounded Peter's dome,
> And groined the aisles of Christian Rome,
> Wrought in a sad sincerity;
> Himself from God he could not free;
> He builded better than he knew.

That was the expression of another great New York statesman and lawyer in one of the most notable cases that ever came before our Supreme Tribunal in the interpretation of the Constitution. No, said Conkling, it did not apply as the men who drafted the amendment thought it would, but it applied with a broadness of wisdom greater than their temporary intentions, and "they builded better than they knew."

Mr. President, that quotation was, of course, as everybody recognizes, from Emerson's immortal poem "The Problem." And Emerson observed in one of his essays, which was a prose statement of that great poem, that it always has been found to be true that wherever any law was passed for the people's rights, where any constitution had been drafted to enlarge the people's powers, it always worked out, under the direction of an Infinite Wisdom, better, wider, and wiser than its authors knew.

So in the election of Senators by the people, Mr. President, the forebodings which the Senator from New York conjured with, after all are lighted up, if, indeed, they are not transformed into rosy hopfulness by these simple facts of history.

The Senator says, Whence comes this desire; that there is no fervent desire among the people for this. How shall the people show their desire, Mr. President? How shall they prove the fervency of their hearts for this proposition within the limits of law? Can they do it more powerfully than by the petitions which they have showered upon Congress, not recently only, but for years?

Can they do it in any other peaceful way than the ordinary way in which they continuously and increasingly have done and are doing it? Does the Senator think the people can express the ardency of their wish for a thing only by arming and marching on Washington?

Mr. President, the people have expressed by every means known to the orderly procedure of peoples of our race their desire for this great reform. Petitions to the Senate for this

amendment, petitions of the legislatures to the Senate for this amendment——

Mr. HEYBURN. How many?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Thirty-six or thirty-seven. I discussed that while the Senator was out.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. The Senator will find some difficulty in verifying his statement that 37 States have asked that Congress shall submit this amendment to the legislatures. They have asked that conventions be called, which is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator does not need, I know, and does not intend, to quibble with a great business.

Mr. HEYBURN. There is no quibble about it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The point is this, that 37 States have asked that in one way or another way the people be permitted to elect their Senators. That is the main proposition. And that is not all——

Mr. HEYBURN. I will call the Senator's attention to the figures at another time, but he had better examine as to it in the meantime.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I referred to two thoroughly posted Senators on the floor, the Senator's colleague and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and they both assured me that the figures were right.

Mr. HEYBURN. I have the resolutions from the States in my desk, and at the proper time I will call attention to them.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think it appears that three or four other Senators have those figures; great numbers have, in any event.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will remind the Senator from Indiana that the pending question before the Senate is whether we shall surrender the power which Congress now possesses to supervise in the last analysis the election of Senators, and I have been waiting to hear the Senator say whether he is in favor of that particular part of the joint resolution.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I am grateful if that circumstance has chained the Senator to his seat for this time. I do not wish to speak upon that——

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is not the only thing that kept me here.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am still more grateful to the Senator for the implication I am permitted to draw from that. I want to speak upon the other question. I will not say whether I disagree with the Senator upon the question he propounds. I am apprehensive of destroying the power of the Congress over these elections, but I am principally determined, so far as my vote and efforts are concerned, upon the main proposition, the election of Senators by the direct vote of the people. The Senator and other Senators might just as well know that nobody can divert the attention of the people from that main issue.

I listened without the slightest thought of intending to speak on this question to the Senator from New York making good points upon that question; but when he came to the election of Senators by the people there were a few unintentional omissions of historical detail to which I thought I would essay to call attention. It was not my purpose to take up so much time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does not the Senator from Indiana think we ought to present a joint resolution to the legislatures of the various States which will embody that one question of the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I should like to see it done, Mr. President, in the quickest and most direct and most single-phased way it possibly can be done.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does not the Senator from Indiana think it is vital that this power, which has been possessed by the Government for nearly a century and a quarter, should be preserved?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is exceedingly desirable, Mr. President, but when the Senator uses the somewhat limited word "vital" I do not believe at this late hour of the night I want to split hairs about that. The thing we do want, the thing upon which the people are determined, the thing which they ought to have, both as a matter of reason and of changed conditions since the Constitution was adopted, is a right of the people to elect their Senators themselves.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Indiana has not yet made up his mind on the other question, I understand.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. When we come to voting I will try to express my final conclusions upon that, though I must say I regret that it ever was brought into the case. I am not without sympathy with the Senator's proposition, though I do not believe I am prepared to go as far as to say that I would be willing to preserve that power and lose the main thing. I am very sorry that that question ever arose, because it does permit a justifiable difference of opinion, based upon history and existing conditions; whereas the main question does not.

I was merely pointing out in closing, Mr. President, when the Senator from New York declared there was no desire for this among the people, that our people had expressed in every way known to the orderly conduct of peoples of our race their desire, their fervent desire, their continued and continuous desire by petitions, resolutions of legislatures, and in every possible way by which it could be done.

More than that, Mr. President, what is the meaning of the advance in the direct primary laws in our various States? It is because in spite of the people's petitions we have not answered the people's petitions as they desired, and so they are trying to get their heart's desire in another way, by primaries, by other plans.

There was a recent great agitation, I think, in the Senator's own State for the direct-primary system. I do not know whether that included the selection of a party's candidate for Senator by direct primaries or not. It does in most of the States, and I assume it did in the State of New York. Perhaps the public prints were wrong, but they represented the Senator as being in favor of that general plan, as was the governor of the State at that time.

In several of the States of the Union the people have tried to get this thing done after we have refused it to them by taking the situation in their own hands and making a provision that the people should vote for two candidates for Senator just as they vote for their governor. In one form and another, from ocean to ocean, the people have not only expressed their fervent desire, which the Senator from New York says he does not perceive, but when we have denied them that desire they have tried to get it indirectly by affirmative laws in their own States.

Senators, can the people in any other or better way express their feelings than they have done? They have been restrained; they have been moderate; they have been orderly. Naturally the Senator does not expect that a desire of the people for legislation shall take the form of mob violence.

Mr. President, Senators need not have any fear of the ability of the people. I venture to say that the masses of the people of Kansas are as steady in their composite judgment and as wise in their combined intelligence as any Representative they send here.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not referring to the Senator in the slightest.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator referred to my State. I want to say that the State of Kansas is in favor of the proposition to amend the Constitution so that Senators may be elected by direct vote, and both the Senators from that State are going to vote for the proposition.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I say, in conclusion, that this is a part, as the Senator from New York said, of a great movement; but it is not a part of a great recent movement, but of a historic movement; not a temporary movement, but one as permanent as the race and as lasting as time. It had its origin in the beginning of human history, and it will go on through human development to the close of human history, with the people's government getting more and more into the people's hands. It is affecting every nation in the world to-day. It is overturning thrones; it is establishing parliaments. We who in modern history began the march should continue to lead that historic progress. [Applause in the galleries.]

PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF FOOD FISHES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (H. Doc. No. 1375), which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

On the 2d of February, 1910, I submitted to Congress "A system of uniform and common international regulations for the protection and preservation of the food fishes in international boudary waters of the United States and Canada," in order that due legislative action on the part of the Government

of the United States may be taken as stipulated in article 3 of the convention of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain on the subject. The attention of Congress was again called to the subject in my annual message of December 6 last.

I now transmit a report from the American member of the International Fisheries Commission furnishing further information in explanation of the value of the regulations and as to certain modifications which have been proposed and showing the importance of early action by Congress. He calls attention to the fact that the fisheries embraced in the regulations are among the most important in the world, and that they can be adequately protected only by the joint action of the two Governments. I can not too strongly urge upon Congress the importance of taking prompt action to put into operation the conservation measures provided in the regulations and to which this Government is pledged by treaty stipulation.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1911.*

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask leave to submit a resolution and have it go over for the day. Let it lie on the table, subject to my call. I give notice that I will call it up to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 345) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate a statement from the records of the Post Office Department showing—

1. The number of opportunities for promotion of railway mail clerks, resulting from deaths, removals, or otherwise, during the past fiscal year and the number of promotions actually made, giving classes in each instance.
2. The number of railway mail clerks killed and injured in wooden railway mail cars suffering wreck or collision while being operated in trains in front of heavier cars of steel or steel underframe construction during the last fiscal year.
3. What penalties, if any, have been enforced against railroads for operating wooden mail cars in front of steel or steel underframe construction cars in the same train, and the amount of penalties collected or withheld from railroads on this ground during the last fiscal year.
4. A statement of all penalties collected or withheld from the railroads for delays in the transportation of mail during the last fiscal year.
5. A list of all railroads with whom mail contracts have been made during the past year in which no provision is made for penalty or damages for (a) delay in the transportation and delivery of mail matter, (b) violation of the law and rules of the department regarding the operation of wooden mail cars in front of steel cars or steel underframe cars in the same train.
6. The number of post-office cars now being constructed or under contract for construction on plans and specifications approved by the Post Office Department showing (a) the number of wooden cars, (b) wooden cars with steel underframe, (c) steel cars.
7. The increase in mail tonnage and the increase in the number of letters and parcels carried during the last fiscal year over the preceding year and the increase, if any, in the number of railway mail clerks and total pay thereof during the same period.
8. The number of resignations of railway mail clerks during each of the past five years, giving the class from which each clerk resigned.
9. The number of unworked mail pouches and bags carried through during the month of January, 1911, as shown by the daily reports of the railway mail clerks on the following representation lines:

Chicago–St. Paul via Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway.
Harrisburg–New York via Pennsylvania Railway.
Washington–Atlanta via Southern.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to say one word with reference to the joint resolution before it is laid aside for the day. I dislike extremely to recur to the matter to which I called attention immediately after the address of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] relative to a statement made by him in his exceedingly impressive and forceful argument, one of the most impressive and forceful I think I have had the pleasure of listening to in the Senate during my term of service here.

It is mainly because of the fact of the character of the speech, its very great impressiveness, and the very great attention which it received not only in this Chamber, but which it will receive from the public at large, that I feel that one of the statements made by the Senator in that speech should not go to the country without some further explanation of the meaning of the Senator as to what he then had in view.

I will repeat substantially what I said to-day when the Senator was unfortunately out of the Chamber. The statement made by the Senator in his speech, if I recollect it correctly (and if I do not the Reporter's notes, of course, will show wherein I am in error), was to the effect, if not in words, that from time to time there were things which happened in the Southern States which ought not to be permitted to happen by those States, and that if they were not corrected by those States the National Government must correct them.

If the Senator had not said that these were happenings in the Southern States I would not feel called upon as a Southern Senator to ask that some more explicit statement be made by him. When the Senator says that they are happening in the Southern States, there must be some things peculiar to the Southern States which do not happen in other States.

I, for that reason, would be very glad to ask the honorable Senator what are the things to which he alludes which from time to time are happening in the Southern States which the Southern States ought not to permit, and which, if the Southern States do permit, the National Government should correct and prohibit.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia will recall that I was discussing the surrender by the Government of the United States of the power necessary effectively to enforce the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. Those amendments were designed to give to the black men of the South protection through the exercise of the power that rests in suffrage. The power of self-protection was one of the great moving considerations of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

Sir, there have been in the South—and my remarks are limited to the South, because it is there that the questions arise under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, and for no other reason, and I accompanied it, the Senator will remember, by a frank admission that there are many things done in the North also which call for the reservation of the same power on the part of the National Government—there have been in the South lynchings, which I am sure the Senator from Georgia deplores as much as I do; there has been peonage, which I am sure he deplores equally with myself; there have been introduced into the constitutions of the Southern States clauses which are grouped under the general description of "grandfather clauses," and which are apparently adapted to limit the operation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are willing, apparently, to hold their hands and to give godspeed to the people of the South in working out the great and difficult problem that is before them; but, sir, if it should come into the mind of the people of the United States that the protection of the blacks, which was designed in these amendments, is not being secured; if it should come that the people of the United States are convinced that injustice and oppression are being visited upon them, then the great reserve power of the National Government to enforce in full the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments will be exercised, and ought to be exercised. So long as the people of the South are working out their difficult problem in kindness to the blacks, so long the rest of the country looks on with sympathy and with good wishes; but if it shall ever come that the spirit of lynching and peonage denies to those poor people the protection that these amendments of the Constitution were designed to give to them, then the reserve power will be reenergized. That is what I meant by what I said.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has brought into this discussion features which are not cognate to the immediate matter under consideration. The question which was being discussed, as I understood, was the necessity of the adoption of the Sutherland amendment in order that the National Government might maintain the control of the manner, the times, and the places of the election of Senators if those elections should be by a direct vote of the people. Therefore the question was on the subject of the exercise of the suffrage, and I thought that the Senator in his reply to my inquiry would possibly confine himself to that, because the other questions to which he makes reference open a very wide field for discussion.

Mr. President, it would probably be sufficient if I were to answer so much of the Senator's reply as relates to the matter of suffrage, because that is the question which we have had under consideration; but as the Senator goes out of his way to speak of lynchings and of peonage, I desire to say one or two words in regard to that without proposing to go into any general debate upon that subject at present, though, if it is desired, I presume not only myself but others from my section will be very glad to answer any argument which may be made or to meet any allegations of fact which may be made in regard to these matters. I will, however, now say one or two things in regard to them.

The great State of New York is not free from the crime of lynching. The great State of New York has very much less in the way of provocation, very much less of those things, those

horrible outrages, which convert men into demons than have the people of the South. They have very much less of those things, Mr. President, which deprive men of their reason and make them do things which they would not otherwise do.

Sir, no man in the South defends lynching. I say "no man," but I mean no man of proper feeling and regard for the law. Yet many at the South realize the fact that there are provocations to resist the power and impulses of which humanity is not only frail, but helpless. As I say, even in the great State of New York there has not only been a lynching, but a lynching of the most extreme and barbaric character, one in which the person lynched was burned at the stake. But further than that, Mr. President, there would be 10 lynchings in New York to where there ever has been one if it were not that New York is a thickly populated State, and most of the provocations to lynchings occur in large communities where there is ample police protection to protect the intended victim from the mob.

A year, sir, never passes but that the New York papers tell us of several, if not many, efforts to lynch people even in the city of New York; efforts which would be successful but for the fact that there is an army of policemen to prevent them, whereas in the South, with innumerably more occasions for those occurrences which stir men to these lawless redresses, the communities are thinly populated and there is no opportunity for organized police to protect them against lynchings.

Mr. President, I could go somewhat further on that subject. I shall not, however, do so, but I think I have suggested a sufficiency of answer in that regard.

I want to say to the Senator from New York in regard to peonage, that there never was a grosser slander against a people than that which is contained in the charges made and often in the prosecutions which are found in the South on that subject. We know what peonage is; we know the country from which it comes and the system which there prevails, where there is practically a slavery, a life-long slavery; and not only a life-long slavery, but a slavery from generation to generation under the bondage of debt.

There is no such thing in the South, and the pretenses of peonage in the South are based upon those things which are hardly worth while being called offenses. They grow out of a condition of affairs where honest men, honorable men, law-abiding men, have to advance money as monthly wages to people under a contract that they will do work for a certain period, generally a very short period, and where those who have thus contracted seek to evade their obligation, and where it is simply an effort to make them carry out the contract, not of peonage, but the contract for ordinary labor for which they have been paid in advance. That is about the sum and substance of every charge of peonage that comes up from the South. It is in almost every instance the effort to enforce the performance of a contract of a few months, where the wages have been in good faith paid in advance by the employer for the advantage and convenience of the laborer. It is a gross slander upon our people, too often countenanced by the courts, to represent that as peonage.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that if the facts could be known. If the east side of New York could be investigated, there would be found very much greater violations of personal liberty, very much greater violations of the law which prohibits that one man or one woman or one child shall be deprived of liberty by another, than is ever found in any so-called peonage at the South.

But, Mr. President, that is not the question to which I addressed my inquiry to the Senator from New York, and I did not understand that those things were in the mind of the Senator when he was delivering his powerful speech, for such it was. I thought the Senator had in mind—and I still think so—those things which related directly to the matter which is before us for consideration and determination. I thought he had in mind the question which arises out of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah—the Sutherland amendment—whether, in case we adopt the constitutional amendment giving to the people the right to elect Senators by direct vote, the question as to the manner of that election shall be determined by the States or whether it shall be determined by the Federal Government.

Although he did not then say so, I understood the Senator, in the remark which I have challenged, to have reference only to the question of suffrage. In the discussion of that particular question, he said that there were happenings in the South from time to time—if I recollect aright, those were his words, not once but "from time to time"—which ought not to be permitted to happen, and which, if they were allowed by the States to continue to happen, the National Government must put its hand out and prevent their happening. I understood him to mean exactly what he alluded to, or substantially what he alluded to, in the latter part of his remarks with reference to the suffrage features of the law in some of the Southern States. For that reason I wanted to ask him to state plainly if he meant that if the Constitution shall be so changed as to provide for the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, in his opinion, the Sutherland amendment was needed in order that if, according to the opinion of Congress, the laws of the Southern States with reference to the suffrage were not such as accorded with the view of Congress as to the rights of the people under the several amendments of the Constitution to cast their votes in the election, it would then be the duty and power of Congress by law to see to it that the laws of the Southern States in those particulars were abrogated and annulled and that those elections for Senators should be governed by laws which would emanate from Congress and not from the States? Am I correct in that, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. ROOT. Perfectly, Mr. President. My proposition is that if the Members of the Senate are to be elected at popular elections the Government of the United States must retain the power to make those elections honest and fair and free, the power to say, if the regulations prescribed by the State are not adequate to that end, that they shall be superseded by regulations made by the Congress of the United States. My proposition, further, is that without that power accompanying this change in the method of the election of Senators, if the change be made, the Government of the United States has surrendered the power for its own preservation and protection.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President——

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me just one second, then I will yield to him.

Mr. President, do I understand the Senator from New York to mean that if the States have now upon their statute books laws which regulate the suffrage in those States, such as the Senator speaks of as "the grandfather clause," though that is simply a term generic in its character which relates to a general class of legislation—does the Senator mean that, with the laws now upon the statute books of the several Southern States, if the proposed amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] should be adopted and we should pass the joint resolution to amend the Constitution and it should be ratified by three-fourths of the States, it would then be within the power of Congress, if it conceived that these grandfather clauses, as they are called, all the body of laws with reference to the regulations and limitations of the suffrage in the Southern States—if Congress should conceive that they were unconstitutional, does the Senator mean that, in his opinion, Congress would have the power, under the amendment of the Senator from Utah, to annul those provisions and to make Federal laws to control the election of Senators in such way as to insure the right to vote to all persons thought by Congress to be entitled to vote?

Mr. ROOT. Without the slightest doubt.

Mr. BACON. Well, Mr. President, it is well that we are given this notice of what the Senator does mean and what the Sutherland amendment means.

Mr. ROOT. I meant to put you on notice, and I mean to put the whole country on notice if my words are able to do so.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I have performed a service in having the Senator announce it, not in general terms, but in particular terms. Sir, with this view it is certainly a very grave risk to run to adopt the Sutherland amendment and to put any such power in the hands of Congress.

I do not desire, Mr. President, to discuss the question of the grandfather clause and the laws of that class adopted by the Southern States for their protection, but I will say this to the Senator from New York and to others: No people ever went through so dark a day as the southern people when they were called upon to deal with the question whether they would submit to what was then the intention of the legislation of Congress, that by enfranchising the blacks and disfranchising many whites their government should be surrendered to the ignorant blacks.

I want to say to the Senator that if the southern people had not heroically contended and battled for white supremacy in the South, had they not subordinated all else to that issue, civilization would have been destroyed in the South; and if civilization had been destroyed in the South, the fatal poison would have speedily affected the whole body politic, and it would have been but a short time before civilization would have been practically destroyed in the whole American Nation.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say just one word in this connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I was going to have the matter laid aside, but if the Senator from Florida desires to speak I have no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. It will take only a moment.

Mr. President, the question of peonage has been referred to, and I will confine my remarks to that one subject in reply to the Senator from New York. I would like to add a word to what the Senator from Georgia has said, especially since there has come to Florida some notoriety in that connection.

In the southern district of Florida there was, I think, one trial involving the question of peonage. There was an acquittal of the defendant in that trial. The judge who conducted it is one of the most eminent on the Federal bench in this country.

In the northern district of Florida there were two trials and two convictions of peonage. One was the case known as the Clyatt case, where there was a conviction in the district court, a writ or error was taken to the circuit court of appeals, and the judgment was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals. But the judges of the circuit court of appeals certified to the Supreme Court, fortunately, the one question as to whether the act under which the prosecution took place was a valid law.

The case therefore came to the Supreme Court of the United States almost by accident, and that court, investigating the case, examined the whole record and reversed the judgment, and declared that there was not a "scintilla of evidence" upon which to base a conviction of the defendant in the case, and the defendant was discharged. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] informs me he appeared as counsel in that case in the Supreme Court, and he will agree, I think, with my statements as to the conclusions of it.

The other case was tried by the same judge within six weeks of his death. He was a judge of whom I do not like to speak further than to call attention to the fact a short while before that he was on trial before this body under charges of impeachment. There was a conviction in that case, known as the Harlan case. A writ of error was taken to the circuit court of appeals. By a majority of the court the judgment was affirmed, without a written opinion. Every effort was made to bring that case to the Supreme Court of the United States, and those lawyers who have examined it thoroughly—a large number of them, at least—are convinced to-day that it would have resulted in the same way that the Clyatt case resulted—in a reversal of the judgment of the lower court. But the Supreme Court of the United States was never able, under the technical rules which control it in such proceedings as were taken, to examine that record, and that conviction stands.

But, Mr. President, what I mean to say in this connection is that it did not concern the colored man at all. No man of color was involved in it. The prosecuting witnesses and the parties who charged they had been subjected to peonage were foreign laborers, brought down from New York under contract with an employer engaged in the lumber and naval-stores business. They were the very sweepings of the slums of Europe.

Mr. BACON. I will say further, if the Senator will permit me, that the party charged in that case was not a southern man. He was from the State of Iowa.

Mr. FLETCHER. The employer charged was from the State of Iowa, and I say here from my place, and on my responsibility, I fully believe that he ought not to have been convicted. But at the same time that is not the question. The point is that the colored man, of whom the Senator from New York speaks in respect to peonage, was not involved. I would say, further, that the colored man is getting fair and decent treatment in the South, and millions of dollars are being spent on his education and for his benefit by the people who pay the taxes in that section.

Mr. BORAH. I presume we have made all the progress today we can on the joint resolution. We have discussed a great many things which have no more connection with it than the man in the moon. The question of lynching and the question of peonage can have no possible relation with this subject in any way, shape, or form, and everyone understands precisely why they are brought into this debate. But as we will not be able to discuss the question at length this evening, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. PERKINS. I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 213) authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in 1915, at San Francisco, Cal.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 8 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 11, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1911.

IN THE NAVY.

I nominate the following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1910, to fill vacancies existing in that grade on that date:

Harry A. Badt,
Walter L. Heiberg, and
Martin J. Peterson.

POSTMASTER.

Robert Z. Swegle to be postmaster at Eureka, Kans., in place of Thomas E. Dittemore, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1911.

THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

James J. Britt to be Third Assistant Postmaster General.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles W. Hoitt to be United States attorney, district of New Hampshire.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Duncan E. McKinlay to be surveyor of customs in the district of San Francisco.

POSTMASTERS.

IOWA.

Henry C. Hill, Milton.
J. Ken Mathews, Mediapolis.
George W. Metcalf, Lansing.
C. H. Westrope, Elliott.
William E. Whetstine, Columbus Junction.

MISSOURI.

Julius H. Conrath, Jefferson City.
George N. Stille, Charleston.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William F. Balsbach, Bellwood.
John N. Brosius, Middleburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *February 10, 1911.*

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 23361. An act authorizing the Hot Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Arkansas, to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the organization on lots Nos. 1 and 2, in block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 21882. An act for the relief of Horace D. Bennett;

H. R. 21646. An act for the relief of William Doherty;

H. R. 13936. An act for the relief of William P. Drummon;

H. R. 31859. An act to authorize the Chucawalla Development Co. to build a dam across the Colorado River at or near the mouth of Pyramid Canyon, Ariz.; also a diversion intake dam at or near Black Point, Ariz., and Blythe, Cal.;

H. R. 19505. An act for the relief of Eugene Martin; and

H. R. 31172. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 9268. An act releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land being a fractional block bounded

on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola;

S. 8736. An act providing for the releasing of the claim of the United States Government to arpent lot No. 44, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.;

S. 8358. An act providing for the releasing of the claim of the United States Government to arpent lot No. 87, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.;

S. 9269. An act releasing the claims of the United States Government to lot No. 306, in the old city of Pensacola;

S. 10171. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the reorganization of the Consular Service of the United States;"

S. 7650. An act for the relief of Thomas N. Boyle;

S. 10691. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 7638. An act for the relief of Bellevadorah Steele;

S. 974. An act for the relief of Albert S. Henderer;

S. 2207. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Aurora, in the State of Missouri;

S. 9270. An act for the relief of Frank W. Hutchins;

S. 1031. An act for the relief of Jaji Bin Ydris;

S. 10596. An act to authorize the Rainy River Improvement Co. to construct a dam across the outlet of Namakan Lake at Kettle Falls, in St. Louis County, Minn.;

S. 9437. An act to provide American register for the steam yacht *Diana;*

S. 10690. An act providing for aids to navigation along the Lewingstone Channel, Detroit River, Mich.; and

S. 10274. An act to authorize construction of the Broadway Bridge across the Willamette River at Portland, Oreg.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 30886. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 30135. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 31161. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 23015. An act to protect the dignity and honor of the uniform of the United States;

H. R. 26150. An act to authorize the cities of Boston and Cambridge, Mass., to construct drawless bridges across the Charles River;

H. R. 14729. An act for the relief of Capt. Evan M. Johnson, United States Army;

H. R. 18342. An act for the relief of E. C. Young;

H. R. 18857. An act for the relief of Laura A. Wagner;

H. R. 5968. An act to pay Thomas P. Morgan, jr., amount found due him by Court of Claims;

H. R. 30149. An act to transfer the military reservation known as Fort Trumbull, situated at New London, Conn., from the War Department to the Treasury Department, for the use of the Revenue-Cutter Service; and

H. R. 31172. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6953) authorizing contracts for the disposition of waters of projects under the reclamation act, and for other purposes, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BAILEY as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PENSION BILLS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that pension bills on the Private Calendar may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that pension bills on the Private Calendar may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire if he means simply pension bills.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I said pension bills.

Mr. MANN. I did not know whether the gentleman's request included bills to relieve charges of desertion.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I suppose they will be in order afterwards; but I did not make that request.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill.

The first business was the bill (H. R. 32435) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William M. Wilson, late of Quartermaster's Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of David B. Macaser, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ignatius O'Danieli, late of Company E, Eighty-first Regiment, and Company D, Fifty-eighth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Cramer, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of August Kluner, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon P. Ulch, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick H. Overman, late of Garrison Guards, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James F. Larimore, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Smith, late of Company D, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Patton, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph P. Clark, late of Company C, One hundred and tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Park, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Campbell, late of Company B, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Arison, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Fultz, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elymas F. Wilkins, late of Company C, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $14 per month, the same to be paid to him under the rules of the Pension Bureau as to mode and times of payment without any deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Alva C. Garrison, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nimrod Austin, late of Company A, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard P. Chandler, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franz Nibler, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Tucker, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Robbins, late of Company K, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Monroe, late of Company G, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus W. Kirk, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonhart Miller, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Pegg, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hefflefinger, late of Company D, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wilson T. Russ, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Blake, alias John Smith, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Britigan, alias Breachum, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron Hart, late of Company K, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delilah J. Chambers, widow of George W. Chambers, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jared K. Rayen, late of Company G, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Allen J. White, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant Company C, Second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Lockstone, late of Company E, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Roberts, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Coonrod, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses H. Hemenway, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Bride, late of Company E, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Washington Davis, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie Richards, former widow of Alfred Wilson, late of Company C, Second Battalion, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and widow of George W. Richards, late of Company H, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph H. Stonebraker, late captain Company G, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Pollock, late of Company G, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram Greene, late of Company H, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Banks, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Glazebrook, late of Company B, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion Titsworth, widow of Cyrus Titsworth, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Rona B. Roswell, late of Company G, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emily Swank, widow of George W. Swank, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Huskins, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Smedley, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Murray, alias John Murray, late of U. S. S. North Carolina and Mercury, United States Navy, and alias Michael McLaughlin, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Jacob Fisher, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram B. King late of Company K, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ole Johnson, late of Company F, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Mardis, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant Company C, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Sanders, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli C. Sensabaugh, late of Companies L and A, First Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Stillwell, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Velonzo Cahill, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phillip Denton, late of Companies H and A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Harvey, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Patterson, widow of Thomas J. Patterson, late of Company A, Seventy-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Thomas Smashey, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Sager, late of Company F, Ninety-sixth Regiment, and Company H, Twenty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry D. Loveland, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Good, late of Ninth Unattached Company, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Nancy A. Foley, widow of Thomas Foley, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Adam L. Foley, helpless and dependent son of said Thomas Foley, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Nancy A. Foley, the name of said Adam L. Foley shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Nancy A. Foley.

The name of James A. Phelps, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey Dennis, late of Company G, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Milligan, widow of Thomas G. Milligan, late second lieutenant Company H, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Frank A. Milligan, helpless and dependent son of said Thomas G. Milligan, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary J. Milligan, the name of said Frank A. Milligan shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary J. Milligan.

The name of John T. Cannon, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 dollars per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ruben L. Crosno, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert A. Houston, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Raymond, former widow of John Bolton, late of Company I, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and forty-ninth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Washington G. Marshall, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Whelan, late of Company A, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Baker, late of Company E, Sixtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Sparlin, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Carpenter, late of Company F, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh H. Sullivan, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Battery C, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Victor Jacket, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey T. Rathbone, late of Company M, Second Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Morris, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now reeciving.

The name of Newton J. Holland, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellis C. Howe, late of Company D, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Henley, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Stearns, late of Company K, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Andrews, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Laughton, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Lewis, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank B. Hall, helpless and dependent child of Benjamin Hall, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Samuel Wilson, late of Company C, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McGeoch, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Shirley, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick M. Butler, alias Patrick Meehan, late of Ninth Unassigned Company, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Gibson, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Loyd, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Reed, late of Company K, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel W. Kessler, late of Company C, Fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charlotte Credit, widow of James Credit, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment, and Company D, Eighteenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Emma Credit, helpless and dependent daughter of said James Credit, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Charlotte Credit, the name of said Emma Credit shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Charlotte Credit.

The name of John Murphy, late of Company E, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin E. Edgell, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Snyder, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abram G. Jackson, late of Company D, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmund Coburn, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and Company G, Thirty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Hawkins, late of Company L, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome Telliga, late of Company F, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus Warren, late of Company D, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Pepper, late of Company B, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles West, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Talmadge, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Main, late of U. S. S. North Carolina, Lancaster, and Savannah, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Moss, widow of Sumers Moss, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ruth Moss, helpless and dependent daughter of said Sumers Moss, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Louisa Moss, the name of said Ruth Moss shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Louisa Moss.

The name of George G. Fiss, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dudley L. Chase, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles P. Rogers, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Holmes, late of Company A, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Murray, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Findley, late of Company H, One hundred and sixty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Schleich, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Tucker, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Buckner, late of Company B, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert K. Russell, late of Companies K and E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Smith, late of Company F, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar W. Cornish, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Parmelee, late of Company L, and sergeant major Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse McKinsey, late of Company D, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert L. Yancy, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Campbell, late of Company G, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper Williamson, late of Company I, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Godfrey Goldsmith, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. McClenny, late of Companies I and C, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias Deveny, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Ellis, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hale Chadwick, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward L. Butts, late of Company A, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archer A. Owens, late acting master, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen Board, late of Company K, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth E. Fisher, widow of George Fisher, late of Companies I and F, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Stella Grace Fisher, helpless and dependent daughter of said George Fisher, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth E. Fisher the name of said Stella Grace Fisher shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Elizabeth E. Fisher.

The name of Charles F. Bridges, late unassigned, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company C, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Schaler, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew G. Bracy, late first lieutenant Company H, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Davis, late of Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Baker, late of Company E, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip Briody, late of Company A, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. McKrill, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane Barr, widow of John G. Barr, late of Company F, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jeanette Ballard, widow of Warren F. Ballard, late first lieutenant and quartermaster Forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David C. Barnard, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Snow, widow of Edward E. Snow, late of Company H, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of David Srackangast, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment, and Company K, Twenty-third Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tildon Graham, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Fifth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Ferguson, late of U. S. S. Winnebago, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip S. Clinard, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Evans, late first lieutenant Company B, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles J. Cram, late of First Company, Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus E. Pierce, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Goodwin, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willis D. Moss, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Flower, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. MacGregor, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christina Gouley, widow of David Gouley, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Murphy, late of Company F, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lorane Maville, widow of Frank Maville, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said soldier until said children shall arrive at the age of 16 years: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary L. Maville, helpless and dependent daughter of said Frank Maville, the additional pension of $12 per month herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lorane Maville the name of said Mary L. Maville shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Lorane Maville.

The name of Oscar F. Kellogg, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Asa Layman, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick E. Lockwood, late paymaster's steward, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Owen Hogan, late of Company B, Van Horn's battalion, United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Sabine, late surgeon, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Boyer, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph S. Johnson, late second lieutenant Company H, Ninety-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses Yocum, late of Company F, One hundred and fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James G. Miller, late of Company O, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet J. Skidmore, widow of Samuel Skidmore, late of Company D, Sixty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Melinda S. Lambert, widow of James H. Lambert, late of Company K, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Theodore F. Colgrove, late lieutenant colonel One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Sloyer, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Ruedi, late of Company G, One hundred and seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month, the same to be paid to him under the rules of the Pension Bureau as to mode and times of payments without any deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments or pension.

The name of Louis H. Glaser, helpless and dependent child of Henry Glaser, late of Company B, One hundred and first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Adam H. Taylor, late of Company M, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry P. Stewart, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Sweigart, late of Company F, Seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen M. Williams, widow of John H. Williams, late of Company C, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henry Seibert, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment, and Company A, One hundred and sixty-second Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Norman H. Kile, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie C. Curtis, former widow of Edwin A. Casey, late assistant surgeon, Twenty-seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas Skillman, late of Company F, Thirtieth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Paden, late of Twenty-second Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan A. Bates, widow of Robert J. Bates, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Turnage, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Bland, late of Company I, Sixty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin L. Mock, late of Company C, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Piper, late of Company A, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susanna Butler, widow of Nathaniel Butler, late of Company H, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, any pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John L. Butler, helpless and dependent son of said Nathaniel Butler, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Susanna Butler, the name of said John L. Butler shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Susanna Butler.

The name of Anderson H. Ash, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Lampson, late of Company F, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zadock Baker, late of Company F, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Parks, late of Company C, Seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Howard, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo King, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment, and Company H, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willard H. Eaton, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Dunkleberger, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Burns, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Mahan, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo D. Stoddard, late of Company F, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willis H. Ferguson, late of Company I, Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cary A. Smith, late first lieutenant Company L, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Palmer, late of Company A, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Twelfth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Peck, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Robertson, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Butler, late second lieutenant, Company B, Forty-seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nixon B. Stewart, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Beck, late of Company C, First Battalion, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Kelley, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment, and Company C, Twentieth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen H. Collar, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin H. Bailey, late of Company D, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Mansfield, late of Company F, One hundred and first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Morrison, late of Nineteenth Independent Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen McCollum, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Gaston, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Weld, widow of Manchester W. Weld, late acting ensign, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Gilbert M. Dinsmore, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter S. Ludwig, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick O'Brien, late of Company I, Sixty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. W. Dow, late second lieutenant Company F, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Morrow, late of Battery A, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Neriah B. Kendall, late captain Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Rockwell, late of Company D, One hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Sibley, late of Company D, Second Battalion District of Columbia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Hesler, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Dollen, late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Bookstore, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Gordon, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ideral Van Fleet, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Wylkinson, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ebenezer E. Wilkin, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Rebecca Mowbray, widow of Clement T. Mowbray, late second lieutenant Company A, First Regiment Eastern Shore Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Orville E. Sawdy, late of Independent Battery B, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis H. Ackerman, late first lieutenant Company B, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and first lieutenant Company I, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Magrath, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Sisemore, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Wooton, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos S. Ladd, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Hobart, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edna S. Littlefield, widow of Solomon Littlefield, late of Company H, Thirty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Randall, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Barry, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. McKenny, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson P. Noyes, late of Company B, Second Regiment, and Company A, Third Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James R. Mooney, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Carter, late of Company H, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caroline F. Everett, widow of Henry D. Everett, late of Company D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Peter Shoffner, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George C. King, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pleasant G. Mills, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Collins, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George I. Stivers, late of Company G, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zoa M. Ladoo, widow of Marshall Ladoo, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Rufus Robbins, late of U. S. S. Great Western, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ovid P. Webster, late of Company H, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Evan F. Cowger, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hulsizer, late of Company E, Thirty-first Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben E. Talmadge, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Nix, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Armstrong, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Ballew, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Schulenburg, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Lukins, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Kennedy, widow of William Kennedy, late of Company H, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month: *Provided, however*, That such pension shall cease upon proof that the soldier is living.

The name of Stephen Comstock, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caleb A. Worley, late enrolling officer, tenth district of Illinois, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Noble C. Burkhart, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Hiller, late of Company D, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas L. Story, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Almanzer W. Layton, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and Eighty-first Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bernard T. Maupin, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert M. Cole, late of Company I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert W. Mateer, late of Company H, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Blackwood, late of Companies A and K, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hila Allbee, helpless and dependent child of Vietts W. Allbee, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Vermont Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Allen Byers, late of Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward P. Burnett, late of Company F, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Seely, late of Company H, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, strike out lines 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16, granting an increase of pension to Amos Mardis, a similar bill having passed the Senate.

On page 20, strike out lines 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, for increase of pension to Edmund Coburn, a similar bill having passed the House.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 700. William M. Wilson.
H. R. 925. David B. Macaser.
H. R. 1302. Ignatius O'Daniell.
H. R. 1359. George W. Cramer.
H. R. 1805. August Kluner.
H. R. 1964. Simon P. Ulch.
H. R. 2345. Patrick H. Overman.
H. R. 2782. James F. Larimore.
H. R. 3539. Thomas Smith.
H. R. 3941. Andrew J. Patton.
H. R. 4597. Joseph P. Clark.
H. R. 5313. John W. Park.
H. R. 5315. Thomas H. Campbell.
H. R. 6124. George W. Arison.
H. R. 6536. Edward Fultz.
H. R. 7291. Elymas F. Wilkins.
H. R. 8609. Alva C. Garrison.
H. R. 10088. Nimrod Austin.
H. R. 10123. Richard P. Chandler.
H. R. 10507. Franz Nibler.
H. R. 11234. Henry C. Tucker.
H. R. 11335. William M. Robbins.
H. R. 11907. James M. Monroe.
H. R. 11908. Cyrus W. Kirk.
H. R. 12015. Leonhart Miller.
H. R. 12449. John A. Pegg.
H. R. 12466. William Heilefinger.
H. R. 12588. Wilson T. Russ.
H. R. 12847. John Blake, alias John Smith.

H. R. 12857. Edward Britigan, alias Edward Breachum.
H. R. 12973. Aaron Hart.
H. R. 13105. Delilah J. Chambers.
H. R. 13122. Jared K. Raven.
H. R. 13545. Allen J. White.
H. R. 13655. William Lockstone.
H. R. 14825. James H. Roberts.
H. R. 15136. John A. Coonrod.
H. R. 15143. Moses H. Hemenway.
H. R. 15643. John W. Bride.
H. R. 15715. Washington Davis.
H. R. 15758. Annie Richards.
H. R. 16148. Joseph H. Stonebraker.
H. R. 16486. John M. Pollock.
H. R. 17190. Hiram Greene.
H. R. 17329. John Banks.
H. R. 17668. William Glazebrook.
H. R. 17793. Marion Titsworth.
H. R. 18882. Rona B. Roswell.
H. R. 19198. Emily Swank.
H. R. 20171. William Huskins.
H. R. 21655. Richard Smedley.
H. R. 21889. Michael Murray.
H. R. 21986. Jacob Fisher.
H. R. 22058. Hiram B. King.
H. R. 22342. Ole Johnson.
H. R. 22357. Amos Mardis.
H. R. 22430. Jacob Sanders.
H. R. 22581. Eli C. Sensabaugh.
H. R. 22669. Samuel Stillwell.
H. R. 22835. Velonzo Cahill.
H. R. 23043. Phillip Denton.
H. R. 23203. William H. Harvey.
H. R. 23205. Sarah A. Patterson.
H. R. 23233. William Thomas Smashey.
H. R. 23489. Charles Sager.
H. R. 23504. Henry D. Loveland.
H. R. 23669. John Good.
H. R. 23837. Nancy A. Foley.
H. R. 24054. James A. Phelps.
H. R. 24117. Harvey Dennis.
H. R. 24173. Mary J. Milligan.
H. R. 24422. John T. Cannon.
H. R. 24524. Ruben L. Crosno.
H. R. 24528. Robert A. Houston.
H. R. 24545. Mary E. Raymond.
H. R. 24934. Washington G. Marshall.
H. R. 25383. Peter Whelan.
H. R. 25449. John R. Baker.
H. R. 25479. William B. Sparlin.
H. R. 25546. Thomas Carpenter.
H. R. 25680. Hugh H. Sullivan.
H. R. 25705. Victor Jacket.
H. R. 25787. Harvey T. Rathbone.
H. R. 25850. John Morris.
H. R. 25980. Newton J. Holland.
H. R. 26039. Ellis C. Howe.
H. R. 26081. George E. Henley.
H. R. 26118. Adam Stearns.
H. R. 26341. Samuel Andrews.
H. R. 26346. John A. Laughton.
H. R. 26379. William G. Lewis.
H. R. 26604. Frank B. Hall.
H. R. 26709. Samuel Wilson.
H. R. 26771. John McGeoch.
H. R. 26855. John A. Shirley.
H. R. 26906. Patrick M. Butler, alias Patrick Meehan.
H. R. 26912. Joseph C. Gibson.
H. R. 26928. George Loyd.
H. R. 26929. Charles Reed.
H. R. 26937. Samuel W. Kessler.
H. R. 27002. Charlotte Credit.
H. R. 27018. John Murphy.
H. R. 27039. Benjamin E. Edgell.
H. R. 27060. George Snyder.
H. R. 27157. Abram G. Jackson.
H. R. 27306. Edmund Coburn.
H. R. 27322. James M. Hawkins.
H. R. 27329. Jerome Telliga.
H. R. 27331. Augustus Warren.
H. R. 27372. William Pepper.
H. R. 27379. Charles West.
H. R. 27381. Isaac Talmadge.
H. R. 27389. John B. Main.
H. R. 27467. Louisa Moss.
H. R. 27479. George G. Fiss.
H. R. 27506. Dudley L. Chase.
H. R. 27515. Charles P. Rogers.
H. R. 27517. Henry Holmes.
H. R. 27533. Alexander Murray.
H. R. 27617. John B. Findley.
H. R. 27631. Martin Schleich.
H. R. 27648. William Tucker.
H. R. 27674. Richard Buckner.
H. R. 27688. Albert K. Russell.
H. R. 27712. John M. Smith.
H. R. 27726. Oscar W. Cornish.
H. R. 27728. John S. Parmelee.
H. R. 27750. Jesse McKinsey.
H. R. 27783. Robert L. Yancy.
H. R. 27800. John Campbell.
H. R. 27801. Jasper Williamson.
H. R. 27807. Godfrey Goldsmith.
H. R. 27872. William C. McClenny.
H. R. 27878. Elias Deveny.
H. R. 27893. John W. Ellis.
H. R. 27935. Hale Chadwick.
H. R. 27964. Edward L. Butts.
H. R. 28005. Archer A. Owens.
H. R. 28038. Stephen Board.
H. R. 28057. Elizabeth E. Fisher.
H. R. 28091. Charles F. Bridges.
H. R. 28144. John M. Schaler.
H. R. 28171. Andrew G. Bracy.
H. R. 28174. John C. Davis.
H. R. 28199. Peter Baker.
H. R. 28302. Philip Briody.
H. R. 28312. James W. McKrill.
H. R. 28230. Jane Barr.
H. R. 28411. Jeanette Ballard.
H. R. 28414. David C. Barnard.
H. R. 28420. Ellen Snow.
H. R. 28458. David Srackangast.
H. R. 28477. Tildon Graham.
H. R. 28513. John A. Ferguson.
H. R. 28583. Philip S. Clinard.
H. R. 28637. Benjamin F. Evans.
H. R. 28758. Charles J. Cram.
H. R. 28768. Cyrus E. Pierce.
H. R. 28796. Charles F. Goodwin.
H. R. 28836. Willis D. Moss.
H. R. 28839. Lewis Flower.
H. R. 28843. John C. MacGregor.
H. R. 28849. Christina Gouley.
H. R. 28894. John Murphy.
H. R. 28933. Lorane Maville.
H. R. 28936. Oscar F. Kellogg.
H. R. 28944. Asa Layman.
H. R. 29009. Frederick E. Lockwood
H. R. 29010. Owen Hogan.
H. R. 29083. Andrew Sabine.
H. R. 29116. Charles W. Boyer.
H. R. 29137. Joseph S. Johnson.
H. R. 29184. Moses Yocum.
H. R. 29198. James G. Miller.
H. R. 29256. Harriet J. Skidmore.
H. R. 29264. Melinda S. Lambert.
H. R. 29315. Theodore F. Colgrove.
H. R. 29326. Edward Sloyer.
H. R. 29328. Henry Ruedl.
H. R. 29336. Louis H. Glaser.
H. R. 29381. Adam H. Taylor.
H. R. 29409. Perry P. Stewart.
H. R. 29485. William H. Sweigart.
H. R. 29509. Helen M. Williams.
H. R. 29534. Henry Seibert.
H. R. 29592. Norman H. Kile.
H. R. 29678. Jennie C. Curtis.
H. R. 29701. Thomas Skillman.
H. R. 29738. Andrew J. Paden.
H. R. 29778. Susan A. Bates.
H. R. 29836. John W. Turnage.
H. R. 29895. James Bland.
H. R. 29978. Martin L. Mock.
H. R. 29996. Charles F. Piper.
H. R. 30001. Susanna Butler.
H. R. 30036. Anderson H. Ash.
H. R. 30048. John R. Lampson.
H. R. 30113. Zadock Baker.
H. R. 30172. Richard Parks.
H. R. 30192. John S. Howard.
H. R. 30196. Alonzo King.
H. R. 30220. Willard H. Eaton.
H. R. 30222. Samuel H. Dunkleberger.
H. R. 30224. John A. Burns.
H. R. 30244. John H. Mahan.
H. R. 30254. Alonzo D. Stoddard.
H. R. 30314. Willis H. Ferguson.
H. R. 30339. Cary A. Smith.
H. R. 30382. Daniel Palmer.
H. R. 30391. Charles H. Peck.
H. R. 30397. George W. Robertson.
H. R. 30402. Benjamin F. Butler.
H. R. 30440. Nixon B. Stewart.
H. R. 30460. William Beck.
H. R. 30474. Patrick Kelley.
H. R. 30476. Stephen H. Collar.
H. R. 30502. Benjamin H. Bailey.
H. R. 30514. James Mansfield.
H. R. 30599. James S. Morrison.
H. R. 30747. Stephen McCollum.
H. R. 30763. James Gaston.
H. R. 30823. Mary E. Weld.
H. R. 30911. Gilbert M. Dinsmore.
H. R. 30933. Peter S. Ludwig.
H. R. 31107. Patrick O'Brien.
H. R. 31111. Charles W. W. Dow.
H. R. 31117. William Morrow.
H. R. 31133. Neriah B. Kendall.
H. R. 31147. John E. Rockwell.
H. R. 31154. Solomon Sibley.
H. R. 31159. Francis M. Hesler.
H. R. 31190. William Dollen.
H. R. 31227. Martin Bookstore.
H. R. 31228. William B. Gordon.
H. R. 31277. Ideral Van Fleet.
H. R. 31278. James M. Wylkinson.
H. R. 31334. Ebenezer E. Wilkin.
H. R. 31345. Sarah Rebecca Mowbray.
H. R. 31417. Orville E. Sawdy.
H. R. 31420. Lewis H. Ackerman.
H. R. 31439. George Magrath.
H. R. 31476. William Sisemore.
H. R. 31478. William Wooton.
H. R. 31501. Amos S. Ladd.
H. R. 31522. Franklin Hobart.
H. R. 31530. Edna S. Littlefield.
H. R. 31571. William H. Randall.
H. R. 31579. Thomas Barry.
H. R. 31591. George W. McKenny.
H. R. 31605. Nelson P. Noyes.
H. R. 31628. James R. Mooney.
H. R. 31632. Paul Carter.
H. R. 31646. Caroline F. Everett.
H. R. 31668. Peter Shoffner.
H. R. 31676. George C. King.
H. R. 31690. Pleasant G. Mills.
H. R. 31692. Daniel Collins.
H. R. 31744. George I. Stivers.
H. R. 31753. Zoa M. Ladoo.
H. R. 31754. Rufus Robbins.
H. R. 31755. Ovid P. Webster.
H. R. 31763. Evan F. Cowger.
H. R. 31766. William Hulsizer.
H. R. 31767. Reuben E. Talmadge.
H. R. 31768. John Nix.
H. R. 31769. Henry C. Armstrong.
H. R. 31781. William A. Ballew.
H. R. 31793. Frederick Schulenburg.
H. R. 31794. Henry H. Lukins.
H. R. 31818. Mary A. Kennedy.
H. R. 31832. Stephen Comstock.
H. R. 31850. Caleb A. Worley.
H. R. 31851. Noble C. Burkhart.
H. R. 31879. Andrew J. Hiller.
H. R. 31896. Thomas L. Story.
H. R. 31903. Alamanzer W. Layton.
H. R. 31946. Bernard T. Maupin.
H. R. 31957. Albert M. Cole.
H. R. 31974. Albert W. Mateer.
H. R. 31977. Josiah Blackwood.
H. R. 31997. Hila Allbee.
H. R. 32032. Allen Byers.
H. R. 32033. Edward P. Burnett.
H. R. 32143. William W. Seely.

DAVID F. WALLACE.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 3982) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of David F. Wallace.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That in the administration of the pension laws, David F. Wallace, who was a private of Company M, Fifth Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of said company and regiment on the 4th day of June, 1864."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of David F. Wallace."

THOMAS SEALS.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 16268) to remove the charges of desertion against Thomas Seals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That in the administration of the pension laws Thomas Seals shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as private in Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, on the 6th day of August, 1862."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Thomas Seals."

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The next business was the bill (S. 10326) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of John D. Elliott, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmund B. Updegrove, late of Company C and first lieutenant Company B, Fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of A. Paul Horne, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dana H. McDuffee, late of the U. S. S. Monongahela and Ohio, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles R. Crouch, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Elwood, widow of Azariah S. Elwood, late assistant surgeon, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elisha W. Bullock, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. C. Herriman, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Russell C. Harris, late of Company A, Eightieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Butterfield, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Eaton, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Parker, late of Company I, Seventeenth Regiment, and Company E, First Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Stephenson, late of Company D, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lafayette J. Spangle, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Stout, late of Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Dickerson, late first lieutenant Company D, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonard Faulkner, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Miller, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Simpson, late of Company G, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Beaumont, late of Company D, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joshua Minthorn, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lurinda E. Spencer, widow of Henry C. Spencer, late second lieutenant Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $15 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rowena M. Calkins, widow of Wilbur F. Calkins, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Helen G. Berkele, widow of Charles W. Berkele, late of Company C, Third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lynderman Wright, late of Company B, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Gardner Lewis, late first lieutenant Company F, Seventy-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Wells, late of Company G, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and One hundred and fourteenth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Montgomery, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emil Joerin, late of Company L, Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie T. Penrose, widow of James W. Penrose, late captain Company F, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and major Second Battalion New Jersey Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Annie Givin Penrose, helpless and dependent daughter of said James W. Penrose, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Annie T. Penrose the name of said Annie Givin Penrose shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Annie T. Penrose.

The name of Rufus M. Taft, alias Madison R. Baker, late of Company H, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Inman, late second lieutenant Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Dunham, late of Company B, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Monnahan, late of Companies A and F, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Bruss, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Haley, late of Company H, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eugene McNair, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James McCartney, late of Company H, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Olmstead, alias Charles R. Campbell, late of Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Long, late of Company C, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Turner, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore Lynde, late of Company B, One hundred and twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Wilson, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas C. Crocker, late of Company B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Armstrong, late of Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Dragoons, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Coose, late of Company E, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Everly, late of Company H, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Masters, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Judson D. Haren, late of Company B, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry V. Steiner, late of Company E, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac James, late of Company B, Third Battalion Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter S. Huffman, late principal musician, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wallace W. Chaffee, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Cox, late of Company G, Two hundred and eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clark Jaco, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lydia A. Patch, formerly Lydia A. Wilson, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and former widow of James M. Wilson, late of Company K, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and fifty-eighth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Harer, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Patton, late of Company D, Second Battalion, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Garrett Conn, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Nolte, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. McElhaney, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Ryan, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orrin Dailey, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew W. Muldrew, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Granville Farance, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Payne E. Lisenbee, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion G. Dunn, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Friedline, late of Company A, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Kew, former widow of Mathew Blair, late of Company I, Fifty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Albert H. Jarnagin, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George T. Myers, late of Company I, Eighty-fourth Regiment, and Company F, Twenty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Jones, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Brady, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Mott, late of Company K, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Polydore R. Pike, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher Lee, late of Company L, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Jencks, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Wheeler, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis W. Heath, late captain Company F, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Ciucas, late of Companies E and F, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Anthony, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Venable, widow of Minor Venable, late of Company K, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amos L. Jones, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Harvey Emerson, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos R. Walters, late of Company D, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Billings, late of Company C, First Regiment, Company G, Twenty-first Regiment, and Company G, Third Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice Jordan, widow of Hezekiah Jordan, late of Company E, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Francis Kelley, late of Company K, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment, and Company H, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hester S. Crane, widow of Orrin J. Crane, late lieutenant colonel Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joshua Burton, late of Company C, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wiley Burton, late of Company C, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Brafford, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan W. Dawson, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick O. Hykes, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael O'Brien, late of Capt. De Goyler's independent battery, Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James J. Boyd, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton Church, late of Company L, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Greenberry Gabbard, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Thomson, late of Company K, Forty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abby M. B. Hayes, widow of Charles Hayes, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James A. Grove, late of Company A, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Eckels, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Pennington, late second lieutenant Company F, Second Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant and adjutant Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander C. McKeever, late of Company A, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah N. Brainerd, late of band, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Johnson, widow of Michael Johnson, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. Sperry, late of Company I, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph N. Harriman, late of Company D, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Kline, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Brice McKinley, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Moeller, late of Company B, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lorenzo D. Shaw, late of Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William G. Wade, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Battery M, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Spencer M. Wyman, late second lieutenant Company K, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Van Dien, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. Smith, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ione D. Bradley, widow of Luther P. Bradley, late brigadier general, United States Volunteers, and brigadier general, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Judson A. Wright, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Dearing, late of Company I, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmer J. Clark, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Sharp, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Third Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry G. Rollins, late first lieutenant Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Smith, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Esty, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ansel W. Fletcher, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cordelia Patterson, widow of Robert Patterson, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert C. Pettit, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment, and Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Turner, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Olaus H. Lucken, late second lieutenant Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Shaver, late of Company A, Third Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant Company F, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Price, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Smith H. Beeson, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Sterling, late of Company K, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Womersley, widow of Alexander Womersley, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William H. Brooks, now known as John Hopkins, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonard Koebler, late of Battery H, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick A. Reen, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company B, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eugene E. Curtice, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Stowell, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and U. S. S. Ohio and Sacramento, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah P. W. Roach, late of Company B, Battalion, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Gant, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram W. Crocker, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin H. Macalaster, late of Company G, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward R. Kneeland, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nettie E. Higgins, widow of Henry H. Higgins, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert A. Blood, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas L. G. Hansard, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Videtto, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall M. Clothier, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dennis Sullivan, late of Company C, First Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Ball, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leander Eddy, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Blaker, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob A. Davis, late of First Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, unassigned, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clement G. Moody, late of Companies I and D, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Morse, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac C. Vaughan, late of Second Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roscoe D. Dix, late of Company K, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Lennane, late of Company K, Seventy-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Milton Ralston, late of Company D, Fourth Independent Battalion Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Bodley, late of Company A, First Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Davisson, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo J. Batchelder, late of Companies H and E, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard H. Hankinson, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Thirteenth Independent Battery Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Byford E. Long, late captain Company E, Sixty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grace V. D. Spencer, widow of Thomas J. Spencer, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3 strike out lines 11, 12, 13, and 14, granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Eaton, the beneficiary being dead.

On page 30 strike out "1910" and insert "1911."

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

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 26. John D. Elliott.
S. 734. Edmund B. Updegrove.
S. 745. A. Paul Horne.
S. 748. Dana H. McDuffee.
S. 852. Charles R. Crouch.
S. 855. Mary E. Elwood.
S. 1145. Elisha W. Bullock.
S. 1181. John D. C. Herriman.
S. 1204. Russell C. Harris.
S. 1688. George W. Butterfield.
S. 2304. Charles W. Eaton.
S. 2448. Theodore Parker.
S. 2792. James A. Stephenson.
S. 2934. Lafayette J. Spangle.
S. 3087. William G. Stout.
S. 3227. Eli Dickerson.
S. 3237. Leonard Faulkner.
S. 3240. Samuel Miller.
S. 3242. James E. Simpson.
S. 3297. George Beaumont.
S. 3320. Joshua Minthorn.
S. 3384. Lurinda E. Spencer.
S. 3386. Rowena M. Calkins.
S. 3387. Helen G. Berkele.
S. 3504. Lynderman Wright.
S. 3511. Samuel Gardner Lewis.
S. 3918. John D. Wells.
S. 3939. James A. Montgomery.
S. 3944. Emil Joerin.
S. 3992. Rufus M. Taft (alias Madison R. Baker).
S. 4213. James Inman.
S. 4364. Thomas A. Dunham.
S. 4365. Henry Monnahan.
S. 4483. William H. Bruss.
S. 4816. Annie T. Penrose.
S. 4969. John B. Haley.
S. 5152. Eugene McNair.
S. 5195. James McCartney.
S. 5324. George Long.
S. 5332. John F. Turner.
S. 5467. Theodore Lynde.
S. 5497. David Wilson.
S. 5514. Thomas C. Crocker.
S. 5774. Charles E. Armstrong.
S. 5888. George Coose.
S. 6038. David Everly.
S. 6054. Eli Masters.
S. 6106. Judson D. Haren.
S. 6112. Henry V. Steiner.
S. 6177. Isaac James.
S. 6216. William L. Olmstead (alias Charles R. Campbell).
S. 6308. Peter S. Huffman.
S. 6484. Wallace W. Chaffee.
S. 6517. John H. Cox.
S. 6626. Clark Jaco.
S. 6689. Lydia A. Patch (formerly Lydia A. Wilson).
S. 6774. Henry Harer.
S. 6775. John Patton.
S. 7019. Garrett Conn.
S. 7074. Charles Nolte.
S. 7078. William J. McElhaney.
S. 7116. Thomas Ryan.
S. 7150. Orrin Dailey.
S. 7175. Andrew W. Muldrew.
S. 7117. Granville Farance.
S. 7294. Payne E. Lisenbee.
S. 7325. Marion G. Dunn.
S. 7326. Abraham Friedline.
S. 7335. Elizabeth Kew.
S. 7506. Albert H. Jarnagin.
S. 7508. George T. Myers.
S. 7553. George Jones.
S. 7555. William H. Brady.
S. 7614. William Mott.
S. 7680. Polydore R. Pike.
S. 7774. Christopher Lee.
S. 7825. Samuel C. Jencks.
S. 7853. John A. Wheeler.
S. 7869. Lewis W. Heath.
S. 7871. Joseph Clucas.
S. 7873. James Anthony.
S. 7885. Mary F. Venable.
S. 7920. Amos L. Jones.
S. 8018. Isaac Brinkworth.
S. 8133. James Harvey Emerson.
S. 8138. Amos R. Walters.
S. 8224. John Billings.
S. 8247. Alice Jordan.
S. 8276. Francis Kelley.
S. 8313. Hester S. Crane.
S. 8365. Joshua Burton.
S. 8366. Wiley Burton.
S. 8373. John Brafford.
S. 8422. Nathan W. Dawson.
S. 8423. Frederick O. Hykes.
S. 8446. Michael O'Brien.
S. 8447. James J. Boyd.
S. 8464. Milton Church.
S. 8468. Greenberry Gabbard.
S. 8640. James Thomson.
S. 8652. Abby M. B. Hayes.
S. 8656. James A. Grove.
S. 8734. William W. Eckels.
S. 8750. Henry Pennington.
S. 8837. Alexander C. McKeever.
S. 8841. Elijah N. Brainerd.
S. 8845. Mary Johnson.
S. 8846. Thomas B. Sperry.
S. 8870. Joseph N. Harriman.
S. 8876. William S. Kline.
S. 8877. Brice McKinley.
S. 8879. William H. Moeller.
S. 8896. Lorenzo D. Shaw.
S. 8899. William G. Wade.
S. 8900. Spencer M. Wyman.
S. 8904. Richard Van Dien.
S. 8915. George F. Smith.
S. 8934. Ione D. Bradley.
S. 8976. Judson A. Wright.
S. 9016. John Dearing.
S. 9017. Elmer J. Clark.
S. 9034. Samuel Sharp.
S. 9035. Henry G. Rollins.
S. 9036. James W. Smith.
S. 9064. Henry H. Esty.
S. 9065. Ansel W. Fletcher.
S. 9066. Cordelia Patterson.
S. 9067. Robert C. Pettit.
S. 9070. Charles H. Turner.
S. 9074. Claus H. Lucken.
S. 9075. James Shaver.
S. 9106. William J. Price.
S. 9111. Smith H. Beeson.
S. 9153. William J. Sterling.
S. 9164. Mary F. Womersley.
S. 9202. William H. Brooks (now known as John Hopkins).
S. 9203. Leonard Koebler.
S. 9206. Frederick A. Reen.
S. 9230. Eugene E. Curtice.
S. 9231. Benjamin F. Stowell.
S. 9236. Jeremiah P. W. Roach.
S. 9319. John Gant.
S. 9380. Hiram W. Crocker.
S. 9431. Benjamin H. Macalaster.
S. 9432. Edward R. Kneeland.
S. 9433. Nettie E. Higgins.
S. 9483. Robert A. Blood.
S. 9494. Thomas L. G. Hansard.
S. 9517. Charles H. Videtto.
S. 9568. Marshall M. Clothier.
S. 9574. Dennis Sullivan.
S. 9616. David Ball.
S. 9622. Leander Eddy.
S. 9632. William H. Blaker.
S. 9664. Jacob A. Davis.
S. 9686. Clement G. Moody.
S. 9687. Benjamin F. Morse.
S. 9689. Isaac C. Vaughan.
S. 9690. Roscoe D. Dix.
S. 9730. Michael Lennane.
S. 9763. John Milton Ralston.
S. 9974. James W. Bodley.
S. 9996. William H. Davisson.
S. 10003. Alonzo J. Batchelder.
S. 10005. Richard H. Hankinson.
S. 10065. Byford E. Long.
S. 10204. Grace V. D. Spencer.

Mr. HOWELL of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was recently passed by the Legislature of Utah, and I desire to read it at this time:

Whereas the Nation is under lasting obligation to the men who preserved the Union during the dark days from 1861 to 1865: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah, That we respectfully request the Senators and the Representative at large from the State of Utah to aid in the prompt enactment of the measure now pending before the Congress of the United States represented by Senate bill 4183 and House bill 18899, entitled, respectively, "To create in the War Department and Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as 'The Civil War Volunteer retired list,' to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving and enlisted men who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the Civil War, and for other purposes."

SEC. 2. That a copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Senators and the Representative at large from the State of Utah.

HENRY GARDNER, *President of the Senate.*
E. W. ROBINSON, *Speaker of the House.*

Mr. Speaker, it is well for this Nation, or any other nation that would continue to exist and thrive in security, to recognize those who bear the burdens when the hour of peril arises; not only because it is just and proper to those who bear those burdens, but more on account of the virtue of setting an inspiring example to the citizens of to-day and those of the future, that they may know the Nation is not ungrateful or unmindful of those who render valuable services when those services are most necessary.

The best guide for present conduct is the experience of the past, and the fact that this Nation has been generous and just to its defenders is a most hopeful omen for the future safety of the Republic. In the hour of the country's need it is well that its citizens should be assured that if they make sacrifices for the general welfare, their deeds, when the days of trouble have passed, will not be quickly forgotten nor go unrewarded.

Our country was founded and established by men who believed in free institutions, and who were willing to offer everything they possessed, even their lives, to insure to posterity the heritage of these ideals. In the crucial periods since its birth equally strong men, truly devoted to its welfare, have arisen and willingly sacrificed their all that the Government might be preserved. And it is well that we have endeavored to heed the wise words of the immortal Lincoln, when he said:

Care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphans.

And also the appropriate thoughts expressed by President Taft in his last message:

To the man who risked everything on the field of battle to save the Nation in the hour of its direct need, we owe a debt which has not been and which should not be computed in a begrudging or parsimonious spirit.

I repeat, it is well that our policy has been in accord with the sentiments thus expressed, as thereby past services are rewarded and an inspiring incentive is held out for future service that insures the stability and life of the Nation.

Where a country like ours, of such magnificent proportions and of such varying and diversified characteristics, has been

settled and built up, it is but natural that in different sections events have transpired which have directly affected the welfare and the existence of that particular community, and hence have indirectly been of importance to the country of which they were an integral part. By settling these difficulties and allaying the dangers as they have arisen, and thereby making sure the peace and the prosperity of these various sections, great service has been rendered the Republic. Conditions peculiar to the different regions have presented various problems. I have in mind to-day particularly the events incident to the settling and upbuilding of the Rocky Mountain West, and in this connection I shall take the liberty of reading a memorial to Congress from the Legislative Assembly of the State of Utah:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialist, the ninth session of the Legislature of the State of Utah, hereby submits for your consideration the following memorial:

Whereas the frontiersmen and early settlers of the Rocky Mountain region made possible, by their fearless courage and heroic self-sacrifice, the present splendid growth and prosperity of the western part of our Nation and have performed a national service of inestimable value; and

Whereas the settlement of the West was accompanied by and its resulting blessings were secured only after bitter and sanguinary conflict with savage foes; and

Whereas the services rendered by the citizen soldiers in Indian warfare, between the years 1854 and 1874, have never been properly recognized or compensated and the day will soon be past in which it will be possible to express the gratitude of the Nation to the lingering remnant of those who performed heroic service in defense of the first efforts of the white man to establish civilization in the mountains and on the plains of the far West: Therefore

The ninth session of the Legislature of the State of Utah respectfully requests that Congress enact such legislation as will give to those who performed service in Indian wars a pensionable status under the laws of the United States, and also that all just claims for compensation for services and supplies be recognized and paid;

That a copy of this memorial be furnished Senators SMOOT and SUTHERLAND and Congressman HOWELL for presentation to the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

HENRY GARDNER, *President of the Senate.*
E. W. ROBINSON, *Speaker of the House.*

Attest:

C. S. TINGEY, *Secretary of State.*

Approved, January 18, 1911.

Mr. Speaker, it affords me pleasure to make a few remarks at this time in favor of the substance of this memorial. Each succeeding age and every different country has in its time and place produced its quota of heroes. Fame has singled out some of the most conspicuous figures, and history has heralded their triumphs, but where one hero has thus been recognized I venture to say there are hundreds whose lives were equally heroic and whose acts if publicly recorded would call forth the unstinted plaudits of mankind, but these heroes belong to that vast majority, who are doomed to "waste their fragrance on the desert air."

In the settlement, growth, and development of our expansive country a multitude of noble characters have been produced; men whose lives were, if the welfare of the community required it, freely placed at the disposal of their fellows. To this class belong the Indian war veterans of the Rocky Mountain West, who for 20 years, from 1854 to 1874, were the defenders of the outposts of civilization against the assaults and attacks of the red man. These men will ever occupy a unique position in history; they were humble husbandmen, they were intrepid warriors, and they were pathfinding pioneers.

No poet or story-teller will ever adequately sing their praises or relate their deeds, as the stage of their activities was far removed from the meeting place of the muses and the office of the record keepers. These men lived unassuming lives; they met every emergency with fortitude and courage; when imminent danger threatened their destruction they rose to the occasion and made such defense and resistance as they were capable of, and then, in a matter-of-fact manner, unannounced and unheralded, returned to their daily tasks.

It seems to me that it is not so difficult to be a hero when in the glamor and excitement of the contest you behold the angel of fame standing near ready to loudly proclaim with resounding trumpet blasts your achievements. But it is altogether different when you are isolated and alone, with no one to announce or note your effort. The men who fought Indians in Utah were separated from civilization by a thousand weary miles of rugged mountains and desolate prairies, with no means of communication other than the slow, patient, plodding oxen. Out there in the wilderness alone and unaided they were endeavoring to provide homes for themselves and families. Gold was not their goal, avarice and greed had not lured them; their fondest hopes were centered in winning a home where they might enjoy peace and quiet. To accomplish this ambition they blazed the trail, they killed the snakes, and they built the bridges. They cleared the stubborn sagebrush from the ground and tilled the virgin soil and reared their crude and humble cottages. But all the while their families and their property were in constant jeopardy and peril from marauding bands of hostile, savage Indians. Therefore the settlers were organized into military companies, standing constantly prepared to go into active service at any moment. The Indians were ever ready when game and forage became scarce to descend upon the settlers and carry away their animals and their provisions; and to prevent these ravages the citizen soldiers would go out and remain out for months protecting the settlements from destruction.

These attacks were fraught with more dangerous consequences than the ordinary war. The Indians knew no code of ethics, and defeat to the white men meant not only temporary loss but utter annihilation and destruction to the whole community, because even though the Indians failed to kill them outright they would rob them of all food supplies and drive away their animals, leaving them destitute, so that before help could arrive they would inevitably have succumbed to the horrors of starvation. Therefore these men fought with desperation. To give up their own lives was comparatively easy if success would finally come, so that homes might be established where people could dwell in safety and security.

In fighting these cruel savages no strains of martial music cheered the soldier in the conflict; if perchance he fell no taps were sounded; no solemn military honors were accorded him. At the conclusion of the sanguinary conflict, when the foe was temporarily vanquished or a truce effected, the soldier returned to take up his labor where it had been interrupted.

Thus intermittent warfare continued throughout 20 years, during which time civilization was steadily creeping west, and settlers, learning of the improved conditions, were rapidly making homes and developing the resources of the country, until now a new empire has been added to the Republic.

With the passing of the years the effects of hardships, privations, and struggle imprinted their ineffaceable mark on these Indian fighters, and left them bowed and bent, and a younger, stronger generation is reaping the benefits of their sacrifices. Many of them have passed to their eternal reward, and their comrades who still remain should be recognized by this Government and receive some compensation for the immeasurable service they rendered in making possible the speedy settlement of the West.

Mr. Speaker, these men should, in the name of plain justice, be remembered in a substantial manner. Not so much is asked; merely that they be given a pensionable status, and be partially reimbursed for supplies furnished in those campaigns. In view of the incalculable and far-reaching beneficial results that have accrued to the Nation by reaping the fruits of their unrequited toil, I urge that adequate recognition be given to the claims of the veterans of the western Indian wars.

JOHN LEE, ALIAS JAMES RILEY.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 30160) for the relief of John Lee, alias James Riley.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws and the laws governing the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, or any branch thereof, John Lee, alias James Riley, now a resident of Kansas, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of Company E, Forty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and United States Navy, on the 9th day of April, 1865: *Provided*, That no pension shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The next business was the bill (S. 10453) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Henry Fleming, late of Company M, Third Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Rebecca Whitthorne, widow of William J. Whitthorne, late major, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month.

The name of John J. Duke, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William T. Douglass, late of Ordnance Detachment, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of William H. H. Watkins, late of Capt. B. Miller's Company I, Second Regiment Washington Territory Volunteers, Oregon and

Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew L. Weatherford, late of Company L, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelia A. Nickels, widow of John A. H. Nickels, late captain, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Gillespie, late of Capt. Callister's company, Smith's regiment, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary G. McCarty, widow of Willard A. McCarty, late of the U. S. S. Buffalo, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Willard A. McCarty until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Irene H. Eubanks, widow of John Eubanks, late of Troop B, Tenth Regiment United States Cavalry, and Hospital Corps, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said John Eubanks until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of Allen Russell, late of Capt. Standage's cavalry company, Nauvoo Legion, Utah Volunteers, Utah Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret C. Dougherty, widow of John A. Dougherty, late commander, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Theophilus R. Bewley, late of Capt. Ankeny's Company C, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lyda S. Armstrong, widow of William K. Armstrong, late first lieutenant, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles C. Hanford, late of Capt. Brady's company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The following committee amendments were read:

On page 1, strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, being the case of Henry Fleming.

On page 2, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9, being the case of William T. Douglass.

On page 2, strike out lines 15, 16, and 17, being the case of Andrew L. Weatherford.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 1218. Henry Fleming.	S. 9663. Mary G. McCarty.
S. 2525. Rebecca Whitthorne.	S. 9671. Irene H. Eubanks.
S. 4877. John J. Duke.	S. 9971. Allen Russel.
S. 8210. William T. Douglass.	S. 9981. Margaret C. Dougherty.
S. 8211. William H. H. Watkins.	S. 10134. Theophilus R. Bewley.
S. 8939. Andrew L. Weatherford.	S. 10167. Lyda S. Armstrong.
S. 9377. Cornelia A. Nickels.	S. 10218. Charles C. Hanford.
S. 9660. John Gillespie.	

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 10327) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Joseph Phillips, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of August Siebrecht, late of Company B, Sixty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and commissary sergeant, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pearl M. Welch, late of Battery A, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $10 per month.

The name of Pauline S. Bloom, widow of Edward J. Bloom, late first lieutenant, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, with $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Edward J. Bloom until he reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of William Horrigan, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen J. Sharp, widow of Alexander Sharp, late captain, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. Armstrong, widow of Samuel E. Armstrong, late captain, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ralph C. Fesler, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $15 per month.

The name of John D. Harrell, late of Company A, First Regiment Florida Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward O. Berg, late of Company H, First Regiment South Dakota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ferdinand Imobersteg, late of band, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John C. Tripp, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $15 per month.

The name of Louisa A. Thatcher, widow of Joseph L. Thatcher, late carpenter, United States Navy, and dependent mother of William J. Thatcher, late chief turret captain, U. S. S. Georgia, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Andrews, dependent mother of Eugene O'Neil, late of Company E, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ada J. Swaine, widow of William M. Swaine, late captain, First Regiment United States Infantry, and major, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert L. Ivey, late of Capt. William H. Cone's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Florida Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James J. Raulerson, late of Capt. Harrington's company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth P. Bell, widow of Vivian G. Bell, late first lieutenant Company H, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $17 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Vivian G. Bell until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Sarah E. Dean, widow of Richard C. Dean, late medical director with rank of rear admiral, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James M. S. Wilmot, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $6 per month.

The name of Emma M. Heines, widow of Edward Heines, late of Battery A, Second Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional for each of the minor children of said Edward Heines until they arrive at the age of 16 years.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

On page 1 strike out lines 10 and 11, and on page 2 strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

On page 3 strike out lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, and on page 4 strike out lines 1 and 2.

On page 5 strike out lines 11 to 16, inclusive.

This bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 3701. Joseph Phillips.	S. 8603. John C. Tripp.
S. 3946. August Siebrecht.	S. 8772. Louisa A. Thatcher.
S. 4098. Pearl M. Welch.	S. 8914. Mary Andrews.
S. 4880. Pauline S. Bloom.	S. 9127. Ada J. Swaine.
S. 4958. William Horrigan.	S. 9225. Robert L. Ivey.
S. 7584. Helen J. Sharp.	S. 9227. James J. Raulerson.
S. 7974. Kate M. Armstrong.	S. 9229. Elizabeth P. Bell.
S. 8308. Ralph C. Fesler.	S. 9325. Sarah E. Dean.
S. 8479. John D. Harrell.	S. 9438. James M. S. Wilmot.
S. 8508. Edward O. Berg.	S. 9635. Emma M. Heines.
S. 8541. Ferdinand Imobersteg.	

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to oppose the first committee amendment that the Clerk has just read and to address the House upon it for a moment or two and have a vote upon the amendment. Mr. Speaker, this is the case of a soldier who was a volunteer in the Civil War, later enlisted in the Regular Army, and was discharged for disability. The disability certified in his discharge was said to have been caused in the service by the use of improper or impure vaccine. Later he applied for a pension, was granted a pension, and for 21 years has been drawing a pension of $12 per month for this disability contracted in the service. At the time of his disability discharge the extent of his disability was certified to as being one-half, or 50 per cent. A bill was introduced in the Senate, it passed the Senate, and has been stricken from this bill by the committee amendment upon the sole ground that the soldier ought to have applied again for an increase of pension at the Pension Bureau before seeking special relief in Congress. No attack is made by the committee upon the seriousness of the present condition of the soldier or that his disability was not acquired in the service and that he should not now be pensioned for the amount stated.

I desire a separate vote upon this amendment and think that the merits of the case being conceded the rule of the committee ought to be waived in this particular instance, at this time in the session, when we all know that if this Senate bill is disallowed here in the House the effect may be to deny relief to this soldier at least for another year.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I will.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask a question for information. From the statement the gentleman made in regard to the claim of the committee, that this soldier should apply again to the bureau, is it conceded that if he did make such an application he could get relief there?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Well, as to that, of course no one knows until it is tried.

Mr. NORRIS. Has he complied with the rule that requires all other soldiers to comply with; that is, that he has exhausted his rights and has been refused before the department?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course I know that is the rule of both the committees of the Senate and the House, to require——

Mr. NORRIS. My judgment is the gentleman's case ought not to be taken in a rule separate from that which applies to other cases, and if he could get relief there and has not exhausted his rights before the department to establish——

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. You all know the Senate has occasionally, as in this case, the physician certifying that the man's disability has very seriously increased during the year, in a case like that, close to the end of the session, granted relief by a Senate bill. In doing so they have made an exception to the rule of the Senate. The House committee has declined to make an exception to the rule of the House without going at all into the merits, but simply saying the man ought to have applied more recently for relief to the bureau.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the gentleman ought to concede that the rule ought to be general and ought to apply to all applicants or to none. The rest of us probably have cases similar to that, and they have been cut out.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Personally, when I have introduced a bill I have always required the soldier to make a recent application to the bureau.

Mr. NORRIS. Has this man done that?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. He has not; but the Senator from my State, knowing the exigency of this case, took the other course. I understand frequently in a case of that kind an exception has been made to the rule. This man had service both in the volunteer service and for a long period in the Regular Army.

I have every reason to believe that if the bill had been sent to the Committee on Invalid Pensions that committee would have made an exception in the case of this soldier, as it has done in other cases. But it went to the other committee by reason of his disability having been acquired in the Regular Army service. The exception has been made by the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. It comes from the Committee on Pensions and not the Committee on Invalid Pensions?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes; it comes from the Committee on Pensions and not the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I earnestly request Members of the House to make the same exception in this case that the Senate committee has made, and not deny this man relief.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Pensions has no objection to the consideration of the claim in question upon its merits. Of course it is a rule familiar to the Members of this House that a claimant must not seek special legislation until he has exhausted his remedy before the Bureau of Pensions. If we allowed a claimant to come before the House for special legislation without first exhausting his remedies before the bureau, then Congress would supersede the Pension Bureau, and there would be no limitation upon the number of cases that we would be called upon to consider.

Now, in this particular case in question the man was pensioned in the early eighties, and applied three times for increase before the bureau, and each time the increase was allowed. But since 1889 he has not even applied for an increase. That is 21 years ago. It is 21 years since he even applied for an increase, and still he comes here and asks us to give him relief by special legislation, which, if granted, would thereby set a precedent which does not now exist. If I may be allowed to differ with my friend from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN], I will ask, if the Committee on Pensions could not see its way clear to recommend the granting of the relief asked for, even if this man had a good case upon its merits, why should the gentleman from South Dakota come here in his behalf and attempt to have his case made an exception and seek relief when the soldier has not been to the Pension Bureau for 21 years? The Senate sought to make it an exception. The House committee, following all the precedents, recommended to strike it out.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not state that the Pension Committee had made an exception in such cases, but I stated that the Committee on Invalid Pensions under some circumstances has made an exception to the rule.

Mr. KOPP. Does the gentleman from South Dakota say that there is a case where an exception had been made by the committee in the House?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I say there have been exceptions before the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and I think that this man, having served as a volunteer soldier in the Civil War as well as served in the Regular Army, is entitled under the rules of the House to have his case considered as an exception.

Mr. KOPP. What, then, will the Committee on Pensions say to any claimant who comes before them, although he has not applied to the Pension Bureau at any time or for a long period of time, if we establish this precedent, and say that a man shall have special relief even though he has not applied to the Pension Bureau for 21 years and the committee will recommend that it be allowed?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I think they can say, as I have already said, that this man was not only a soldier who had received disability in the Regular Army, but that his case was exceptional, because he was a Civil War veteran. He received his disability in the Regular Army, but he would be entitled to a pension as a Civil War veteran, independent of that disability.

Mr. NORRIS. If he received his disability in the Regular Army, there would be no question about his getting relief at the department, would there?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I can not say as to that. I know that in many cases they do not get the degree of relief that they are entitled to. Many of the pension bills we pass here are passed on the theory that the men can not get what they are entitled to in the bureau.

Mr. NORRIS. I will admit that there are a good many cases like those which the gentleman mentions, but the theory of special legislation is that these disabilities do not come from the service. If they come from the service and originate there, there would be no limit, and in that case the applicant might perhaps get a higher pension from the department than he would receive through a special bill passed here in the House.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course this is an exception to the rule, but it should be borne in mind that this is an exceptional case, and it is a case under which the man, considering his disability, certainly would be entitled to the relief asked for before the other committee.

Mr. KOPP. What reason can the claimant assign for not applying to the Pension Bureau for relief?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Of course, as I stated at the outset, that was the proper course for him to have taken. If I had introduced the bill myself, I would have insisted that he should have done so. But I want to say, on the other hand, that it is not always the man who is most persistent before the bureau in demanding increase after increase who is the most worthy, and the fact that this man has suffered long under a blood poisoning that he obtained in the service, which has been certified to, now for 21 years without having asked for a further increase, makes it clear to my mind that there ought to be a limit to the punishment that the House puts upon him for not having made earlier application. I know that in good and orderly procedure this man should have done so. But we are approaching the end of the session, and in such an extreme case as this I think the House would more honor the rule in its breach than by its observance, especially when we know that no other bill for this man's relief can be passed at this session.

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

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. KOPP. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 35, noes 30.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I demand tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The other committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

ALFRED CHILDERS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Alfred Childers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the pension laws, Alfred Childers, who was a private in Company I, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said organization on the 30th day of August, 1862: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emoluments shall accrue by virtue of the passage of this act.

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

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 10454) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Lyman Aldrich, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Black, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah M. Rice, late of Company I, First Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Moulton, late captain Company B, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Taylor, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus T. Wardwell, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lafayette Carmack, late of Company M, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Black, alias William Hutchinson, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Mills, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Anderson, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Burt, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Dannels, late of Company K, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry W. Holcomb, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthew M. Perry, late of Company F, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enos Tyson, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christoph Stolte, late of Company G, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Engineers of the West, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Israel D. Lewis, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph B. Williams, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edgar Williams, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lena Rodelsheimer, widow of Solomon Rodelsheimer, late captain Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William A. Hicks, late of Company M, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Mead, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Griffin, late of Company G, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie F. Grosvenor, widow of Silas N. Grosvenor, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucetta A. Robinson, widow of John A. Robinson, late assistant surgeon Thirty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John L. Corey, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sampson G. Haws, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Odle, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Second Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Tournier, late of Company A, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gilbert G. Fitch, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Chappell, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Bishop, widow of Wait R. Bishop, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James W. Griffith, late of Company G, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Felmly, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William White, late of Company A, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin O. Spaulding, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sebastian Glasstetter, late of Company G, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Carr, late of Company F, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Worden, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per nomth in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Churchill, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Derick Banta, late of Company F, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Crawford, late of Company E, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Collins, late of Company G, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Wolgamot, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Merrifield, late of Company G, and second principal musician Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Tubbs, late of Company G, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Wiswall, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Bond, late of Company K, Eighty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Loftus, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David A. Henderson, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McCombs, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Fine, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Benson, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. McCune, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Thomas, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Fording, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Stroyick, late of Company K, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Moore, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David D. Rains, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cole, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert J. Atwell, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Joy, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Pollock, late first lieutenant Company I, Thirty-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas E. Nason, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonah Hutzler, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Sullivan, late master-at-arms U. S. S. Grampus and Great Western, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jefferson D. Coats, late of Company C, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Loren Shedd, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert L. Graves, late of Company I, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William P. Snodgrass, late of Company G, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lena D. Nickerson, widow of Azor H. Nickerson, late captain Company I, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas D. Dalton, late of Companies F and A, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hezekiah E. Burton, late of Company I, Thirtenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy F. Nell, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Edwards, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Cullen, widow of James Cullen, late of Third Independent Battery, Connecticut Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company L, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Annie Neid, former widow of Bernard Diestel, late of the United States Military Academy Artillery Detachment, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Elihu S. Warner, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Simons, widow of Thomas Simons, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joshua G. Richardson, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David S. Bender, late second lieutenant and captain Company I, Forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and captain Company M, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos H. Cory, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Van Tuyl, late first lieutenant Company G, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Daugherty, late of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Romanzo J. Ashley, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederic C. Buten, late second lieutenant Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip Bixby, late of Company E, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Carter, late captain Company B, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Baker, widow of Peter Baker, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Norris, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace A. Massey, alias Charles D. Monroe, late of Company B, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Edward F. Smith, late of Fifth Independent Battery (E), Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall Sias, second, late of Company I, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dewitt C. McGill, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dayton P. Clark, late first lieutenant and captain Company F, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John K. Law, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael H. Higgins, alias Michael Hennessy, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gilman S. Danforth, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar D. Purinton, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Mantle, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Burdick, widow of Caleb H. Burdick, late of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Justus P. Luther, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Russell, late of Company E, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. Haines, late of Battery C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thaddeus Cross, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Maxey, late of Company E, Eightieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Cox, late of Company E, Twenty-fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel M. Anderson, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment, and second lieutenant Company K, Twentieth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moores Freeman, late of Company B, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. B. McNees, late of Company A, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Shields, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ulvilda E. Britton, widow of Edward Britton, late of Sixth Independent Battery Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Birney Wilkins, late of Companies I and D, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Blackburn, late of Company F, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Wallace, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert G. Webster, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac T. Hart, late first lieutenant Company D, Third Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Sandford, late of Company A, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan E. Garland, widow of Samuel J. Garland, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ira Hakes, late of Company M, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abner B. Crombie, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alden S. Wood, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. H. Patch, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Scheer, late of Company D, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Ann Duffy, widow of Joseph Duffy, late of Company K, One hundred and fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joshua S. Fisher, late of Company C, First Battalion Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Marsh, late first lieutenant Company F, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Addleman, late of Company I, Fifty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Means, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Fairman, late of Company I, Sixty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McCune, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James G. Durham, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Lauderback, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Asa Blanchard, late first lieutenant Company F, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nahum B. Pinkham, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas H. Drenner, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Johnson, late of Companies A and D, First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Anderson, widow of Albanis L. Anderson, late first lieutenant Company F, Third Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Blade, alias James Malaney, late of Battery B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephriam Hanson, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles P. Powers, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horatio Nelson, late of Company E, One hundred and sixty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benoni Sweet, late sergeant major Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis Young, late of Company K, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Stewart, late of Company H, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen J. K. Dean, widow of William B. Dean, late second lieutenant Company H, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jasper England, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment, and Company H, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Evans, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charlotte Johnson, widow of George W. Johnson, late of Companies K and E, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John C. Barr, late acting ensign, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert N. Adams, late colonel Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 11, granting an increase of pension to Marshall Sias, strike out "twenty-four" and insert "thirty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The above bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 701. Lyman Aldrich.
S. 1188. William C. Black.
S. 2089. Josiah M. Rice.
S. 2106. Charles Moulton.
S. 2936. George W. Taylor.
S. 3274. Cyrus T. Wardwell.
S. 3816. Lafayette Carmack.
S. 3820. William H. Black (alias William Hutchinson).
S. 3855. James H. Mills.
S. 3963. Thomas Anderson.
S. 3964. Thomas Burt.
S. 3967. William Dannels.
S. 3989. Perry W. Holcomb.
S. 3990. Matthew M. Perry.
S. 3991. Enos Tyson.
S. 4270. Christoph Stolte.
S. 4430. Israel D. Lewis.
S. 4658. Joseph B. Williams.
S. 4763. Edgar Williams.
S. 4811. Lena Rodelsheimer.
S. 4889. William A. Hicks.
S. 5096. William B. Mead.
S. 5478. John Griffin.
S. 5515. Jennie F. Grosvenor.
S. 5776. Lucetta A. Robinson.
S. 5990. John L. Corey.
S. 6061. Sampson G. Haws.
S. 6098. Alfred Odle.
S. 6210. Charles A. Tournier.
S. 6331. Gilbert G. Fitch.
S. 6451. Levi Chappell.
S. 6476. Sarah E. Bishop.
S. 6697. James W. Griffith.
S. 6701. William L. Felmly.
S. 6755. William White.
S. 6909. Benjamin O. Spaulding.
S. 6911. Sebastian Glasstetter.
S. 7072. John W. Carr.
S. 7087. John B. Worden.
S. 7188. John A. Churchill.
S. 7189. Derick Banta.
S. 7207. George W. Crawford.
S. 7208. Thomas Collins.
S. 7279. Joseph Wolmagot.
S. 7303. James E. Merrifield.
S. 7309. James B. Tubbs.
S. 7327. Charles Wiswall.
S. 7328. George Bond.
S. 7353. Alfred Loftus.
S. 7367. David A. Henderson.
S. 7407. John McCombs.
S. 7422. George W. Fine.
S. 7489. Frank Benson.
S. 7540. William H. McCune.
S. 7544. William A. Thomas.
S. 7556. William Fording.
S. 7583. John G. Stroyick.
S. 7598. Henry Moore.
S. 7692. David D. Rains.
S. 7776. John Cole.
S. 7778. Robert J. Atwell.
S. 7870. Martin Joy.
S. 7880. John W. Pollock.
S. 7951. Thomas E. Nason.
S. 8035. Jonah Hutzler.
S. 8178. George Sullivan.
S. 8264. Jefferson D. Coats.
S. 8267. Loren Shedd.
S. 8298. Albert L. Graves.
S. 8314. William P. Snodgrass.
S. 8315. Lena D. Nickerson.
S. 8368. Thomas D. Dalton.
S. 8369. Hezekiah E. Burton.
S. 8375. Timothy F. Nell.
S. 8444. John T. Edwards.
S. 8838. Margaret Cullen.
S. 8843. Annie Neid.
S. 8847. Elihu S. Warner.
S. 8848. Anna Simons.
S. 8895. Joshua G. Richardson.
S. 8903. David S. Bender.
S. 8906. Amos H. Cory.
S. 8921. John J. Van Tuyl.
S. 8923. James S. Daugherty.
S. 9037. Romanzo J. Ashley.
S. 9076. Frederic C. Buten.
S. 9077. Philip Bixby.
S. 9083. George W. Carter.
S. 9149. Mary A. Baker.
S. 9155. John Norris.
S. 9165. Horace A. Massey (alias Charles D. Monroe).
S. 9166. Edward F. Smith.
S. 9170. Marshall Sias, 2d.
S. 9223. Dewitt C. McGill.
S. 9224. Dayton P. Clark.
S. 9232. John K. Law.
S. 9279. Michael H. Higgins (alias Michael Hennessy).
S. 9280. Gilman S. Danforth.
S. 9313. Oscar D. Purinton.
S. 9341. John Mantle.
S. 9342. Sarah C. Burdick.
S. 9406. Justus P. Luther.
S. 9416. Charles H. Russell.
S. 9434. John S. Haines.
S. 9435. Thaddeus Cross.
S. 9472. William C. Maxey.
S. 9481. James W. Cox.
S. 9522. Samuel M. Anderson.
S. 9544. Moores Freeman.
S. 9555. James H. B. McNees.
S. 9603. Patrick Shields.
S. 9672. Ulvilda E. Britton.
S. 9688. Birney Wilkins.
S. 9702. Solomon Blackburn.
S. 9712. William H. Wallace.
S. 9713. Albert G. Webster.
S. 9728. Isaac T. Hart.
S. 9739. Peter Sandford.
S. 9813. Susan E. Garland.
S. 9871. Ira Hakes.
S. 9879. Abner B. Crombie.
S. 9880. Alden S. Wood
S. 9881. William H. H. Patch.
S. 9884. Frederick Scheer.
S. 9886. Mary Ann Duffy.
S. 9911. Joshua S. Fisher.
S. 9936. Henry A. Marsh.
S. 9942. Henry A. Addleman.
S. 9943. William Means.
S. 9944. William M. Fairman.
S. 9972. John McCune.
S. 9980. James G. Durham.
S. 9982. Thomas Lauderback.
S. 9986. Asa Blanchard.
S. 10000. Nahum B. Pinkham.
S. 10029. Silas H. Drenner.
S. 10031. John H. Johnson.
S. 10032. Sarah E. Anderson.
S. 10049. James Blade (alias James Malaney).
S. 10058. Ephriam Hanson.
S. 10061. Charles P. Powers.
S. 10120. Horatio Nelson.
S. 10123. Benoni Sweet.
S. 10128. Francis Young.
S. 10129. William E. Stewart.
S. 10140. Helen J. K. Dean.
S. 10163. Jasper England.
S. 10174. William Evans.
S. 10178. Charlotte Johnson.
S. 10280. John C. Barr.
S. 10290. Robert N. Adams.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 10595) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Horace Perry, late first lieutenant Company I, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Riffe, late of Company D, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Algernon Luse, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Uhler, late of Company H, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Rutherford, late captain Company I, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac R. Jameson, late sergeant First Company Sharpshooters, Twenty-seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cassius W. Andrew, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezra W. Robinson, late first lieutenant and adjutant, Second Regiment Indiana Home Guards-Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Obed W. Barnard, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Evans, late of U. S. S. North Carolina, Sebago, and Savannah, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Dannerberger, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Stetson, late of Company D, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Magers, late of Company K, Twenty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hector C. Northington, late first lieutenant Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Rigney, late of Company G, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron A. Doty, late of U. S. S. North Carolina and Augusta, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan Rouch, late of Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Wellington K. Eggleston, late of Company G, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry E. Davis, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Morrison, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia M. Rhodes, widow of Hinman Rhodes, late major and colonel, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Choat, late of Company A, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Mather, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zelates Hill, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey R. Currier, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Smith, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Rose, late of Company G, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catharine M. Cunningham, widow of Peter J. Cunningham, late of Company A, Ninety-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel W. Graham, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caleb Reynolds, late of Company G, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Cook, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Jerome, late of Company F, Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Taylor, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Dickson, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrenius J. Laughlin, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Troop L, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Springsteen, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Asbury F. Haynes, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. McLean, widow of Allen C. McLean, late of Company C, Seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Milton M. Adamson, late of Company I, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. McLaughlin, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Castle, late sergeant major Seventy-third Regiment, and captain Company A, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Massey, late of Company E, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Mitchell, late of Company A, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Thomas, alias Franklin, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Sackett, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Rine, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Miller, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Williams, late of Company C, Second Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Dill, late of Company B, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie S. McKenney, widow of James McKenney, late of Company B, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of David H. Janes, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Amick, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Gray, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abel Markwell, late of Company H, Eighty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Forty-third Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Augsburger, late of Company A, Fortieth Regiment, and Company I, Fifty-first Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Fontaine, late of Company B, Third Regiment, and Company K, Sixth Regiment, Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Drew, late of Company D, First Battalion, Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Tousley, late of Company A, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Folger, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Spencer Walker, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry N. Bradbury, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson R. Brown, late of Companies G and B, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert D. Damren, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Sargent, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lawrence Payne, jr., late of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Gunning, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hudson Sherwood, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melville J. Lane, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Armstrong, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gunner Larsan, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Winfield S. Webster, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Enos Allman, late of Company E, Seventy-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sidney J. Hazelbaker, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nannie R. Dudley, widow of William W. Dudley, late lieutenant colonel Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Stephen G. Bowles, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Criswell, late of Company G, Eighty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter Dickinson, late of Company K, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John O. Sutherland, late of Company G, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Morgan, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Riley, late of Company A, Fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Stewart, late of Company D, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Clark, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clark H. Butterfield, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Jane Norton, widow of Francis M. Norton, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ralph Kent, jr., late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvester O. Lord, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles C. Lyon, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli B. Clark, late of Company F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Second Battery Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Taylor, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment, and Company D, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter S. Chenoweth, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Snow, late of Company K, Ninety-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fifth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Manion, widow of Martin Manion, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Asbury B. Castle, late chaplain One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Oliver, widow of Alfred S. Oliver, late assistant surgeon Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Sidney W. Park, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Woodward, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Whipple M. Brayton, late first lieutenant Company D, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Lucian, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Kelley, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Hanaford, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie A. Sanborn, widow of John G. Sanborn, late of Company I, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Walter E. Pingree, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dennis Griffin, late of Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nazaire Bodett, late of Company H, First Battalion, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Darwin R. Streeter, late of U. S. S. Exchange, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Scace, late of Company E, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson Washburn, late second lieutenant Company L, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Burrows, late of Fourth Independent Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin F. Bolton, late of Company E, Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Marquart, late of Company H, Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Shaffer, late of Company L, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Hoyt, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Herman C. Eversz, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seth W. Ewings, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles G. Rising, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William V. Sheets, late of Thirteenth Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Driscoll, late of Company H, Sixty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of May C. Knight, widow of Edwin A. Knight, late hospital steward, Fifth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adelbert Bywater, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Harvel, late of Company B, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maria Jones, widow of Seymour Jones, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ira W. Dill, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jessie F. Loughridge, widow of James Loughridge, late first lieutenant Company K, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Peter K. Bonebrake, late of Company I, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Crawford S. Barclay, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph F. Kassner, alias Frank Weber, late of Company B, Stewart's Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and Company M, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Wilson, late of Company G, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonora M. Talbot, widow of Charles H. Talbot, late first lieutenant Company E, Nineteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Henderson, late of Company E, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Thessia, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. French, late second lieutenant Company K, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Littlefield, late of Company G, Twenty-ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Burgess, late of Companies E and H, Thirty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clarence E. Bullard, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment, and second lieutenant Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melinda E. Chase, widow of Sherman Chase, late of Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Clara M. Murray, widow of John H. Murray, late captain Company M, Sixty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adams T. Murphy, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nelson Beach, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adelbert Whitney, late of Company A, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi B. Wallace, late of Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Murdie, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sadie O. Purcell, widow of Thomas Purcell, late first lieutenant Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Marcus P. Wheeler, late of Company G, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Royal S. Childs, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry F. Tilton, late of Company K, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi T. Pond, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Culhan, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Malachi Cordero, late of Company C, First Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha Vangilder, former widow of Robert McConnell, late of Company B, Brackett's battalion, Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas Reed, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Stern, widow of Charles G. Stern, late of Company A, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth V. McKeever, widow of John McKeever, late of Company D, Third Battalion, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward Kightlinger, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred H. Miller, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barney A. Cooper, late of Company B, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

The above bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 276. Horace Perry.
S. 721. John W. Riffe.
S. 1047. Algernon Luse.
S. 1512. Francis M. Uhler.
S. 1791. James A. Rutherford.
S. 2095. Isaac R. Jameson.
S. 2267. Cassius W. Andrew.
S. 2932. Ezra W. Robinson.
S. 3228. Obed W. Barnard.
S. 3229. Richard Evans.
S. 3235. John Dannerberger.
S. 3408. Edward Stetson.
S. 3879. Samuel Magers.
S. 3975. Hector C. Northington.
S. 3976. Patrick Rigney.
S. 3986. Aaron A. Doty.
S. 4165. Nathan Rouch.
S. 4211. Wellington K. Eggleston.
S. 4486. Perry E. Davis.
S. 4529. John L. Morrison.
S. 4909. Julia M. Rhodes.
S. 5028. Francis M. Choat.
S. 5210. Jesse Mather.
S. 5217. Zelates Hill.
S. 5218. Harvey R. Currier.
S. 5219. John Smith.
S. 5223. John Rose.
S. 6128. Catharine M. Cunningham.
S. 6246. Daniel W. Graham.
S. 6678. Caleb Reynolds.
S. 6696. Joseph Cook.
S. 6698. Franklin Jerome.
S. 6700. William Taylor.
S. 6798. David Dickson.
S. 6955. Cyrenius J. Laughlin.
S. 7082. John W. Springsteen.
S. 7089. Ashbury F. Haynes.
S. 7234. Mary M. McLean.
S. 7329. Milton M. Adamson.
S. 7403. Thomas J. McLaughlin.
S. 7433. Henry A. Castle.
S. 7436. Francis M. Massey.
S. 7442. William E. Mitchell.
S. 7545. Robert Thomas (alias Franklin).
S. 7577. Frank Sackett.
S. 7595. David Rine.
S. 7596. Calvin Miller.

S. 7664. Alfred Williams.
S. 7693. Edward Dill.
S. 7695. Jennie S. McKenney.
S. 7709. David H. Janes.
S. 7710. George W. Amick.
S. 7736. Jesse Gray.
S. 7815. Abel Markwell.
S. 7819. John Augsburger.
S. 7874. James H. Fontaine.
S. 7879. William F. Drew.
S. 7882. Joseph C. Tousley.
S. 7924. Frederick Folger.
S. 7940. Spencer Walker.
S. 7952. Henry N. Bradbury.
S. 7993. Nelson R. Brown.
S. 8020. Robert D. Damren.
S. 8150. Ellen Sargent.
S. 8214. Lawrence Payne, jr.
S. 8215. Thomas Gunning.
S. 8225. Hudson Sherwood.
S. 8226. Melville J. Lane.
S. 8230. James Armstrong.
S. 8240. Gunner Larsan.
S. 8266. Winfield S. Webster.
S. 8275. Enos Allman.
S. 8328. Sidney J. Hazelbaker.
S. 8393. Nannie R. Dudley.
S. 8469. Stephen G. Bowles.
S. 8514. William Criswell.
S. 8601. Walter Dickinson.
S. 8634. John O. Sutherland.
S. 8658. George W. Morgan.
S. 8669. Daniel Riley.
S. 8791. William E. Stewart.
S. 8816. George Clark.
S. 8824. Clark H. Butterfield.
S. 8849. Mary Jane Norton.
S. 8850. Ralph Kent, jr.
S. 8851. Sylvester O. Lord.
S. 8888. Charles C. Lyon.
S. 8901. Eli B. Clark.
S. 8991. Charles W. Taylor.
S. 8992. Peter S. Chenoweth.
S. 8994. Andrew J. Snow.
S. 9051. Catharine Manion.
S. 9059. Asbury B. Castle.
S. 9078. Mary J. Oliver.
S. 9079. Sidney W. Park.
S. 9116. William Woodward.
S. 9154. Whipple M. Brayton.
S. 9173. John B. Lucian.
S. 9233. George Kelley.
S. 9235. William F. Hanaford.
S. 9237. Annie A. Sanborn.
S. 9281. Walter E. Pingree.
S. 9285. Dennis Griffin.
S. 9288. Nazaire Bodett.
S. 9312. Darwin R. Streeter.
S. 9315. William B. Scace.
S. 9316. Nelson Washburn.
S. 9344. Calvin Burrows.
S. 9346. Franklin F. Belton.
S. 9467. David Marquart.
S. 9478. William C. Shaffer.
S. 9479. Charles L. Hoyt.
S. 9486. Herman C. Eversz.
S. 9487. Seth W. Ewings.
S. 9489. Charles G. Rising.
S. 9490. William V. Sheets.
S. 9491. Thomas Driscoll.
S. 9535. May C. Knight.
S. 9549. Adelbert Bywater.
S. 9563. John M. Harvel.
S. 9569. Maria Jones.
S. 9604. Ira W. Dill.
S. 9610. Jessie F. Loughridge.
S. 9619. Crawford S. Barclay.
S. 9623. Joseph F. Kassner (alias Frank Weber).
S. 9640. David Wilson.
S. 9661. Leonora M. Talbot.
S. 9744. William Henderson.
S. 9810. Thomas Thessia.
S. 9811. George F. French.
S. 9812. Albert Littlefield.
S. 9835. Thomas Burgess.
S. 9870. Clarence E. Bullard.
S. 9885. Melinda E. Chase.
S. 9945. Clara M. Murray.
S. 9946. Adams T. Murphy.
S. 9953. Nelson Beach.
S. 10002. Adelbert Whitney.
S. 10044. Levi B. Wallace.
S. 10045. John Murdie.
S. 10048. Sadie O. Purcell.
S. 10096. Marcus P. Wheeler.
S. 10130. Royal S. Childs.
S. 10166. Henry F. Tilton.
S. 10254. Levi T. Pond.
S. 10262. Patrick Culhan.
S. 10291. Malachi Cordero.
S. 10292. Martha Vangilder.
S. 10315. Thomas Reed.
S. 10316. Mary E. Stern.
S. 10322. Elizabeth V. McKeever.
S. 10338. Edward Kightlinger.
S. 10339. Alfred H. Miller.
S. 10517. Barney A. Cooper.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 32674) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of James H. Campton, late of Fifth Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Lolless, late of Company C, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin C. Overturf, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elbridge G. Arlin, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of August Knocke, late of Company I, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank C. Bruner, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Stark, late of Company D, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthias S. Hartman, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Bow, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Hickman, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grace Olive Jones, helpless and dependent child of Robert Jones, late of Company B, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Marion J. Green, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Weber, widow of William M. Weber, late first lieutenant and regimental quartermaster Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Fortner, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Littleton, widow of Adam D. Littleton, late first lieutenant and adjutant Fifty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Silvester Bryant, late of Company M, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Clear, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza S. Stiteler, widow of William Stiteler, late of Company A, and quartermaster sergeant Seventy-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Charles F. Brown, late of Company I, Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Estella M. Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of said Charles F. Brown, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Eliza S. Stiteler the name of said Estella M. Brown shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Eliza S. Stiteler.

The name of Andrew J. Huggins, late of Company M, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Q. Moses, late of Company I, Seventy-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Nesler, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Jennings, late of Company H, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Norman B. Ames, late captain Company A, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph McClellan, late first lieutenant Company C, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Owens, late of Company G, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Kilgore, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah H. Devin, widow of George W. Devin, late adjutant Forty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Lockhart, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha Rearick, widow of Joseph W. Rearick, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Estella Rearick, helpless and dependent daughter of said Joseph W. Rearick, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha Rearick the name of said Estella Rearick shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $12 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha Rearick.

The name of John E. Merritt, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dallas Wamsley, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Hile, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Almon G. Cooley, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Boyer, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Voigt, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment, and Company H, Third Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Turner, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clement R. Strahan, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Betz, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Siders, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonidas Folckemmer, late of Company A, One hundred and tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jessie W. Sterling, widow of Amos J. Sterling, late lieutenant colonel, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Oscar Hoskins, late of Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment, United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adget V. Kenney, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam D. Miller, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. Foreman, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archibald Matthews, late of Company M, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Kelliher, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rawson Holman, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. B. Huntsman, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edgar L. Beckwith, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George M. Trickey, late of Company E, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen M. Blanchard, widow of John A. Blanchard, late surgeon Forty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. Riley, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mercy M. Sutorius, widow of Alexander Sutorius, late first lieutenant, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca E. Ginn, widow of Benjamin F. Ginn, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William O'Neill, alias William McDonald, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Bishop, late of Eighteenth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry L. Steckel, late of Company G, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Hathaway, late of Company B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Goodwine, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Ninty-third Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Trimble, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Lees, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William N. Hunt, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew P. Brink, late of Company B, Third Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonard A. Gay, late first lieutenant Company B, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucien I. Perry, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank B. Carey, helpless and dependent child of Daniel J. Carey, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Hunter, late of Company E, Second Regiment Eastern Shore Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha P. Lansing, widow of Eli Lansing, late of Company F, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Sohrweide, late of Company E, Fifty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Reid, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthew M. Finch, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles H. Ranney, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Junius S. Smith, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper W. Brewster, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Palmer, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Lancers, Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Smith, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius B. Libey, late hospital steward, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary S. Lillibridge, widow of Clark Lillibridge, late of Company C, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Morris B. Matheny, late of Company K, Seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen D. Guerin, late of Company I, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William I. Rugg, late of Company L, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Kerr, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Wise, late of Company G, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Gochenour, late of Company E, Ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Fifth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Paul Unglaube, late of Company C, Sixty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Dickey, late of Company E, First Battalion, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Corwin A. Belknap, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David N. Brown, late of Company H, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Rohleder, late of Twenty-first Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Tucker, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emanuel Coykendall, late of Company M, Eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company D, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert P. Talmadge, late of Sixth Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Kent, late of Company G, Eighty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Crow, late of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emanuel Peter, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willard P. Marsh, late of Companies E and C, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adolph Blanchard, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Hicks, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas H. Hughes, late of U. S. S. Princeton, Linda, and Delta, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Throckmorton, late of Company A, Forty-first Regiment, and Company K, Fifty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel W. Yount, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Strait, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Chadwell, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Uriah Butler, late of Company I, Eighty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Watt, late of Company G, Fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward J. Green, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Davis C. Smith, late of Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben Bruner, late of Company D, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Murray, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Anderson, late of Company K, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Coakley, late of Company G, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Siddall, late commissary sergeant One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Erastus W. Hanes, late second lieutenant Company E, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham S. Reed, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Kibler, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane V. McBroom, helpless and dependent child of William H. McBroom, late of Company B, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Clara B. Dunn, widow of James Dunn, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Alpha H. Shildtz, late of Company B, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Dunn, alias John Perry, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry T. Bevans, late of Company F, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mads C. Morison, late of Company B, First Battalion Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Braden, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Carr, late of U. S. S. Dan Smith, Home, and Princeton, United States Navy, and Company F, Second Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Heston, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Chamberlin, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick W. Farr, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eldridge P. Hargrove, late of Company E, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maria Washburn, former widow of Hosea Hall, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George Wilhelm, late captain Company F, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Conrad Shefler, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip H. Bayes, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Elder, late of Company C, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Fourth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bianca Blenker, helpless and dependent child of Louis Blenker, late brigadier general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward Loreaux, late of Company B, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Flynn, late of U. S. S. Ohio, Colorado, and Princeton, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willis C. Hadley, late of band, Twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Moore, late of Company C, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Gordon, late of Company H, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Chaplain, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah J. Hall, former widow of Hiram S. Wentworth, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Seton Harper, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment, and Company B, Sixty-ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonard H. Washburn, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Green, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Lonergan, late of Company A, Sixty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harrison Brown, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hutcheons B. Durham, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Haverfield, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ebenezer Blanchard, late of Company E, Third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Kaiser, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Colistus G. Bell, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Balser Kirsh, late of Company B, Eighty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Wellar, late of band, Forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gabriel L. Mullock, late of Company F, First Regiment New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bazel D. Battin, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper N. Marsh, late of Company C, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Cameron, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Jenness, late of Seventh Independent Battery Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Blocksom, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew J. Powell, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George F. Mullen, late of Company E, Forty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Leavell, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph V. Gillespie, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Springer, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Norris S. Burnett, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Creighton, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard M. Braden, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus R. Jaynes, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Hanna, late first lieutenant Company H, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jackson S. Clark, late acting master's mate, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram B. Melendy, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Geiger, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Roderick A. Caldwell, late of Company D, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Cherry, late unassigned, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac R. Nichols, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Byron W. Nicoll, late of Company E, Thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Howell, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Bortz, late of Company G, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim Sempere, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel L. Fridiger, late of Company C, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Stitt, late of Capt. Dougherty's company, One hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John V. R. Williams, late of Companies K and F, Thirty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cassel, late of Company E, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Potter, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Brown, late of Company K, Sixty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip M. Fridley, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John N. West, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grace E. Kniffen, helpless and dependent child of Charles H. Kniffen, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joanna Burnett, helpless and dependent child of James W. Burnett, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Hilon L. Mead, late of Company E, One hundred and fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Convers C. Black, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram D. Alford, late of Company A, Eighty-third Regiment, and Company K, Ninety-seventh Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ernest Weinhold, late of Company H, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Mooney, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Prentice E. Call, late of Company D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall Clark, late of Company L, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Kennedy, late of Company I, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Spencer Hunniwell, alias George Spencer, late of U. S. S. Itasca and O. H. Lee, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Penelton Ziler, late of Company F, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephus Shearer, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hamilton P. Chase, late of Company A, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Hicks, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Lanier, late of Company H, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Gordon, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Walker, late of Company F, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Courtney, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Watson, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Ackley, late of Company A, Ninety-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael T. Holden, late of Company K, Fifty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome C. Holloway, late of Company C, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Gibbons, widow of William Gibbons, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Burtie Gibbons, helpless and dependent daughter of said William Gibbons, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine.

The name of Anna E. Birkle, widow of Landolin Birkle, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ira G. Haven, late of Company G, Eighty-third Regiment, and Company B, Ninety-seventh Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Hicks, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Georgia Ann Watts, widow of William J. Watts, late of Company B, First Regiment Alabama and Tennessee Volunteer Vidette Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Chilcote, widow of Nathan B. Chilcote, late of Company C, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George Dennis, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar B. Knight, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Cannon, late of Company A, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hans Johnson, late of Company G, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nels Nelson, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Satterfield, late of Company F, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Ambers, late of Company C, Second Regiment New Jersey Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma Price, widow of Joseph W. Price, late of Company D, Second Regiment, and Company A, First Regiment, Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Johnson, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Derrick Huck, late of Company A, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philander M. East, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos B. Watson, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Johnson, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David McMiller, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William L. Carpenter, late second lieutenant Company G, Thirty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bernard Murphy, late of U. S. S. North Carolina, Potomac, and Lackawanna, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos P. Caldwell, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin Richmond, late of Company D, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Rooney, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie L. Comstock, widow of Richard E. Comstock, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jesse M. Roberts, late first lieutenant Company F, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles S. Griffith, late of Company L, Eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles June, alias Charles Crawford, late of Company G, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Eliza Newton, widow of Andrew Newton, late first lieutenant Company F, Thirteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel P. Hyatt, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Ford, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry G. Bickel, late of Company E, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Troy, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hooser, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Lennon, alias John Leonard, late of Independent Company, Oneida (N. Y.) Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josephine Mequillet, widow of David Mequillet, late captain, Company H, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Godwin, widow of Charles W. Godwin, late of Company H, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Annie Godwin, John Godwin, and Lilly Godwin, helpless and dependent children of said Charles W. Godwin, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary M. Godwin the names of said Annie Godwin, John Godwin, and Lilly Godwin shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $10 per month each from and after the date of death of said Mary M. Godwin.

The name of Edwin Jones, late of Battery G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh C. Hamilton, late of Company B, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert A. Williams, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Peters, late of Company D, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Oatman, late of Company K, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Welker, widow of John J. Welker, late of Company E, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nicholas Doran, late of Company G, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. McClane, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Shoppell, late of Company C, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twelfth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Williams, late of Company C, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Brennan, widow of James Brennan, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lucy Brennan, helpless and dependent daughter of said James Brennan, said pension shall be reduced to $20 per month.

The name of Michael Looney, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Newton Coberly, late of Second Battery, Kansas Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eben R. Wadleigh, late of U. S. S. Sonoma, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles S. Campbell, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Fritts, late of Companies I and B, and hospital steward, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Gilmore, late of Company I, Ninety-first Regiment, and Company B, One hundred and twentieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Tubbs, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph N. Smith, late of Company G, Second Regiment New Jersey Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Demas L. Coe, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Clemens, now known as John Stewart, late of Company G, Fifty-sixth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McCollister, late of Company E, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abner R. Bradney, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James F. Watson, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Smith, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lorenzo S. St. John, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Modglin, late of Company A, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, on page 19, I move to strike out lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, the beneficiary, John D. Strait, being dead.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, on page 34, I move to strike out lines 23 and 24, and on page 35 lines 1 and 2, increasing the pension of John Mooney, he being dead.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 587. James H. Campton.
H. R. 1303. Andrew J. Lolless.
H. R. 1679. Franklin C. Overturf.
H. R. 4394. Elbridge G. Arlin.
H. R. 4768. August Knocke.
H. R. 4793. Frank C. Bruner.
H. R. 5972. John Stark.
H. R. 6786. Matthias S. Hartman.
H. R. 7841. Andrew J. Bow.
H. R. 8371. James A. Hickman.
H. R. 8679. Grace Olive Jones.
H. R. 8736. Marion J. Green.
H. R. 9681. Sarah A. Weber.
H. R. 10003. Andrew J. Fortner.
H. R. 10254. Sarah J. Littleton.
H. R. 10495. Silvester Bryant.
H. R. 10525. Henry H. Clear.
H. R. 11222. Eliza S. Stiteler.
H. R. 11506. Andrew J. Huggins.
H. R. 12477. John Q. Moses.
H. R. 12577. Solomon Nesler.
H. R. 13949. Elijah Jennings.
H. R. 14047. Norman B. Ames.
H. R. 14351. Joseph McClellan.
H. R. 14432. William H. Owens.
H. R. 14749. James T. Kilgore.
H. R. 15112. Sarah M. Devin.
H. R. 16392. Benjamin F. Lockhart.
H. R. 16406. Martha Rearick.
H. R. 16982. John E. Merritt.
H. R. 18255. Dallas Wamsley.
H. R. 18940. George M. Hile.
H. R. 19208. Almon G. Cooley.
H. R. 19511. William H. Boyer.
H. R. 19541. Robert Voigt.
H. R. 19904. John Turner.
H. R. 19974. Clement R. Strahan.
H. R. 20206. John Betz.
H. R. 20243. Henry A. Siders.
H. R. 20289. Leonidas Folckemmer.
H. R. 20653. Jessie W. Sterling.
H. R. 20852. Oscar Hoskins.
H. R. 20873. Adget V. Kenney.
H. R. 21169. Adam D. Miller.
H. R. 21258. George B. Foreman.
H. R. 21382. Archibald Matthews.
H. R. 21386. Michael Kelliher.
H. R. 21468. Rawson Holman.
H. R. 21575. John W. B. Huntsman.
H. R. 21640. Edgar L. Beckwith.
H. R. 22128. George M. Trickey.
H. R. 22181. Helen M. Blanchard.
H. R. 22265. Thomas B. Riley.
H. R. 22399. Mercy M. Sutorius.
H. R. 22743. Rebecca E. Ginn.
H. R. 22785. William O'Neill, alias William McDonald.
H. R. 22903. John B. Bishop.
H. R. 22955. Henry L. Steckel.
H. R. 23028. George H. Hathaway.
H. R. 23622. Jacob Goodwine.
H. R. 23958. Edward Trimble.
H. R. 24102. William Lees.
H. R. 24347. William N. Hunt.
H. R. 24354. Andrew P. Brink.
H. R. 24447. Leonard A. Gay.
H. R. 24489. Lucien I. Perry.
H. R. 24491. Frank B. Carey.
H. R. 24543. John W. Hunter.
H. R. 25174. Martha P. Lansing.
H. R. 25184. Henry Sohrweide.
H. R. 25543. William Reid.
H. R. 25611. Matthew M. Finch.
H. R. 25839. Charles H. Ranney.
H. R. 25910. Junius S. Smith.
H. R. 25940. Jasper W. Brewster.
H. R. 26390. Josiah Palmer.
H. R. 26413. John B. Smith.
H. R. 26421. Cornelius B. Libey.
H. R. 26522. Mary S. Lillibridge.
H. R. 26775. Morris B. Matheny.
H. R. 26784. Stephen D. Guerin.
H. R. 26828. William I. Rugg.
H. R. 26854. John T. Kerr.
H. R. 26999. Henry Wise.
H. R. 27040. Amos Gochenour.
H. R. 27104. Paul Unglaube.
H. R. 27162. William Dickey.
H. R. 27166. Corwin A. Belknap.
H. R. 27327. David N. Brown.
H. R. 27330. George Rohleder.
H. R. 27342. George W. Tucker.
H. R. 27373. Emanuel Coykendall.
H. R. 27390. Robert P. Talmadge.
H. R. 27392. John R. Kent.
H. R. 27396. William Crow.
H. R. 27476. Emanuel Peter.
H. R. 27503. Willard P. Marsh.
H. R. 27504. Adolph Blanchard.
H. R. 27513. Samuel Hicks.
H. R. 27516. Thomas H. Hughes.
H. R. 27534. John W. Throckmorton.
H. R. 27547. Daniel W. Yount.
H. R. 27764. John D. Strait.
H. R. 27766. James Chadwell.
H. R. 27787. Uriah Butler.
H. R. 27804. Albert Watt.
H. R. 27855. Edward J. Green.
H. R. 28050. Davis C. Smith.
H. R. 28247. Reuben Bruner.
H. R. 28253. James B. Murray.
H. R. 28291. James Anderson.
H. R. 28332. William W. Coakley.
H. R. 28397. Frank Siddall.
H. R. 28415. Erastus W. Hanes.
H. R. 28515. Abraham S. Reed.
H. R. 28584. George W. Kibler.
H. R. 28684. Jane V. McBroom.
H. R. 28693. Clara B. Dunn.
H. R. 28700. Alpha H. Shildtz.
H. R. 28724. James Dunn, alias John Perry.
H. R. 28791. Henry T. Bevans.
H. R. 28837. Mads C. Morison.
H. R. 28838. James M. Braden.
H. R. 28915. Edward Carr.
H. R. 29026. John Heston.
H. R. 29063. Thomas Chamberlin.
H. R. 29082. Frederick W. Farr.
H. R. 29097. Eldridge P. Hargrove.
H. R. 29148. Maria Washburn.
H. R. 29233. George Wilhelm.
H. R. 29322. Conrad Shefler.
H. R. 29334. Philip H. Bayes.
H. R. 29335. Joseph Elder.
H. R. 29531. Bianca Blenker.
H. R. 29532. Edward Loreaux.
H. R. 29561. John M. Flynn.
H. R. 29618. Willis C. Hadley.
H. R. 29619. James Moore.
H. R. 29769. Charles Gordon.
H. R. 29839. David Chaplain.
H. R. 29845. Hannah J. Hall.
H. R. 29904. Seton Harper.
H. R. 29943. Leonard H. Washburn.
H. R. 29990. John F. Green.
H. R. 30013. Michael Lonergan.
H. R. 30054. Harrison Brown.
H. R. 30059. Hutcheons B. Durham.
H. R. 30090. John C. Haverfield.
H. R. 30091. Ebenezer Blanchard.
H. R. 30102. Jacob Kaiser.
H. R. 30133. Colistus G. Bell.
H. R. 30195. Balser Kirsh.
H. R. 30208. James M. Wellar.
H. R. 30213. Gabriel L. Mullock.
H. R. 30221. Bazel D. Battin.
H. R. 30223. Jasper N. Marsh.
H. R. 30275. Alexander Cameron.
H. R. 30279. William Jenness.
H. R. 30338. Joseph Blocksom.
H. R. 30377. Andrew J. Powell.
H. R. 30378. George F. Mullen.
H. R. 30384. William H. Leavell.
H. R. 30441. Joseph V. Gillespie.
H. R. 30456. George W. Springer.
H. R. 30475. Norris S. Burnett.
H. R. 30481. Robert Creighton.
H. R. 30498. Richard M. Braden.
H. R. 30508. Cyrus R. Jaynes.
H. R. 30541. Calvin Hanna.
H. R. 30613. Jackson S. Clark.
H. R. 30614. Hiram B. Melendy.
H. R. 30616. James W. Geiger.
H. R. 30619. Roderick A. Caldwell.
H. R. 30620. John W. Cherry.
H. R. 30648. Isaac R. Nichols.
H. R. 30651. Byron W. Nicoll.
H. R. 30655. William Howell.
H. R. 30729. Benjamin Bortz.
H. R. 30749. Ephraim Sempere.
H. R. 30841. Samuel L. Fridiger.
H. R. 30848. Andrew Stitt.
H. R. 30856. John V. R. Williams.
H. R. 30939. John Cassel.
H. R. 30945. Robert Potter.
H. R. 30973. William B. Brown.
H. R. 30978. Philip M. Fridley.
H. R. 31013. John N. West.
H. R. 31032. Grace E. Kniffen.
H. R. 31033. Joanna Burnett.
H. R. 31118. Hilon L. Mead.
H. R. 31123. Convers C. Black.
H. R. 31131. Hiram D. Alford.
H. R. 31132. Ernest Weinhold.
H. R. 31148. John Mooney.
H. R. 31195. Prentice E. Call.
H. R. 31215. Marshall Clark.
H. R. 31271. Richard Kennedy.
H. R. 31282. George Spencer Hunniwell, alias George Spencer.
H. R. 31294. Penelton Ziler.
H. R. 31338. Josephus Shearer.
H. R. 31352. Hamilton P. Chase.
H. R. 31375. Samuel Hicks.
H. R. 31456. James W. Lanier.
H. R. 31457. Isaac Gordon.
H. R. 31458. John Walker.
H. R. 31468. William Courtney.
H. R. 31471. William Watson.
H. R. 31475. Charles Ackley.
H. R. 31514. Michael T. Holden.
H. R. 31557. Jerome C. Holloway.
H. R. 31561. Margaret Gibbons.
H. R. 31629. Anna E. Birkle.
H. R. 31634. Ira G. Haven.
H. R. 31639. Adam Hicks.
H. R. 31642. Georgia Ann Watts.
H. R. 31665. Mary E. Chilcote.
H. R. 31693. George Dennis.
H. R. 31705. Oscar B. Knight.
H. R. 31752. Robert Cannon.
H. R. 31759. Hans Johnson.
H. R. 31771. Nels Nelson.
H. R. 31825. Samuel C. Satterfield.
H. R. 31864. Eli Ambers.
H. R. 31874. Emma Price.
H. R. 31877. Samuel Johnson.
H. R. 31891. Derrick Huck.
H. R. 31892. Philander M. East.
H. R. 31910. Amos B. Watson.
H. R. 31948. James Johnson.
H. R. 31949. David McMiller.
H. R. 31971. William L. Carpenter.
H. R. 31976. Bernard Murphy.
H. R. 31981. Amos P. Caldwell.
H. R. 31996. Edwin Richmond.
H. R. 32034. John Rooney.
H. R. 32045. Jennie L. Comstock.
H. R. 32053. Jesse M. Roberts.
H. R. 32088. Charles S. Griffith.
H. R. 32095. Charles June, alias Charles Crawford.
H. R. 32112. Mary Eliza Newton.
H. R. 32115. Daniel P. Hyatt.
H. R. 32136. Daniel Ford.
H. R. 32139. Henry G. Bickel.
H. R. 32144. Joseph C. Troy.
H. R. 32151. John W. Hooser.
H. R. 32155. John Lennon, alias John Leonard.
H. R. 32183. Josephine Mequillet.
H. R. 32184. Mary M. Godwin.
H. R. 32192. Edwin Jones.
H. R. 32195. Hugh C. Hamilton.
H. R. 32201. Robert A. Williams.
H. R. 32207. William C. Peters.
H. R. 32211. George Oatman.
H. R. 32227. Elizabeth Welker.
H. R. 32229. Nicholas Doran.
H. R. 32231. Thomas B. McClane.
H. R. 32236. Charles Shoppell.
H. R. 32237. Charles Williams.
H. R. 32241. Mary Brennan.
H. R. 32242. Michael Looney.
H. R. 32253. Newton Coberly.
H. R. 32257. Eben R. Wadleigh.
H. R. 32258. Charles S. Campbell.
H. R. 32276. John R. Fritts.
H. R. 32277. James A. Gilmore.
H. R. 32287. John B. Tubbs.
H. R. 32291. Joseph N. Smith.
H. R. 32298. Demas L. Coe.
H. R. 32311. Peter Clemens, now known as John Stewart.
H. R. 32323. John McCollister.
H. R. 32330. Abner R. Bradney.
H. R. 32365. James F. Watson.
H. R. 32370. William R. Smith.
H. R. 32374. Lorenzo S. St. John.
H. R. 32529. William T. Modglin.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 32675) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of William A. Williams, late of Capt. J. S. Boggess' Company A, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William O. Tumlinson, late of Capt. J. B. McCown's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion M. Redmon, late of Capt. James Bourland's First Company, Texas Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Green B. Powell, late of Capt. Boggess' Company A, Mounted Battalion Texas Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel J. McElrath, late of Company A, First Mounted Battalion Texas Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. McKinzie, late of Capt. John G. Walker's Company B, Mounted Battalion Texas Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Jacobs, late of Capt. Walker's Company B, Mounted Battalion Texas Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Besser, late of Capt. McCown's company, Texas Mounted Rangers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abner H. Beard, late of Capt. H. E. McCulloch's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Arnett, late of Company A, Mounted Battalion Texas Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hurst, late of Capt. Fitzhugh's Company D, Mounted Battalion Texas Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac C. Holt, late of Capt. Bagby's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred House, late of Capt. H. E. McCulloch's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Goodnight, late of Capt. J. J. Grumble's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. Fleming, late of Capt. William R. Henry's Company C, Mounted Battalion, Texas Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Fitzhugh, late of Company D, Mounted Battalion, Texas Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam H. Files, late of Capt. McCown's company, Texas Mounted Rangers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert W. Eller, late of Capt. H. E. McCulloch's company, Texas Mounted Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Earp, late of Capt. Boggess's Company A, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Debord, late of Capt. Henry's Company C, Texas Mounted Volunteers, Texas and New Mexico Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Dye, late of Capt. W. R. Henry's company, Texas Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Bingaman, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Harry Horton, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan F. Titus, jr., late of Company F, Fifth Regiment United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Feemster Penland, late of Company H, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lars P. Nelson, late of U. S. S. Monadnock, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Lillie P. Hinman, late nurse, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Cyrus R. Manion, late of Company E, Sixth United States Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month.

The name of Emma C. Smith, widow of Frank G. Smith, late second lieutenant Company H, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $15 per month.

The name of Shipman H. Crouch, late of Capt. John Creighton's company, Ninth Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Poplin, late of Company H, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Abraham H. Garrison, late of Company B (Capt. B. F. Burch), First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah J. Alexander, widow of Willis Alexander, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Susie E. Gore, widow of Jesse H. Gore, late of Company E, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John S. Miller, late captain, Oregon Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. McKee, late of Capt. Charles Bennett's Company F, First Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Johnson, late of Company K (Capt. F. M. P. Goff), Second Regiment Washington Territory Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian wars, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George P. Robertson, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Isabella S. Craig, widow of John N. Craig, late captain, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Jaquett, late of Capt. Jesse Walker's company (A), Ninth Regiment Oregon Mounted Militia, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George L. Hayes, late of Capt. Abel George's company, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month.

The name of William W. Cox, late of Company E (Capt. H. O'Neil's company), Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Oregon and Washington Territory Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ernest T. Aulich, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Cora M. Jackstock, widow of Louis Jackstock, late of Company I, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month and $2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Louis Jackstock until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of James W. Hollandsworth, late of Company A, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $18 per month.

The name of John Kennedy, late of U. S. S. Harvard, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Carrie Olson, widow of Ned Olson, late of Company L, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, with $2 per month additional on account of each of the three children of said Ned Olson until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of James C. Coppedge, late of Company A, Second Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of Andrew Kirkpatrick, late of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Daniel Smith, late of Company K, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. F. Julian, dependent son of Alfred M. Julian, late of Capt. Jacob Peak's company, Tennessee Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph B. Kisting, late of Troop D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of Catherine Lusk, widow of John Lusk, late of Capts. Brassfield's and Kelley's company, Kentucky Militia, War of 1812, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James O'Hare, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month.

The name of James W. Gray, jr., late first lieutenant Company F, First Regiment South Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Catherine C. Malin, widow of James F. Malin, late of Company K, Third Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month and $2 per month additional on account of each of the three children of said James F. Malin until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Frank E. Moore, late second lieutenant Company F, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Henderson, late of Capt. Newbern's company, Florida Volunteers, Florida Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Almira G. Kilbourne, widow of Henry S. Kilbourne, late major and surgeon, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Kelley, late of Troop L, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Bowen, late of Capt. O'Neill's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Seminole Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Golda McGill, widow of Arthur C. McGill, late of Company K, Thirty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert B. Davis, late of Capt. William Tom's company, Texas Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 3103. William A. Williams.
H. R. 3113. William O. Tumlinson.
H. R. 3126. Marion M. Redmon.
H. R. 3133. Green B. Powell.
H. R. 3143. Samuel J. McElrath.
H. R. 3145. George W. McKinzie.
H. R. 3152. John J. Jacobs.
H. R. 3167. James Besser.
H. R. 3172. Abner H. Beard.
H. R. 3174. John F. Arnett.
H. R. 3179. William Hurst.
H. R. 3186. Isaac C. Holt.
H. R. 3189. Alfred House.
H. R. 3195. Elijah Goodnight.
H. R. 3197. William B. Fleming.
H. R. 3198. Solomon Fitzhugh.
H. R. 3200. Adam H. Files.
H. R. 3201. Robert W. Eller.
H. R. 3204. Alexander Earp.
H. R. 3205. John H. Debord.
H. R. 3207. Benjamin F. Dye.
H. R. 5008. George Bingaman.
H. R. 6694. Harry Horton.
H. R. 9153. Jonathan F. Titus, jr.
H. R. 10903. Feemster Penland.
H. R. 12607. Lars P. Nelson.
H. R. 13109. Lillie P. Hinman.
H. R. 16069. Cyrus R. Manion.
H. R. 16748. Emma C. Smith.
H. R. 18235. Shipman H. Crouch.
H. R. 20625. John M. Poplin.
H. R. 20922. Abraham H. Garrison.
H. R. 21953. Hannah J. Alexander.
H. R. 23604. Susie E. Gore.
H. R. 24901. John S. Miller.
H. R. 24902. Benjamin F. McKee.
H. R. 26080. John L. Johnson.
H. R. 26427. George P. Robertson.
H. R. 26625. Isabella S. Craig.
H. R. 26850. William H. Jaquett.
H. R. 27555. George L. Hayes.
H. R. 27556. William W. Cox.
H. R. 27589. Ernest T. Aulich.
H. R. 27857. Cora M. Jackstock.
H. R. 28013. James W. Hollandsworth.
H. R. 28354. John Kennedy.
H. R. 28900. Carrie Olson.
H. R. 29231. James C. Coppedge.
H. R. 29316. Andrew Kirkpatrick.
H. R. 29461. Daniel Smith.
H. R. 30429. George W. F. Julian.
H. R. 30665. Joseph B. Kisting.
H. R. 30985. Catherine Lusk.
H. R. 31339. James O'Hare.
H. R. 31499. James W. Gray, jr.
H. R. 31686. Catherine C. Malin.
H. R. 32013. Frank E. Moore.
H. R. 32054. Robert Henderson.
H. R. 32224. Almira G. Kilbourne.
H. R. 32279. James Kelley.
H. R. 32304. William M. Bowen.
H. R. 32413. Golda McGill.
H. R. 32552. Robert B. Davis.

Mr. DRAPER. Mr. Speaker, on page 6, line 14, after the word "Sixth," I move to insert the word "Regiment."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, line 14, after the word "Sixth," insert the word "Regiment."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 24, add the following:

"The name of Mattie J. Sarver, widow of Doctor E. Sarver, late of Company G, Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, and $2 per month additional on account of each of the three minor children of said Doctor E. Sarver until they reach the age of 16 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word in explanation and in support of the amendment. Doctor E. Sarver entered the Spanish-American War service from West Virginia on July 1, 1898. He was discharged April 10, 1899. At the time of his discharge he was suffering from a condition of the lungs which ultimately developed into consumption, so that his friends were required to send him to Colorado for relief. This soldier, who had served nearly one year in the service of the United States in the Spanish War, actually died in the poorhouse in Colorado Springs, leaving a widow and three small children, who are now in such destitute circumstances as to be objects of charity and in danger of becoming poor-farm tenants themselves.

The pension claim of the widow has been rejected in the Pension Bureau on the sole ground that the soldier was suffering with this disease prior to his enlistment. I have carried on a great deal of correspondence and have gone to a great deal of trouble out of my sympathy for this poor woman and her little children, and have accumulated a volume of 50 letters in the endeavor to help them. Among other things, I have run down and located the commanding officer of the company and got a letter from him, which I turned over to the Pension Committee on the first day of the present Congress, or, to be more specific, on the 7th of last December, stating that to all appearances this man was physically sound and healthy at the time he entered the service.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Where did he serve?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I do not believe he went to Cuba. I am not sure where he served. I believe that when the United States accepts the service of a soldier and subjects him to a physical examination before enlisting him, it ought to be concluded by the findings, but I have gone further than that in this case, and, at great cost of time and effort to myself, have run down the commanding officer, who furnished a statement to the effect that this man appeared to be sound and well when he enlisted.

Mr. KOPP. Has there been a special bill introduced for this claimant?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. There has been a special bill introduced for her.

Mr. KOPP. When was it introduced?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. At the last session of Congress, and I have endeavored to get action upon it and get it put through at this session. I do not care to go into that feature of the case, however. I do not care to criticize anybody on account of inattention to this very deserving measure.

Now, proceeding, the Pension Bureau, in running down this case, sent a special examiner to West Virginia, and he examined and took the affidavit of two persons, who testified as follows. They testified that they knew Sarver well; that they had an opportunity to observe his condition upon his return from the service. They know that he was suffering with lung trouble upon his return, which was about three weeks after his discharge; that he suffered from lung trouble considerably from that time until the spring of 1904, when he went to Kanawha County, W. Va., and later his lodge sent him to Colorado, where, as I stated, he died of consumption at the county farm; but the point to which I wish to direct attention is this, that these witnesses knew this man well, but did not make any statement to the pension examiner that he was suffering from lung trouble before he entered the service, and the pension examiner, having secured no testimony to that effect from them and there being no testimony in the record to show that the man was suffering from tuberculosis before he entered the service, I say that it ought to be deemed conclusive that he was sound, especially when the Army examiner found him to be sound on enlistment, and that therefore it would inevitably follow that this condition accrued after his entry into the service. In addition to that, I want to say that there are affidavits here of the company sergeant stating that Sarver was a good soldier, that he was a manly man, and certifying that he suffered three distinct sicknesses as the result of colds caught when on duty, exposed to the cold and the rain and the snow.

[The time of Mr. MARTIN of Colorado having expired, by unanimous consent he was granted five minutes more.]

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has mentioned two; as I understand, the evidence was taken on special examinations.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Was that all of the special examination that was taken in West Virginia, or does the gentleman know what the other evidence is?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. No; there was an attempt made to get some statement from the regimental surgeon, who said he did not know the man at all and remembered nothing about his case.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. These were lay witnesses that testified?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Yes. They also got the affidavits of physicians who treated him in West Virginia for lung trouble after his discharge from the service. The examiner of the Pension Committee placed before me what he said was all of the evidence that had been secured by the Pension Bureau, and after reading it I said to the committee examiner that I would defy the Pension Commissioner or anybody else to point out to me one scintilla of evidence to show that Sarver had tuberculosis prior to the time of his enlistment; and I say now, on my honor as a Member of this House, that if there is any evidence to that effect pending in the Pension Bureau it was not pointed out in the files before me by the examiner of the committee, and I went to the trouble of making copies of all of the testimony that had been secured by the Pension Bureau in this case, and I hold it in my hand, and no evidence of that character whatever was present there.

Mr. KOPP. Was any action taken by the committee?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. There has been no action by the committee one way or the other. As I stated a moment ago, that is a subject I could go into, but I do not care to do that.

Mr. AMES. I want to ask that question myself. This is the first time that I have heard of the case. The case may be a perfectly good one and I would like to know why the gentleman could not get some consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I will say that on December 7, 1910, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, inclosing the letter which I had just then secured from the commanding officer of the company, and which I asked to have filed with my bill (H. R. 25620) granting a pension to Mattie J. Sarver.

On the next day, which was December 8, I sent the chairman of the Committee on Pensions this letter:

DECEMBER 8, 1910.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I will thank you to advance and consider H. R. 25620, granting a pension to Mattie J. Sarver, in support of which four affidavits are on file with your committee. I wrote you concerning the bill

on July 27, 1910. Since then, forgetting about the rejection of the claim in the Pension Bureau, I have succeeded in running down and getting a letter from First Lieut. A. F. Millan, which I mailed you yesterday. I am convinced that the soldier died as the result of conditions contracted in the service, and the need of the widow, with her three small children, is so urgent that I have done a large amount of corresponding to locate witnesses and get statements in support of her claim. I trust, therefore, that the evidence on file will be found sufficient and that you may see your way clear to making an early and favorable report.

Very truly, yours, JOHN A. MARTIN.

Mr. AMES. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him again? To what subcommittee was that bill referred?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There was a reply. I received a reply from the chairman of the committee on December 17, 1910. That reply is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1910.

Hon. JOHN A. MARTIN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter requesting that your bill H. R. 25620, proposing to grant a pension to Mattie J. Sarver, be considered by this committee, I would suggest that you take the matter up with Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, the subcommittee having charge of all Colorado bills.

Yours, very truly, H. C. LOUDENSLAGER, *Chairman.*

I then visited the committee room and called up Mr. BENNETT's office at about that time and ascertained that he was in Kentucky, and I understood he was absent for a long period of time. I went to Mr. BENNETT's office during the Christmas holidays and left a list of four or five pension bills to which I had called the attention of the committee clerk and which I wanted considered, and I will say now I have never had one single bill considered or acted upon by the Pensions Committee during this whole Sixty-first Congress. I made special mention, Mr. Speaker, of this bill to the committee clerk, and Mr. BENNETT's secretary, because I had then received a letter from Mrs. Sarver's friends in Colorado Springs stating that her state of mind was so serious that if her bill was acted upon adversely she was not to be notified for fear of some rash action.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman to say the Pension Office has finally rejected this claim?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. And it was done upon the ground this man had the disease at the time of his enlistment?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Yes; and no other.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. You say the record was that there was no such disease. Now, how do you justify—what evidence does the department have to base that rejection upon?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I have already made this statement. I have said the examiner in the Pension Committee upstairs here in the building furnished me with the evidence, which he stated to me was all the evidence which had been secured by the Pension Bureau, and I found no statement to that effect in that evidence, which I copied off and have here, and I have already called attention to the affidavits of two persons, given to the Pension Bureau examiner, who said they knew Sarver well and that when he returned from the service he had consumption, and I have tried to impress upon the Members the significance of the fact that there was no testimony secured from these witnesses that prior to the time of entering the service there was any such disease.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Was there any evidence, other than that on which this evidence was based, going to prove that?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. As I said a moment ago, I have not found it, but I do not want to be put in a position of having made a false statement.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about the merits of this bill. I doubt whether any member of the Pensions Committee does, but in justice to the committee a statement should be made. I know that every Member on the floor of this House, or nearly so, who has bills pending before the Committee on Pensions, and has had bills postponed, or at least the consideration of them, thinks that the committee perhaps has not been giving them due attention. I know that the prevalent idea is that the Committee on Pensions is not doing all that it can. Now, that is being judged from the fact that so many are being reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Of course it is well known that these two committees are acting under different laws. So far as I am concerned, I will say I have not missed a meeting of the committee. We have met regularly ever since our chairman returned, and we have had special meetings. We have made a consistent effort to report out all the bills possible; but, operating under a service law only, and with hundreds, aye, thousands, of bills pending before the committee, we could only report out a certain number. We have been doing the very best we could, whether we are criticized by the membership of the House or not. We have tried to be fair and have tried to report out the meritorious bills.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN] had a bill which may be meritorious; I am not prepared to say that it is not meritorious, but I am prepared to say that there are hundreds of other bills, no doubt just as meritorious, that have not been reached, because we have not had the opportunity to take them up. It seems to me that legislation in this way, by piecemeal, is ill advised, and if we are going to give this claimant a pension, why not give every other worthy claimant a pension from the floor of this House? That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter which I served in person, on the 1st of February, on the subcommitteeman who had charge of this bill, and at his suggestion I phoned to the Pension Committee examiner to have the files in the case sent for; I did that myself.

FEBRUARY 1, 1911.

Hon. JOSEPH B. BENNETT, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: During your absence in Kentucky I left a list of pension bills pending in your subcommittee which I would be glad to have considered, and particularly H. R. 25620, to grant a pension to Mattie J. Sarver. There are several affidavits filed with the bill, making a sufficient showing, I think, to justify favorable action, and the case is a most urgent one. Sarver died of tuberculosis, but the Pension Bureau rejected the widow's application on the ground that the disease originated prior to his enlistment. Among other things, I have secured a statement from Sarver's commanding officer, A. F. Millan, first lieutenant Company G, Second West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, stating that when Sarver entered the service he appeared to be physically sound. Sarver left a wife and three small children, who have been in such destitute circumstances as to require charitable assistance. Indeed, so desperate is her case that friends have requested me not to inform her in the event of an unfavorable issue with reference to her pension act.

I have done a great deal of work and corresponding in this case and I trust that it will receive favorable action.

I would also appreciate consideration of the other bills mentioned in the list to which I refer.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

Mr. KOPP. We are not responsible for the action of the subcommittee. The gentleman must realize that each subcommittee has several hundred bills pending before it, and each member of the subcommittee can not have written up all the bills intrusted to him. No doubt the Member referred to by the gentleman from Colorado has a good reason to assign for the delay in reporting that bill. I have not been able to report out 10 per cent of the bills that have been referred to me, covering the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, although I have made an earnest effort to get out as many as possible, and I have no doubt the Member of the subcommittee in question has made that same effort.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Speaker laid before the House the bill (H. R. 30886) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of certain soldiers and sailors, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The Speaker also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 31161) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The Speaker also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 30135) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SULLOWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the several bills in order for to-day were passed was laid on the table.

SALE OF LAND TO FORT SMITH, ARK.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 10348) entitled "A bill to cede and sell to the city of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, a municipal corporation, a portion of a tract of ground adjoining the national cemetery in said city of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas," etc.

The clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and hereby is, authorized and directed, upon the payment by the city of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, a municipal corporation, of such sum as he may determine to be the reasonable value of the premises, to convey to said city the following-described portion of the National Cemetery Reserve in the city of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, to wit: Beginning at a stone which is set approximately at the center of South Sixth Street and at the extreme northeast corner of the National Cemetery Reserve in the city of Fort Smith, State of Arkansas, for a point of beginning; thence in a westerly direction and along the line of said reserve 157.2 feet to a point; thence in a southeasterly direction 207.6 feet, more or less, to a point in the east line of said cemetery reserve and in the west line of South Sixth Street; thence in a northerly direction and along the line of said cemetery reserve for a distance of 145.5 feet to the point of beginning.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill do pass.

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

A similar bill, H. R. 31823, was laid upon the table.

THOMAS HOYNE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House, House joint resolution 209, for the relief of Thomas Hoyne, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill H. R. 27144, a similar bill, was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS THE COLORADO RIVER.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 32479 be transferred from that committee to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the following bill be transferred from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Indian Affairs. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 32479) to authorize the maintenance and operation of a diversion dam across the Colorado River, and for other purposes.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EVAN M. JOHNSON.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] offers the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 59), which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 14729) for the relief of Capt. Evan M. Johnson, United States Army, the enrolling clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to strike out of line 10 of the engrossed bill the words "March 24, 1902," and insert in lieu thereof the words "May 16, 1899," the latter being the date of the sinking of the transport Meade, mentioned in the bill in question.

The SPEAKER. The bill does not seem to be here.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. I understood it had passed the Senate and was over here for the purpose of enrollment; possibly it has not been enrolled yet.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object until I understand what the purpose is.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It is just to correct an irregular date. In passing the bill between the House and Senate there was a mistake made in the date of the sinking of the vessel. The bill has passed the House and Senate unanimously, and it is just to correct the record, by having the enrolling clerk insert one date instead of the other.

Mr. SULZER. Is this a joint resolution?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. SULZER. It ought to be a joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What was the bill?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. The bill is for the relief of a man named Johnson.

Mr. MANN. How did it pass the House?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. It passed unanimously.

Mr. MANN. What date was in the bill when it passed the House?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. The bill will show it exactly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says the date was changed in transmission from one House to the other, and I want to know.

The SPEAKER. The situation seems to be this, as far as the Chair can judge without having the original bill, that the original bill gives the date of sinking the transport *Meade* in the harbor of Ponce as March 24, 1902. The concurrent resolution is to authorize the enrolling clerk of the House to change that date to May 16, 1899, that being the date of the sinking of the transport *Meade* mentioned in the bill in question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is the change merely for the purpose of identifying the time and place?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. That is all.

Mr. MANN. The error was in drafting the bill?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And not in transmitting it between the two Houses?

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. No, sir.

Mr. MANN. That is quite a different thing.

The question was taken, and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SMITH of Texas, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for the day on account of sickness.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (H. Doc. No. 1375), which was read and referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

On the 2d of February, 1910, I submitted to Congress "a system of uniform and common international regulations for the protection and preservation of the food fishes in international-boundary waters of the United States and Canada," in order that due legislative action on the part of the Government of the United States may be taken, as stipulated in article 3 of the convention of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain on the subject. The attention of Congress was again called to the subject in my annual message of December 6 last.

I now transmit a report from the American member of the International Fisheries Commission, furnishing further information in explanation of the value of the regulations and as to certain modifications which have been proposed, and showing the importance of early action by Congress. He calls attention to the fact that the fisheries embraced in the regulations are among the most important in the world, and that they can be adequately protected only by the joint action of the two Governments. I can not too strongly urge upon Congress the importance of taking prompt action to put into operation the conservation measures provided in the regulations and to which this Government is pledged by treaty stipulation.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1911.*

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the matter referred to in the President's message, in which he states reference was made to a former special message, is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. In view of that fact, by unanimous consent, the reference will be changed from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 31596).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GAINES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the bill was last before the committee a point of order was pending, reserved by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, since the last meeting of the committee I have conferred with the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Agriculture and have come to the conclusion that it would be impracticable to adopt the same character of amendment that was carried in the naval appropriation act of last year, which authorized the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims up to an amount of $500 and make report thereof to Congress. So far as I am concerned, I withdraw the point of order and offer an amendment which will require the Secretary of Agriculture to make an annual report to Congress of the amounts that may be refunded hereunder.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I am with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order withdrawn?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after the semicolon, in line 4, page 48: "and the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annually reports to Congress of the amounts refunded hereunder."

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman was going to limit the amount to be paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I stated that after investigating this matter—I do not wish to take any advantage of the gentleman's reservation—I found it was entirely impracticable to apply the same condition to the Agricultural Department as that which we applied to the Navy Department and which we have also extended to the Department of Commerce and Labor. Instances have been called to my attention by the chairman of the committee wherein there may be amounts that would require the refunding of thousands of dollars, that would occasion great embarrassment in the administration of the forest reserves. I think in the administration of this branch of the service we must allow a large discretion in the Secretary of Agriculture, and that we safeguard the interests of the Government by making him report annually the transactions under this provision.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. This provision will only be good for one year in this bill, would it not? That does not make it law.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is merely appropriation law. That would be subject, I think, to a point of order in a succeeding appropriation bill, if it was sought to raise the point of order then.

Mr. LEVER. Let me suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the committee make a statement in respect to this matter.

Mr. MANN. This makes permanent law, I will say to the gentleman, in my judgment.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Then I shall object to permanent law. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of that. I would have to reserve the point of order to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked the gentleman from Illinois whether the point of order had been withdrawn, and was informed that the point of order had been withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes; it was with the understanding, as I understood, that there was to be a limitation of the amount to be paid in any one case.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I will agree with the Chairman, but the gentleman does not desire to take any advantage of the matter.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think I can make a statement that will satisfy the gentleman from Illinois, simply citing a specific instance to bear out the general observation made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. There are pending now in the Forest Service two timber sales in each of which a deposit of $25,000 has been required. That money has gone into the Treasury. It would still be within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to cancel all that may have been done looking to the carrying out of these contracts, and if he should do that it certainly would seem as if the firms who have advanced these large sums of money ought to have them refunded without going to the Court of Claims.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is covered by existing law, is it not, as to deposits?

Mr. SCOTT. It has been held by the comptroller that it was not. I will read to the gentleman a decision of the comptroller——

Mr. MANN. If it does not, then this does not do it.

Mr. SCOTT. Which the solicitor of the department cites as a reason for asking for this provision to be inserted. The comptroller, under date of December 28, 1910, rendered a decision, which is as follows:

Money collected for a supposed timber trespass on an unprotected homestead entered prior to the inclusion of the lands in a national forest, but afterwards found to have been lawfully cut thereon, can not be refunded under the act of March 4, 1897, if the timber so cut is not the product of the national forest.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but the gentleman stated that they wanted to be able to refund money which had been deposited. That is covered by existing law, or at least this section says so. Here is what the paragraph reads:

Provided further, That so much of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending, June 30, 1908," approved March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. L., pp. 1256, 1270), which provides for refunds by the Secretary of Agriculture to depositors of moneys to secure the purchase price of timber or the use of lands or resources of the national forests such sums as may be found to be in excess of the amounts found actually due the United States, be, and is hereby, amended, etc.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. But in relation to the latter part of the paragraph the statement which the Forester supplies to me is this:

It happens occasionally that on account of defective surveys the area upon which timber is marked for sale includes land which is afterwards found to be in private ownership. This was the case in the sale made to J. H. Hamblin & Sons Co., of Little Rock, Ark., for timber in the Arkansas National Forest, of which an amount valued at $79.70 was cut from the lands of J. D. Henderson. The comptroller held that under existing law the money could be refunded to neither of the parties.

It is to cover a case of that kind that we are asking this legislation.

Mr. MANN. That is not a case of a deposit.

Mr. SCOTT. No; it is not a case of a deposit; it is a case of erroneous payment.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], under the amendment which requires the amount of these refunds to be reported to Congress, so we are notified of the amount and the nature, if further legislation be necessary that there is an ample provision for the protection of the Government.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Kansas give me the information as to the total amount of money included in these claims?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I endeavored to obtain that information, but I was not able to get it, because most of these claims are on file in the district offices—the six or seven district offices scattered throughout the country. There are on file here in Washington claims amounting altogether to $143.95. These range in amount from $2 to $47.

Mr. LEVER. That about answers what I was going to ask and that was, if there is any information as to the largest amount of any one claim.

Mr. SCOTT. I notice here another amount of $52.25, which is the largest amount in the statement given to me, but I was informed there might be a larger amount even than $500 occasionally collected by mistake. But whatever the amount, it would seem it ought to be refunded. It ought to be refunded all the more if it was a large amount than if it were a small amount.

Mr. MANN. If we collect this money erroneously, we ought to pay it back and then be informed of that fact.

Mr. SCOTT. I will be glad if the gentleman will withdraw the point of order, and when the report is made it will be easy, then, for the next Congress to make any change that experience may show to be wise.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, in reporting back to Congress, if this goes into the permanent law it would require an act of Congress to get rid of it.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. And you might have some difficulty about getting rid of it.

Mr. MANN. If there was shown to be an abuse there would not be any trouble about getting rid of it.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 10 per cent of the total of all sums appropriated under "General expenses, Forest Service," and under "Improvement of the national forests," may be used in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture as provided above under "General expenses, Forest Service," and under "Improvement of the national forests," for all expenses necessary for the general administration of the Forest Service.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, my attention was diverted for the moment and I did not notice the Clerk had read the paragraph with the subhead of "Improvement of the national forests." I would like to offer the following amendment, simply to correct the form of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, page 48, after the word "forests," strike out "there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $490,000, to be expended as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct," and insert, in line 15, page 48, after the word

"forests," the following: "four hundred and ninety thousand dollars," so that the paragraph will read:

"For the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, telephone lines, cabins, fences, and other permanent improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests, $490,000."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I notice there is almost a doubling of appropriation of this item than was carried last year. Is the chairman of the committee able to inform the committee as to the reason for this large increase for this special service?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation last year carried $275,000 for the improvement of the forests. There is an increase recommended this year of $215,000, and the committee felt justified in making that recommendation on account of the very obvious need of improving the forests just as rapidly as possible. There are detailed estimates on file with the committee aggregating $8,000,000 for such improvements in the forests as the Forester believes ought to be made in order to afford adequate fire protection—for the construction of trails, the making of fire lanes, the building of telephone connections, and things of that sort. The Committee on Agriculture feels that, considering the large sum that has been estimated for for this object, it is not extravagant to spend in the neighborhood of half a million dollars in one year, because we believe the expenditure will very much more than pay for itself in the enlarged opportunity which the improvements will afford for the better protection of the forests.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I understand that, in order to carry out the recommendations of the department, it will require an appropriation of over $8,000,000 and that you have recommended the appropriation of but one-twentieth of that amount in this bills.

Mr. SCOTT. That is the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the committee approving a plan to carry out the recommendation of the department that will involve an expenditure of $8,000,000?

Mr. SCOTT. There has been appropriated for the improvement of the forests sums ranging from $275,000 to $600,000 each year for a number of years. The committee is acting upon the theory that the forests should be improved just as rapidly as the work of improvement can be economically done. We do not believe that $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 could be economically expended in one year, but we do believe that half a million dollars can be judiciously expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the proposition as it has been before the committee in prior years, involving the expenditure of millions of dollars, as suggested by the gentleman, been asked for this year in the estimates?

Mr. SCOTT. I did not mean to convey the impression that the estimates this year had asked for $8,000,000, to be all appropriated and expended in the coming fiscal year. I intended to say that estimates had been made, or plans had been presented to the committee, outside of the Book of Estimates, showing that in the aggregate there would be required something like $8,000,000 to improve the forests to the extent that the Forester thinks they should be improved in order to be perfectly protected.

Mr. STAFFORD. Have not the plans of prior years, as submitted to the committee by the Forester, involved an expenditure of millions of dollars, as has been submitted this year?

Mr. SCOTT. There was one year when the Forester came before the committee and asked for an appropriation of $2,000,000, to be available for expenditure in a single year in the improvement of the forests. The committee's recommendation for that year was $500,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, then, from the gentleman's remarks, there is no abatement in the policy for the protection of our national forests, but, in fact, there has been an elaboration of the plan to protect them.

Mr. SCOTT. There is certainly no abatement of the policy. It is well understood that in order to have these forests properly safeguarded against fire it is necessary to construct trails and fire lines and telephone connections, and the committees believe that ought to be done just as rapidly as it can be done, with a reasonable annual expenditure.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has the floor.

Mr. BOOHER. Do I understand that this bureau will be self-sustaining in the near future?

Mr. SCOTT. That subject had not come into the discussion, and I have made no statement in regard to it.

Mr. BOOHER. I understood the chairman to say something about this extra appropriation, to the effect that it would result in making the Bureau of Forestry self-sustaining.

Mr. SCOTT. The statement I made was that it would promote the protection of the forests, and make it easier to guard them against fire. I have made no statement as to the time when we might look to see the forests self-supporting. I may say, however, that the income from the forests this year will amount to something like $2,000,000; so that they are now about 50 per cent self-supporting. It will be some years, I think, before they can be expected to support themselves.

Mr. BOOHER. I suppose the chairman of the committee is aware of the fact that during the Fifty-ninth Congress, in the Littlefield investigation, the Chief Forester said that in three years from that time the Forestry Bureau would be self-sustaining, and at that time the total appropriation was only $1,000,000. This bill carries over $5,000,000.

Mr. SCOTT. I remember very well the statement to which the gentleman refers, and I think, without doubt, if the forests had been exploited, if the policy of selling the timber that was most accessible, as fast as possible, had been pursued, the forests would by this time have been self-supporting.

Mr. BOOHER. When was the policy of selling this waste material discontinued?

Mr. SCOTT. The policy was changed some two or three years ago, it being the judgment of the Forester, having, I suppose, of course, the support of the Secretary of Agriculture, that it would not be a wise conservation of a great natural resource to sell off the timber which was easily available and leave unsold that which was less accessible; and the policy was then entered upon of gradually improving the forests, so that the various sections of the country could be supplied from the forests most convenient to those sections.

Mr. BOOHER. At the time of the Littlefield investigation the Chief Forester testified that the receipts of the Forest Service at that time were about $600,000, and the expenditures $1,000,000 for that year. Now the receipts are something over $2,000,000 and the expenditures over $5,000,000, so that the expenditures have increased a great deal more largely than the receipts.

Mr. SCOTT. It is explained by the fact that a great deal of work is being done now in the forests that was not being done then, by the fact that a great many uses are being made of the forests which were not being made then, and by the fact that the forests have been greatly extended.

The gentleman knows, doubtless, that the more the country is settled up and the more that homesteaders locate within the forests or in the neighborhood of the forests, the greater is the demand upon the forest force.

Mr. BOOHER. Then, the receipts should be so much greater.

Mr. SCOTT. That would not necessarily follow, because a very large proportion of the timber used by homesteaders is granted to them free of cost.

Mr. BOOHER. That certainly would not add to the cost of maintaining them.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; it would add to the cost of maintaining them, for the reason that just as careful supervision is required, if not, indeed, a more careful supervision, over the man who is using timber without cost than over a man who is using timber that has been bought.

Mr. LAMB. And for the further fact that millions of acres of land have been converted into the forest reserves since that time.

Mr. SCOTT. What the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] says is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. I ask unanimous consent that it be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT. At the time to which the gentleman refers I think the area of the forests was perhaps about 100,000,000 acres. It is now about 190,000,000.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it true that as you add to the forest reservation the expense becomes so much greater than the receipts all the time, increasing by a much larger per cent?

Mr. SCOTT. It will be true to a certain extent.

Mr. BOOHER. Then what is the average of increase, if the expense increases at a greater per cent than the receipts?

Mr. SCOTT. I think I might say to the gentleman that the philosophy of the forest policy, as I understand it, is to conserve the forests primarily, and not primarily to go into the timber business; and it follows, therefore, necessarily, that if we want to conserve the forests we must extend their boundaries to include all the forests that belong to the Nation.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it the gentleman's idea of the conservation theory that the longer it is continued the greater the expense will be?

Mr. SCOTT. No; that does not follow at all. In fact, the longer it is continued in proportion the less the expense will be.

Mr. BOOHER. The expense has not decreased during the last five years.

Mr. SCOTT. Because we have been extending the borders of the forest reserve, but we have now taken in practically all the land that will ever be so designated. From this time on, it seems to me, the receipts from the forests ought gradually to overtake the expenditures.

Mr. BOOHER. I hope that is true. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a part of the testimony taken before the Committee on Expenditures in the Agricultural Department—the testimony of Chief Forester Pinchot.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOUTELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the matter referred to:

Appropriations for Forest Service for the following years, ending June 30: 1907, $1,000,000; 1908, $2,400,000; 1909, $3,296,000; 1910, $4,646,200; 1911, $5,801,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are all the forest reserves of the Government open to grazing by private individuals, subject to the regulations and control of the Government?

Mr. PINCHOT. Subject to regulation; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Government receive anything for those privileges?

Mr. PINCHOT. It does. Two years ago, for the first time, we announced that a charge would be made for grazing on the public lands in the forest reserves, and we collected the first year $540,000 from that privilege. This coming summer we will get probably $600,000 or more.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a net income to the Government, is it?

Mr. PINCHOT. No; it is not a net income.

The CHAIRMAN. What do we have to expend in order to produce that $600,000 of result?

Mr. PINCHOT. That question requires this answer: When the forest reserves were transferred to the Department of Agriculture the income for the previous fiscal year had been less than $60,000, under the charge of the Land Office, and the expenditures $375,000. The gross appropriation for the two the year of the transfer was $850,140, I think. The income was $767,000 for the first full year we had charge of it, and the net charge upon the Treasury was about $400,000 less than it had been before. In other words, we began at once to make forest reserves pay. At the time of the transfer I agreed that I would never ask Congress for more than a million dollars for running expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean for the whole bureau?

Mr. PINCHOT. For the whole bureau; but I would earn the rest, if they would give me the right to do it. This year I asked for $900,000 instead of the million, and the income for the present fiscal year will amount to about one and one-quarter millions.

The CHAIRMAN. Will it result in making the expenses of your bureau, taking everything into account, about $2,100,000?

Mr. PINCHOT. No; the expenses this year will be about $1,800,000.

The CHAIRMAN. So that you have a margin to the good?

Mr. PINCHOT. We have a margin to the good; and I have promised the Committee on Agriculture that in five years from the transfer the forests will be costing the Government nothing at all.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, your bureau will be self-sustaining?

Mr. PINCHOT. Yes. It has three more years in which to do it.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman in charge of this bill a question. From what source do you get the $2,000,000 and over that is spoken of as the income from the Forestry Bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. In general terms, it comes from the sale of the timber and grazing fees. There are also other special uses from which other receipts come.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. To what other uses does the chairman refer?

Mr. MANN. Water powers and uses of that kind.

Mr. SCOTT. The leased land over which irrigation ditches are carried and water power furnished, and so forth. Let me say that during the fiscal year 1910 the receipts were as follows: From sales of timber, $1,043,428.20; grazing, $986,909.38; special uses, $58,910.50. In addition it was estimated that the free use of timber was allowed to the value of $176,166.51.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to say that I have been very much interested in this subject, because in our State, instead of this Forest Service being a benefit to us, it is absolutely an injury, both as respects the grazing privilege, from which some $900,000 is collected—partly from our State and partly from other States that are under this tribute system—but more especially with reference to that part collected at the expense of diminishing our timber supply and the destruction of its usefulness.

Mr. Chairman, one-third of the area of the State I have the honor in part to represent is included in forest reserves. In this connection, I hope you will remember that the original purpose for these withdrawals from the public domain was based upon the idea that in order to conserve the water supply needed for irrigation purposes this was deemed necessary to preserve the forests, they helping to make the best reservoirs for such supply. That fundamental idea and purpose met with the hearty acclaim of the whole semiarid region, but no sooner was the power given and the withdrawals made, than, greatly to our dismay, the opposite of what we expected was soon projected. That a system of espionage was to be inaugurated against the homeseeker on our public domain and the prospector in our mountains against their free and unlimited right, under the law, to pursue their respective vocations, was not expected. And now, since the full developments of the realities contemplated by these "New Nationalists" has dawned upon us, we find none to defend the policy save a few cattle barons and a few manufacturers of lumber. The owners of small herds of cattle, who, in times gone by, were wont to use the ranges, have been driven out, and the home builders are made to pay nearly double the price they formerly had to pay for their lumber.

That is not all. Vast areas of good agricultural land have been inclosed in these reserves, thus withdrawing an opportunity from the homeseeker and, at the same time, imposing upon the present taxpayer a burden he would be proportionately relieved from, could such areas be brought within the taxing power of the State.

The man who wants a home, who perhaps has spent the most of his days upon the farm, acquainted with soils, a long resident of the West, knowing the adaptability at different altitudes for a given kind of crop, and willing to take his chances, is met with a denial of his right by some youngster just from the city, or college life, and is curtly informed the land is not suitable for agricultural pursuits. The judgment of the dilettante prevails, and the homeseeker is told as the sweep was, in one of Dickens's novels, to "move on."

Again, when the old grizzled prospector, with his years upon years of experience in reading the language of rocks, has but unloaded his patient and faithful burro, pitched his tent, spread his shakedown, and shouldered his pick, then comes around another of these youngsters, who, in terse and peremptory language, tells him that he is not in a mineral zone and, therefore, he must move on. If the old prospector has been so unfortunate as to have escaped discovery until he has spent much time, labor, and money, and has, in his judgment, just reached the cap-rock of his pursuit, and is then discovered, nevertheless, he is told to move on. And so it is with reference to every endeavor of those undertaking to follow others whose pluck and energy opened up to the world the secret sources of wealth in the West with freedom, and without hindrance—they are met upon the threshold of a new undertaking by the order to move on.

The laws with reference to obtaining title to agricultural land, as well as mineral, by this new policy of which we complain, are made to bend by exasperating rules and regulations in the hands of these regulators, corresponding to their peculiar whims, prejudices, and incompetence.

The prospect for the one seeking a home of finding one, and the other to prospect as he would for the discovery of a mine, is so discouraging that increased population of our State and the future of our mining resources is brought to a standstill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill brings the yearly demand for millions of dollars for the support of the Forestry Bureau. Year after year, we find an increased demand. This appropriation asks for $5,500,000 and over. Last year we appropriated $5,000,000 for this same service. We have, therefore, an increased demand over last year of $500,000, and, as appears from the colloquy between the chairman and myself, the Government receipts for the sale of timber from these forest reserves in 1910 were $1,043,428.20, and from grazing privileges $986,909.38, and $58,910.50 from rentals of rights of way, water-power sites, and so forth. I do not, of course, include the item of $176,166.51, allowed for the free use of lumber, nor do I see how such item could in any way be regarded as a proper charge. Therefore we have the account as follows: Five million dollars spent last year, and $2,124,808.08 received, at an expense to the Government of $2,908,751.92, less 25 per cent to the States and Territories for roads and school purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I venture to say I voice the sentiment of 99 per cent of the citizens of those States and Territories exploited by this policy in saying we have received no corresponding benefit from the operation of this bureau, and if the objector or the credulous asks "Why," I should be led to say that outside of the pecuniary loss to us—of which I shall speak later—we are justified in criticizing the Government for engaging in a commercial business at all, because it is un-American and un-Republican, as well as unconstitutional. Further, we feel resentful, because such acts upon the part of the Government is a discrimination against us never exercised toward our sister Commonwealths in the upbuilding of their statehoods. History shows that the timber supply, grazing privileges, coal lands, and water-power sites of these sister Commonwealths were never capitalized for Government revenues, hence the unjustified discrimination against the West.

But, more than that, Mr. Chairman, and aside from the moral and ethical phase, and aside from the economic side of the question, as shown by the receipts and expenses of the bureau, there is another view which challenges the wisdom of the policy. We not only need our forests to conserve the rainfall, and that very badly, but we need the lumber that may be spared, and that very badly, for our own building purposes. Under the present system our watersheds are shorn of their power to store water, the timber felled that ought to stand for still other purposes, and there is transferred from us 75 per cent of its value to the National Treasury. Along with this 75 per cent goes also 75 per cent of our grazing privileges. And when there is added to this through culling out of some partly matured trees, a loss of from a dozen up of young trees, killed by the felling of one of those isolated giants, there may be a better appreciation of the injury we sustain. Coupled with this, we may add that the axman does not realize that our trees only grow 90 days in the year, and only six hours a day over that period, and, therefore, none are matured, and hence a further wanton and unnecessary destruction of our forests and consequent loss to us. Besides that, under this bill the Government is allowed to sell, not only to a trust, but is allowed to sell to a trust authorized to ship the product from our State, though we have been for years importers of lumber for house building.

Mr. Chairman, I will not ask the indulgence of the Chair, nor impose upon the House the history and evolution of the laws and rights of the occupants of our public domain. I will, however, say briefly that whilst this history shows there was a time in the early days that the Government sought to utilize the natural resources for governmental purposes, it only lasted during the time when the original 13 States owned the whole of the public domain westward, but not since the Louisiana purchase in 1803 has the Government invaded the rights of home builders.

It is well known that the Free Soil Party, formed in 1850, established the status of the American citizen to acquire, free of cost, a home on his own soil. Following this movement, we find perfected the rights as now defined by law—the acquirement by citizens of homes on the public domain. Side by side we find the public mineral domain open for exploration and ownership, and their well-defined rights have never been challenged nor interfered with until the introduction of the "red tape" and exasperating regulations inaugurated by the heads of the Forestry Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, it was by a chance glance of an early pioneer in that western country, pursued by an Indian, tomahawk and scalping knife in hand, whilst in hiding by the side of a rivulet, he discovered a gleam in the sand, so different in color that it led him to pick it up with his trembling hand, which finally led to the discovery of the gold fields of California. Thenceforward the stream of migration has been westward. That migratory movement has been more or less attended with dangers, privations, and disappointments; yet the pluck, energy, and perseverance of the early pioneers and their descendants have builded empire upon empire there, and the country they invaded, conquered, and reclaimed has contributed millions to our wealth in gold and silver, and is destined to be the granary of the world, adding year after year to the population, wealth, and substance of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, directly traceable to the shortsighted policy concerning the administration of the natural resources of Colorado I wish to give an illustration:

The census figures show that in 17 of the mining counties of the State where the greatest number of acres of forest reserves are located they lost in population nearly 33,000 in 10 years. I challenge all experts in calculation to find a greater loss, according to popuation, in any section of the Union, and I hold that the loss is due solely to this Forestry Bureau and its administration of the Forest Service.

We Congressmen from the West ask our colleagues from the South, North, and East to consider calmly our demand, and we hope future legislation will be measured out to us upon the principle of the Golden Rule—

As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye so unto them.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 5 clerks, class 4; 6 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, $1,440; 12 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,300; 18 clerks, class 1; 13 clerks, at $1,020 each; 11 clerks, at $1,000 each; 18 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk, $720; 1 property clerk, $1,600; 1 assistant property custodian, $900; 1 chief food and drug inspector, $2,760; 1 food and drug inspector, $2,250; 6 food and drug inspectors, at $2,000 each; 13 food and drug inspectors, at $1,800 each; 1 food and drug inspector, $1,620; 11 food and drug inspectors, at $1,600 each; 8 food and drug inspectors, at $1,400 each; 1 laboratory helper, $1,020; 4 laboratory helpers, at $1,000 each; 4 laboratory helpers, at $960 each; 2 laboratory helpers, at $900 each; 6 laboratory helpers, at $840 each; 2 laboratory helpers, at $780 each; 17 laboratory helpers, at $720 each; 2 laboratory helpers, at $660 each; 19 laboratory helpers or laborers, at $600 each; 1 laboratory assistant, $1,200; 1 tool maker, $1,200; 1 janitor, $1,020; 1 student assistant, $300; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 1 skilled laborer, $900; 2 skilled laborers, at $720 each; 1 skilled laborer, $600; 4 messengers or laborers, at $600 each; 2 messenger boys or laborers, at $540 each; 8 messenger boys or laborers, at $480 each; 3 messenger boys or laborers, at $420 each; 1 messenger or laborer, $360; 6 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $242,190.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language to be found beginning in line 3 on page 49, "one chief clerk, $2,000." The present salary is $1,800. I make the point of order as against the increase of $200.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment to restore the original salary to $1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, lines 3 and 4, after the semicolon, insert "one chief clerk, $1,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the food and drugs act: For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, rent, gas, electric current, official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, and all other expenses, employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as may be considered necessary for the purposes named, $610,110.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this paragraph for the purpose of making an inquiry. I notice this paragraph uses this language for the purpose of carrying out the law, and so forth—

In the city of Washington and elsewhere.

It then goes on and provides for an appropriation for expenses, and so forth, and the employment of such assistant clerks and other persons as is considered necessary for the purpose named, and appropriates $610,110. I want to inquire what this word "elsewhere" means, and if that is not new legislation. I reserve the point of order on the paragraph, and especially upon the word "elsewhere."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the language to which the gentleman calls attention is not new legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman means by that that it has been carried in appropriation bills heretofore?

Mr. SCOTT. It has been carried in appropriation bills heretofore, and the necessity for it arises from the fact that in the enforcement of the pure-food law it is necessary to send inspectors all over the country and to maintain chemical laboratories in various large cities in the country. On that account it is essential that the word "elsewhere" should appear in this paragraph.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that it has ever been ruled by a Chairman presiding in Committee of the Whole that even the Agricultural Department, where not specially authorized by acts, could provide for officers outside of the city of Washington. It has been uniformly held that the departments, under the Revised Statutes establishing various departments, and providing for their various duties, and giving them various authorities, might create offices and expend money in the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, but that when you undertake to provide that a head of a department should expend money by the appointment of employees or officers outside of the District of Columbia, there would have to be some specific authorization of law for it other than in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. The Department of Agriculture is specifically charged with the enforcement of the pure food and drug act.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I understand that.

Mr. SCOTT. Does not the gentleman believe that in view of the legislation which imposes upon the Secretary of Agriculture this duty he would be warranted in expending money outside the city of Washington if it were necessary in order to enforce the act?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I do know under the rulings that have been made. I do not know that I am going to make the point of order, but I wanted to call the attention of the House and the Chair to this provision. I know how important it is that this act should be enforced. I do not agree with the policy of it in all particulars. If we could have it administered as it should be administered, it would be of great service to the people, and has been a great service to the people, I will state that. Until the questions that have been raised in the courts have been decided I do not want to hamper or hinder the proper enforcement of this law, but what I object to, what I want to direct the attention of the committee and the country to, is the unlimited discretion, the unlimited power, that is sought to be given in this bill to the Secretary of Agriculture to spend money upon anything, whether it relates to the enforcement of the pure-food law or any other law. There is no suggestion in the bill, no effort anywhere to say how many places he shall create, how many employees he shall employ, and what salary he shall pay, and there is no restriction or limitation whatever in this bill upon the Bureau of Chemistry or the Secretary of Agriculture as to the amount he shall pay any particular person or the money he shall spend for any particular object. He is given carte blanche to spend $610,110 as he pleases without any effort to say what the salary shall be of the man in any particular case. I think it is subject to a point of order. I am not going to discuss that.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my friend yield for one more question?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Of course.

Mr. SCOTT. The language by which the Department of Agriculture is charged with the duty of enforcing the meat-inspection act is practically the same as that in which it is charged with the enforcement of the pure-food law. Does not my friend believe that an appropriation bill may properly carry language which allows the Secretary to employ meat inspectors in Chicago, Kansas City, and other places?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Well, I understand the bill provides for so many inspectors.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. It ought to if it does not.

Mr. SCOTT. But it does not.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. It ought to whether it does or not.

Mr. SCOTT. It leaves it discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. It ought to provide for a specified number and ought not to leave unlimited the number that may be employed and the amount of salaries which can be paid unlimited in amount.

Now, I merely want to enter a protest against this manner of legislation. I want to suggest that this bill, which in a great measure does great benefit to a large number of our farmers throughout the country—and I do not want to suggest that I want to attack it in any way—but there is, however, in my judgment, under the guise—I will not use that word in any offensive sense—I will say, under an effort to expend money in the interest of agriculture, too much discretion given to the department. There is too much money provided, and the expenditure of that money is by officials who have the discretion of saying what shall be done with the money and what salaries people shall receive. Now, after pointing out under the statute in what the other departments are required to do, to appoint such clerks, such employees, or such officials to discharge their duties in those departments in Washington, that would be a compliance with the law, but when the Agriculture Department was created and when the various other departments were created, their duties were specifically stated and their powers specifically limited, and I hope in the near future, when the Members of Congress shall assemble to enact the next agricultural bill and to enact the other appropriation bills, the men who have been chosen by the people to represent them will be more careful than have those in this bill and in some other appropriation bills, and let the people understand for what purposes and for what offices their money is being expended and what salaries are being paid.

I say this mode of legislation is contrary to our rule, and that the Department of Agriculture or any other department should not be given carte blanche to appoint all the officials and employees it sees fit and even undertake to fix what the salaries shall be, whether $1,000, $1,200, $1,500, $2,000, or even $5,000. It has a tendency to create favoritism in the appointment of officials; it has the tendency to overestimate the qualifications of men for the duties which they are called on to perform; it has a tendency to put off the day when other employees and clerks in the service of this Government in the city of Washington may have their salaries justly increased. For that purpose I have reserved the point of order, but I do not desire to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in reply to my friend from Georgia that the Committee on Agriculture have been doing just exactly what he would expect them to do, from the remarks which have fallen from his lips. Now, if you will turn to the Book of Estimates, you will find out that the Agricultural Committee had before them a list of these expenses in Washington and elsewhere. For instance, under the food and drugs act, in Washington there was an estimate of $182,770. Then the food and drug act salaries out of Washington and elsewhere is defined in this language. Then that follows on with a bill of particulars, I might say, and sums up $221,246, thus accounting for nearly the whole amount in this paragraph.

Mr. BOOHER. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia a question?

Mr. LAMB. Yes, sir; certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. Does this bill in any place give the number of veterinarians employed in any of the stock yards, or the number of meat inspectors?

Mr. LAMB. The bill does not, but the annual reports from the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture do give the numbers of those officers. My friend from Missouri can find out all that information at any time he desires by going down and getting that document.

Mr. BOOHER. I know; but in every other department we appropriate for so many clerks and employees specifically, while in this bill it is left almost entirely in the discretion of the department to fix the number and salaries of the employees.

Mr. LAMB. Yes; but the gentleman must have faith and confidence in somebody. Somebody has got to be responsible, and in the administration of this food and drug act, which spreads all over the country, we are compelled to vest discretion in somebody to administer this money.

Mr. BOOHER. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to the expenditures of the so-called referee board? Does he think those expenditures are right?

Mr. LAMB. Yes; $28,088 is the amount that was expended for the year.

Mr. BOOHER. From the 1st day of March, 1908, to December 31, 1909, Dr. Russel H. Chittenden's salary was $13,709.66, and his other expenses were $5,769.59. Dr. C. A. Herter's salary was $9,822.13 and his other expenses were $3,518.66. Dr. John H. Long's salary was $15,685.34 and his expenses were $8,473.48.

Mr. LAMB. What is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. BOOHER. I am reading from the testimony of Mr. Zappone, the disbursing clerk of the Department of Agriculture. Dr. Ira Remsen's salary was $11,631.36 and his expenses——

Mr. LAMB. My friend from Missouri is making a speech and taking my time.

Mr. BOOHER. No. If the gentleman will allow me, I was just calling the attention of the gentleman to this subject and asking him if he approved of this expenditure.

Mr. LAMB. Does the gentleman from Missouri comprehend the wide scope of this board of review, and does he know what splendid talent is required in those positions?

Mr. BOOHER. Yes; I will say to the gentleman, I know. Dr. Ira Remsen's salary was $11,631.36 and his expenses were $4,030.86.

Mr. LAMB. Those gentlemen cover the whole administration of that service.

Mr. BOOHER. I beg to differ with the gentleman. We have here the salaries and expenses of those gentlemen traveling about the country.

Mr. LAMB. I rose to speak on this paragraph and to answer a question of my friend from Georgia, and now the gentleman from Missouri is occupying my time. The bill that we are discussing is in the hands of an abler man than I, but——

Mr. BOOHER. If the gentleman from Virginia will allow me, I am not complaining about the conduct of the bill by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, but I simply want to call the attention of the House to these expenditures under the referee board.

Mr. COCKS of New York. That is the referee board. We know all about that.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, permit me to ask, Why should there be such a difference in the salaries of these officers, doing the same business and performing the same duties, under the same terms?

Mr. LAMB. For the same reason that there is a difference between your salary and the salary of one of these clerks at $2,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my colleague from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] allow me to answer the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LAMB] has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that he may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not want the committee to get the impression from what has just been read by the gentleman from Missouri that the salaries of $11,000 and $15,000, and other large sums, are paid to one individual man. The amounts there named are paid to the men whose names are given in connection with them for the total cost of maintaining the laboratories which they are conducting in carrying out the work of the department, and if the gentleman will look into the matter a little more carefully he will find out that the sum actually received by the individuals whom he has named is a very modest sum, indeed.

Mr. BOOHER. Here is the proposition: Why should one of these men receive $15,000 in salary for a certain period of time and another receive $9,000?

Mr. SCOTT. I can not allow the gentleman to state that this person receives $15,000 in salary. The $15,000 covers an allotment with which the scientist to whom it is paid is to carry on the expense of the laboratory in which he is to make certain investigations for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. He may carry a dozen clerks.

Mr. SCOTT. He may carry a dozen clerks, and does carry two or three skilled chemists, and pays them a large part of that sum.

Mr. BOOHER. Why is it carried on the books of the department under the head of "Salaries?"

Mr. SCOTT. It is not so carried.

Mr. BOOHER. It is; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. SCOTT. On the books of the department the gentleman will find, if he investigates, the sum has been lumped by Mr. Zappone in the testimony he is quoting.

Mr. BOOHER. The Committee on Investigation of Expenditures in the Agricultural Department investigated this very thing, and we elicited from the bureau the thing I am stating, that under the head "Salaries" they carried this amount to Dr. Long of $15,500.

Mr. SCOTT. Did the gentleman get an impression that $15,000 was paid to Dr. Long as his compensation?

Mr. BOOHER. I most certainly did.

Mr. SCOTT. Then he has got an erroneous impression. The sum was paid to Dr. Long for the entire cost of maintaining the laboratory which he conducts to carry on these investigations and a great many other expenses.

Mr. BOOHER. I insist that the expenses the chairman speaks about come under the head of "Other expenses" and not under the head of "Salaries."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to my friend from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who has, no doubt, the detailed estimate before him.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will yield to me, I will read:

Referee board.

Five consulting scientific experts, at $2,000 each	$10,000
One expert	3,500
Three experts, at $200 per month each	7,200
Two experts, at $150 per month each	3,600
One expert, at $1 per hour (estimated amount)	1,800
One expert, at $50 per month	600
One collaborating stenographer, at $25 per month	300
Total	27,000

Mr. BOOHER. Now, that is exactly the "Other expenses," and here is this extra help paid for under the head of "Other expenses," exactly as I have it, and it does not cover any part of the salaries. Under the head of "Salaries" is carried the salaries of the members of the referee board.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOHER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I was not in sympathy with that board or the creation of it——

Mr. LEVER. Neither was I.

Mr. MANN (continuing). But in justice to the facts it is proper to say that these were investigations carried on in a chemical laboratory and in a laboratory under the control of Dr. Long, where he was at great expense; and those consulting scientists received a salary of $2,000 each.

Mr. BOOHER. That is set out here under the head of "Other expenses," that the gentleman from South Carolina read. We have the same list of "Other expenses" here.

Mr. LEVER. Except that your list refers to two years ago and mine refers to the past year.

Mr. BOOHER. It carries the same thing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the amount which the gentleman read was not an individual salary to Dr. Long, but was to cover the expense of his laboratory in doing this work, which involves the payment of a number of experts.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask what the salary of Dr. Long is, in fact?

Mr. MANN. Two thousand dollars.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] allow me to make this statement?

Mr. BOOHER. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. The entire cost of the referee board for the fiscal year 1910 was $27,000. Obviously, therefore, the amount spoken of by the gentleman from Missouri could not be paid to each one of these gentlemen as salaries.

Mr. BOOHER. I am going by the sworn testimony of the officials.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am familiar with what my friend from Virginia calls attention to. I have been familiar with the fact for several years that the Secretary of the Treasury has to submit to the Congress an itemized statement of the expenditures and the estimates. I had that book upon my desk, the same as my friend from Virginia had, and which he read from; and because I had that and saw the expenditures that have been made, and the estimates that have been proposed, I call attention to the large increase in this amount.

Now, we have in the last appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture this item:

For all expenses necessary to carry into effect an act known as the pure food and drug act, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemical supplies, etc., $240,000.

And—

For employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as the Secretary may consider necessary for the purpose named, $287,340.

The Committee on Agriculture, in passing its last bill, the bill for the last fiscal year, saw fit to segregate that amount, and saw fit to say how much was to be expended elsewhere and in the city of Washington for the purpose of carrying that out.

They do not do that in this bill. Now, the Secretary in submitting these estimates says:

There is an apparent decrease in the above appropriation of $92,230; but adding the saving in salaries of 137 employees transferred to the statutory roll, amounting to $152,230, there is an actual increase of $60,000. This increase is for paying the expenses of expert witnesses and other expenses in connection with the enforcement of the food and drugs act. This appropriation has been segregated from the appropriation for general expenses, Bureau of Chemistry, and several minor changes made in the wording.

Now, we have in the same Book of Estimates, in relation to the food and drugs act, the number of employees and the salaries paid to each, amounting to $182,770, and for those employed outside of Washington, $259,108.50, so that it all amounts to about $460,000.

Now we are asked—and I apprehend we are going to do it—to pass a bill without anything in the report of the committee, without anything in the bill indicating to this House for what purpose this large increase over last year is made. It is said by my friend from Virginia that in order to inform ourselves about it each Member not upon the Appropriations Committee must go and dig up the information contained in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. LAMB. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not say any such thing.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman held the Book of Estimates in his hand, and said that each one could get the information from it.

Mr. LAMB. I said we would show it. I did not say you could dig it up.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The gentleman said we could find the information in this book. Oh, yes; if all of us were on the Committee on Agriculture, or if we had the time to devote to it, as my friend has, we could go through the pages of this large volume and find it for ourselves; but I humbly and respectfully submit that it might be the duty of the Committee on Agriculture to inform other gentlemen who may not desire to engage in this apparently useless work of finding out where the money is expended, where this increase goes.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not hear the statement the gentleman made, and I wish he would state how much of an increase he figures there is over the current year.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I read from the Book of Estimates.

Mr. SCOTT. I thought the gentleman made a statement as to the amount of the increase.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I undertook to do so. I called attention to the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a note on page 121 of the Book of Estimates.

Mr. SCOTT. I thought the gentleman said there was $200,000 increase.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I said the whole amount paid for the enforcement of the pure food and drugs act amounted to about $460,000, and that here you appropriated some $600,000.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to make this statement to the gentleman: The increase in the appropriation for the enforcement of the pure food and drugs act carried in this bill in excess of the current appropriation is $60,000. The total increase in the entire bureau over the appropriation for the current year is only $68,080.80.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I said that the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, as contained in the Book of Estimates, showed that under this bill there was an appropriation for salaries in Washington, $182,770; and for salaries outside of Washington, $259,108.50. And added together they amounted to about $455,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Probably about $555,000, making a total appropriation of about $60,000 more than last year.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I simply ran the figures up in my mind. I will admit that the gentleman is more accurate, as he probably has the exact figures. I called attention to the fact that there was an evident increase of over $60,000. I did not misquote anybody.

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, not at all. I did not know that the gentleman made the statement.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. My only information is from the Book of Estimates furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury. Now, Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that when we are increasing appropriations by leaps and bounds, increasing them from year to year, running up into thousands of dollars, we ought to know for what this money is expended. I apprehend that there are not 20 Members in this House outside of the Committee on Agriculture that can find the time or occasion to tell for what this large sum of money appropriated is expended. That is all I desire to call the attention of the House to, and to the unwise way of appropriating large sums of money, to be expended in Washington and elsewhere, without any safeguards thrown around it. I do not care who is at the head of a department, or who the official may be, we ought to safeguard and protect the expenditure of the people's money, no matter for what purpose it is expended, and no matter how pure and honest and how faithful the official may be to whom the expenditure is intrusted. It is our business to know where it goes, and to protect it. That is all I desire to say. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," be amended so as to provide that whenever any preparation, such as tincture made from a fresh plant or from any part thereof, or a dilution of either a fresh or dried plant tincture or other drug substance which may be made upon the scale of 1 part of the tincture or solution and 9 parts of menstruum, and which process may be successively repeated by using 1 part of each succeeding dilution and 9 parts of menstruum or a trituration made upon the scale or proportion of 1 part of the substance and 9 parts of milk sugar, and which process may be successively repeated by using 1 part of each succeeding trituration and 9 parts of milk sugar, is not mentioned in the United States Pharmacopœia or the National Formulary and is mentioned in the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States, it shall be judged by the standard contained in the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph.

While I have made the point of order against this provision in the bill, it is not because I object to giving recognition to a Homeopathic Pharmacopœia in the pure-food law. When the pure-food law, otherwise known as the food and drugs act, was prepared, it provided, as a mere matter of convenience, that drugs named in the United States Pharmacopœia should not be required to have any specific statement as to strength or otherwise in connection with the name of the drug if the article conformed to the requirements for the drug so named in the United States Pharmacopœia.

It is evident that we can not successfully enforce a law which has two standards under the same name without any further indication of what is intended. But, as I understand the item in this bill, it obviates that difficulty by proposing that only those drugs which are named in the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia and not named in the United States Pharmacopœia shall conform to the requirements of the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia if the name be given without further indication of the strength or other quality.

I am inclined to think there could be no objection to this provision if there were no controversy as to what Homeopathic Pharmacopœia shall be recognized. There is no controversy in reference to the United States Pharmacopœia. There is but one. But there are two homeopathic pharmacopœias, each claiming to be the correct one.

The paragraph in the bill proposes to recognize the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States, published under the direction of the committee on pharmacopœia of the American Institute of Homeopathy. The first edition of this publication, I think, was issued in 1897, and the second, which, I believe, is the last, was issued in 1901. But there is another homeopathic pharmacopœia, known as the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, th eighth edition of which was issued in 1904 or 1906.

Various bills have been before Congress since the passage of the food and drugs act seeking recognition, by amendment of that act, for the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States, the one referred to in the paragraph in this bill. Those, so far as the House is concerned, have been before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think, also, that one or two bills have been introduced in one of the branches of Congress seeking to recognize the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia.

I am not qualified at present to pass upon the respective merits of these two homeopathic pharmacopœias. But there have been many communications sent to us protesting against the recognition in the law of the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States as against the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia.

In an article in the Hahnemannian Monthly of September, 1908, is an article objecting to recognition of the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States, and various articles have appeared at different times in the Homeopathic Recorder, published at Lancaster, Pa., to the same effect. I have received a large number of letters along the same lines, a few of which I herewith insert.

The following is a letter from the secretary and manager of the Standard Homeopathic Pharmacy, of Los Angeles, Cal.:

STANDARD HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY,
Los Angeles, Cal., December 15, 1908.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, *Washington, D. C.*

RESPECTED SIR: It is my privilege, and I give myself the honor to write you with regard to the recognition of the Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy.

I most respectfully petition that this be denied. The book which is used at present has been used for many, many years, and is entitled and known as the "American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia," and should receive the consideration of the Congress of the United States.

I humbly petition this in the name of and in the spirit of hundreds of physicians along the coast and in California, all of whom, as far as I have been able to ascertain, are opposed to the recognition of the book known as the "Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy."

The recognition of the Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy would work great hardship, not only upon the human subscriber and the business he represents, but it would cause a great deal of trouble, misunderstanding, and inharmony to the profession, and would be the cause of a great deal of monetary loss. I speak from a practical experience of over 20 years in homeopathic pharmacy and its relation to the physician.

In the interest of homeopathy, its followers, and the financial and general moral interest, the undersigned respectfully presents—

THE STANDARD HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY,
WM. A. BROOKS, *Secretary and Manager.*

I concur most heartily.

F. S. BARNARD, M. D., *President.*

Here is a letter from the manager of the Kansas City Homeopathic Pharmacy Co.:

KANSAS CITY HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., December 10, 1908.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois,
Washington, D. C.

RESPECTED SIR: I have the honor to address you upon a subject touching the recognition of a book entitled and known under the name of "Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy."

The undersigned manager of the Kansas City Homeopathic Pharmacy Co., begs to submit for consideration that instead of the above-named book, called "Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy," another book, published by Messrs. Boericke & Tafel, of Philadelphia, Pa., entitled "The American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia," should receive recognition by the Congress of the United States.

The subscriber most respectfully presents this petition, based upon the fact that, in his capacity as manager of the above-named pharmacy, he is supplying and is in contact with thousands of homeopathic physicians in the West; that he has duly solicited and has the expressions of the wants of such physicians, which are that they desire to have the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia recognized as the

official book. This book is now being used and is recognized as the practical, truthful, representative book and the guide for and of the homeopathic profession, and has been so used for many years and is still the recognized guide almost universally employed; any deviation or change from the teachings of this book at this time would very much harm the cause of homeopathy, as well as of the individual physician; therefore the adoption of the Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy would invite inharmony, misunderstanding, great hardship, and untold confusion.

The undersigned also most respectfully calls attention to the fact that applications now before you to recognize the Pharmocopœia American Institute of Homeopathy, supported by so-called supplications obtained in a political routine and rushed through meetings in an obscure way ought to carry very little weight with your honorable committee.

The writer, informing himself further upon the expressions, finds that the large homeopathic establishment in Philadelphia, known under the name of Boericke & Tafel, the largest pharmacy in the East, has the same experience. A similar opinion is obtained from the pharmacy in Louisville, and still another opinion of the same character is obtained from the extensive homeopathic pharmacy in Los Angeles.

Respectfully submitted.

J. C. WISE.

Also a letter from the Southwestern Homeopathic Pharmacy Co., of Louisville, Ky.:

SOUTHWESTERN HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY CO.,
Louisville, Ky., December 14, 1908.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

RESPECTED SIR: I take the liberty to address you with reference to the recognition of a book called "Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy," and I most humbly beg that this request be refused, and that instead of the above-mentioned book the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia be recognized.

The reason for this petition is based upon the requests of many prominent homeopathic physicians whom we supply, and also upon the honest conviction of your humble writer, that the said Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy would create much disorder, hardship, and misunderstanding, both morally and financially.

The writer, in petitioning for the recognition of the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, calls attention to the fact that this book has been for a great many years, and is yet, the accepted guide of formulary of homeopathy throughout the United States, being used by physicians and colleges, and the Pharmacopœia American Institute of Homeopathy is not desired by the fraternity at large, notwithstanding the fact that so-called supports from State associations have, in a political way, been obtained for it.

After making a thorough investigation, your humble petitioner finds that a large majority of other pharmacies have the same experience, and that the desire of the majority of homeopathic physicians is to recognize the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia.

Hoping that this petition may meet your approval,

I am, with much respect, yours, truly,

M. E. HAYDON,
Manager Southwestern Homeopathic Pharmacy Co.

Also a letter from the proprietor of the Washington Homeopathic Pharmacy of this city:

WASHINGTON HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACY,
SUCCESSOR TO BOERICKE & TAFEL,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1908.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your valued communication of the 8th instant to hand, asking for information relative to the standing of the two pharmacopœias pertaining to homeopathy.

I am very glad of the opportunity to submit the following by way of explanation, and I trust that you will comprehend that the matter is of vast importance to the homeopathic pharmacists throughout the country.

The American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia is a compilation of the ideas, formulas, and data as handed down to us by the founder of homeopathy, namely, Samuel Hahnemann, and which the homeopathic pharmacists have used continuously for the past 100 years. Upon this our materia medica is based, upon this our provings have been made and recorded to the satisfaction of every homeopath, not only in this country but the whole world. Again, the above pharmacopœia serves to teach the different strengths of all homeopathic preparations, and which concedes, quite naturally, that the drugs therein should be handled in quite a different manner from the method set forth in the pharmacopœia known as the United States Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, the sole idea of which is to teach us that all of our drugs shall consist of but one strength.

The United States Homeopathic Pharmacopœia consists of ideas originated by a few who would revolutionize the homeopathic world, and by some manner of means succeeded in having the same adopted by the American Institute of Homeopathy, a large body consisting of nearly every homeopathic physician in this country, and it is safe to say there are a very few of them who know anything about pharmacy.

Now, even though the American Institute of Homeopathy did adopt this new publication, think you that the pharmacists conform to the step taken by them? I invite you to take a canvass of the homeopathic pharmacists throughout this country and you will learn that we prefer Hahnemann's ideas, and that we stick to them, and will continue to do so unless Congress passes on the bill offered and known as the Gallinger bill.

The matter simmers down to this: Are we to follow Hahnemann, the founder of homeopathy, or take up the opinion of a seemingly private work?

This subject has been the bone of contention for the past 10 years, and in the opinion of the writer has reached that stage when it is looked upon as a farce, and I beg to assure you that the matter should be dropped and not referred to again until the same can be taken up with the American Institute of Homeopathy, which meets in June, and final disposition is determined upon.

The homeopathic pharmacists of this country have not been acquainted with the object of the Gallinger bill, but I have taken steps to acquaint them of the existence of the same, and it is quite likely that you will receive communications from all of them, the more staid of which will be better able to treat of the subject than the writer.

Yours, very truly,

C. V. DORMAN.

Also a letter from Dr. William O. Cheeseman, homeopathic physician of Chicago:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 29, 1908.*

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, *Washington, D. C.*

FRIEND MANN: I write you to protest against the bill amending the food and drug act, and is numbered H. R. 6089.

This amendment has been introduced through the efforts of Dr. T. H. Carmichael, professor of pharmacology, Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia.

This bill represents only a desire of a small portion of the homeopathic physicians of this country, as about 90 per cent now use by preference the preparations made according to the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, published by Messrs. Boericke & Tafel.

On behalf of the majority of the homeopathic physicians of the United States I urge you to vote against this bill and use your influence to defeat it.

Thanking you in advance for this favor, and with best wishes for yourself, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

WM. O. CHEESEMAN, M. D.

Also two letters from Dr. A. C. Allen, of the Medical Advance, homeopathic publication of Chicago:

THE MEDICAL ADVANCE,
Chicago, Ill., April 27, 1908.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C., *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your esteemed favor of 21st: It has always been considered a fundamental principle in the homeopathic school that the remedy should be prepared in the same way and by the same method as was the drug from which the original provings were made. This has not only been the custom, but is considered vital in securing the active properties of a medicine. The Pharmacopœia, seeking legal indorsement in Congress, changes the method of preparation and consequently the strength of many of the homeopathic mother tinctures from the strength in which the remedy was originally tested on the healthy—that is, the drug provings on which the homeopathic materia medica is based.

In making the potencies of the various remedies, either alcohol or distilled water is used in converting the triturations of the solid substance, metal or mineral—e. g., gold, silver, lead, graphite, alumina, silica, etc.—from the triturations into the liquid potencies. This Pharmacopœia does not authorize the conversion of triturations in any form into liquid potencies.

The majority of homeopathic colleges in the United States do not use this Pharmacopœia in their pharmaceutical departments or in instructing their classes, and for the reasons above stated are opposed to its becoming legalized by Congress.

A large majority of the homeopathic physicians in this country, for the reasons mentioned above, use the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, and probably will continue to use it, even if the House bill now in Congress should become a law.

Yours, very truly,

H. C. ALLEN.

—

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I write to protest against the bill which is before the committee for amending the food and drugs act and is numbered H. R. 6089.

This amendment has been introduced through the efforts of Dr. T. H. Carmichael, professor of pharmacology, Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia. The bill represents the desire of but a very small class of homeopathic physicians, as more than 90 per cent of the homeopathic physicians of the United States now use by preference preparations made according to the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, which differs in principle from the United States Homeopathic Pharmacopœia. The majority of homeopathic colleges in the country use the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia as a textbook.

This is an effort to obtain official indorsement of a Pharmacopœia to the detriment of an earlier and rival work. It will be of no earthly use to the profession if the bill becomes a law, and you will confer a favor on many of your friends by killing it if possible.

Very truly, yours,

H. C. ALLEN, M. D.

Also, a letter from P. H. Mallen Co., manufacturing homeopathetic pharmacists, of Chicago:

P. H. MALLEN CO.,
MANUFACTURING HOMEOPATHIC PHARMACISTS,
Chicago, Ill., May 11, 1908.

Hon. J. R. MANN, M. C., *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: We wish to protest against bill No. 6089 now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This bill is one amending the pure food and drug act, and the amendments make the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States the authorized work. We wish to say that more than 90 per cent of the homeopathic physicians of the United States are using, by preference, the homeopathic remedies that are prepared according to the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, which differs in principle from the Homeopathic Pharmocopœia of the United States. We trust that you will use your best efforts in having the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia substituted for that of the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States.

Very truly, yours,

P. H. MALLEN CO.,
P. H. MALLEN, *President.*

Also a letter from Mr. Boericke, of Boericke & Tafel, homeopathic pharmacists, of Philadelphia. This firm is the publisher of the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia.

PHILADELPHIA, *November 21, 1908.*

Hon. J. R. MANN, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In accordance with a request sent us by Dr. M. R. French, of Chicago, I mail you to-day a copy of the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia and some journals, together with a catalogue of Boericke & Tafel.

From the articles marked and from the letter to Dr. Carmichael by the Bayard Club, it may be evident that there is a decided opposition to the United States Homeopathic Pharmacopœia, and it is a fact that the majority of homeopathic physicians, as well as the majority of homeopathic pharmacies, prefer the preparations made according

to the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia. This latter pharmacopœia is also adopted as the standard in several States, and was adopted at the annual meeting last June by the International Hahnemannian Association, which is a representative body of homeopathic physicians of considerable influence.

Any further information I may be able to give you in this matter will be gladly furnished by me.

Yours, truly, F. A. BOERICKE.

In view of the fact that I have received so many letters in connection with the consideration of this subject before my committee protesting against official recognition of the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States and insisting that most of the homeopathic pharmacists and physicians recognize the American Homeopathic Pharmacopœia and not the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States, I have made the point of order to strike out the provision in the bill which proposes to recognize the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction of this subject, is quite willing to give full and complete consideration to the question at any time when the parties interested desire to appear before it, although it would seem that the people believing in homeopathy ought to come to some agreement among themselves before they ask Congress to enact legislation which may determine for them to a large extent the character of the medicinal preparations they are to receive.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in order that the reasons which actuated the committee in inserting this paragraph may be understood, I submit the following letter:

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF HOMEOPATHY,
Philadelphia, Pa., January 10, 1911.

Hon C. F. SCOTT, *Chairman,*
And Members of the Committee on Agriculture.

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with the request of the Hon. C. F. SCOTT, your chairman, I submit the following facts in reference to the proposed paragraph in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, which provides for the introduction of the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States into the food and drugs act as the standard for such preparations of drugs as are not mentioned in the United States Pharmacopœia or National Formulary.

As chairman of the pharmacopœia committee of the American Institute of Homeopathy, I represent 2,900 members out of a total of 15,000 physicians in the United States who desire that their preparations shall be standardized in the food and drugs act. It will be observed that our national society bears the same ratio in membership to the total number of physicians as obtains in other national medical associations. In addition, there are a very large number of other physicians who use fresh-plant tinctures.

We are not asking that our pharmacopœia supplant the United States Pharmacopœia, and wherever the preparations are of the same kind, as in cases of tinctures from dried plants, the United States Pharmacopœia would remain the standard, but in the case of tinctures from fresh plants, of which there are about 300, and triturations with milk sugar, and the dilutions of remedies, there is now no standard, and for that reason we pray for the introduction of the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States, and that these preparations be plainly labeled "prepared according to the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States." This would, of course, clearly designate the standard. In the cases mentioned by Dr. Wiley, opium, nux vomica, and cinchona, being dried-plant tinctures and mentioned in the United States Pharmacopœia, that work would be the standard.

We would, therefore, suggest the adoption of the following, which you will notice is identical with the statement made by your chairman (see p. 254, next to last paragraph, statement of Dr. Wiley, on agricultural appropriation bill), which Dr. Wiley in the next paragraph says would be perfectly satisfactory to him. We simply mention, after the words "that whenever any preparation" and the words "is not mentioned in the United States Pharmacopœia, etc.," the following, for the purpose of defining the use of the word "preparation" as used in this connection: "*Provided,* That whenever any preparation, such as a tincture made from a fresh plant or from any part hereof, or a dilution of either a fresh or dried-plant tincture, or other drug substance, which may be made upon the scale of one part of the tincture or solution and nine parts of menstruum, and which process may be successively repeated by using one part of each succeeding dilution and nine parts of menstruum, or a trituration made upon the scale or proportion of one part of the substance and nine parts of milk sugar, and which process may be successively repeated by using one part of each succeeding trituration and nine parts of milk sugar, is not mentioned in the United States Pharmacopœia or the National Formulary, and is mentioned in the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States, it shall be judged by the standard contained in the Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States."

This definitive declaration prevents ambiguity, and does not in any manner alter the paragraph as inserted by the Secretary of Agriculture and modified by your chairman and agreed to by Dr. Wiley.

Respectfully submitted.

T. H. CARMICHAEL, M. D.,
Chairman Committee on Pharmacopœia,
American Institute of Homeopathy.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph of this bill under the heading of Bureau of Chemistry, which is no doubt subject to a point of order, if adopted will recognize the United States Pharmacopœia as the standard of such drugs as are not now recognized under the pure food and drugs act.

The Homeopathic Pharmacopœia of the United States is the one which has been recognized by the American Institute of Homeopathy. This is an organization of homeopathic physicians of the United States, and is composed of the foremost leaders of the profession of this country. In my judgment, if Congress is to recognize any pharmacopœia of this school of medicine, it should adopt that one which has the indorsement of the national organization. A good many years ago the American Institute of Homeopathy appointed a committee of eminent physicians to write a pharmacopœia that might be satisfactory and have the indorsement of the organization. This committee after years of work and study finally produced in 1897 the first addition. Those physicians who composed the committee and edited this first edition were such men as Conrad Wesselhoeft, Boston, Mass., chairman; J. Wilkinson Clapp, Boston, Mass., secretary; Lewis Sherman, Milwaukee, Wis.; Henry M. Smith, New York, N. Y.; James E. Gross, Chicago, Ill.; William Boericke, San Francisco, Cal.; A. C. Cowperthwaite, Chicago, Ill.; Malcolm Leal, New York, N. Y.; H. R. Arndt, San Diego, Cal.; Edward P. Colby, Wakefield, Mass.; A. F. Worthington, Cincinnati, Ohio; and T. Y. Kinne, Paterson, N. J. And those who edited the edition of 1901 are the following: Charles Mohr, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman; J. Wilkinson Clapp, Boston, Mass., secretary; Conrad Wesselhoeft, Boston, Mass.; A. C. Cowperthwaite, Chicago, Ill.; C. A. Boericke, Philadelphia, Pa.; O. A. Dewey, Ann Arbor, Mich.; John L. Moffat, Brooklyn, N. Y.; and T. H. Carmichael, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. J. P. Dake, of Nashville, Tenn., had much to do with the early part of the writing of this pharmacopœia, but on account of his death was unable to help complete the work. These men have been eminent in the profession, and in my judgment were unselfish in recommending this pharmacopœia to the homeopathic physicians of the United States. They did not represent any particular manufacture of medicines, but sought to write and adopt such work as would be of use to physicians of this school of practice.

There have been other homeopathic pharmacopœias published in the United States, but these usually were written for some manufacturing firm. The foremost among them is the American Pharmacopœia, and is published by Boericke & Taffel, a manufacturing firm of Philadelphia, Pa. This is a reliable firm and one in which the physicians of the school have confidence in their honesty and integrity. Yet it hardly seems fair that there should be a failure to recognize the pharmacopœia of this school of medicine because it does not suit any particular manufacturing firm. But the one should be recognized that has the indorsement of the profession at large. It seems that the one indorsed by the American Institute of Homeopathy should be indorsed, if any is to receive recognition by Congress. This paragraph only seeks to recognize as the standard of this school of such remedies as are not mentioned in the United States Pharmacopœia. There is quite a difference in the preparation of many of the remedies used by the different schools of medicine. While it is not feasible to recognize two standards under the pure food and drug act, yet it seems to me that we ought to give recognition to the one which now has the indorsement of the highest authority of the organization of this school of medicine. It is not probable that the complete indorsement by all manufacturing firms of this pharmacopœia could be brought about in the near future. But if Congress will recognize the work of the highest authority in the school, I have no doubt that in a short time whatever changes may be necessary in this work will be carried out. And it is no doubt the changes will be necessary, as the United States Pharmacopœia, which is now recognized under the pure food and drug act, has had many changes made since it was first adopted in convention. This must necessarily be so with the advancement in medicine and new remedies being discovered and new processes of manufacture and extracting the active principle of drugs. I regret that it has been thought necessary to make a point of order against this provision in the bill for the reason that it must defer the recognition of the pharmacopœia of this school of medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SOILS.

Salaries, Bureau of Soils: One soil physicist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 1 executive assistant, $2,000; 3 clerks, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 3 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, $1,260; 8 clerks, class 1; 4 clerks, at $1,000 each; 3 clerks, at $840 each; 1 soil bibliographer, $1,400; 3 draftsmen, at $1,200 each; 1 draftsman, $1,000; 1 photographer, $1,200; 1 messenger, $720; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, $480; 1 messenger boy, $360; 1 laborer, $600; 1 laborer, $300; 1 charwoman or laborer, $480; in all, $48,320.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in the paragraph, in lines 16 and 17:

One soil physicist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000.

His present salary is $3,500, and I make the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order on the salary of the chief.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing now that I desire to say in connection with the matter.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 17, page 53, before "dollars," insert "three thousand five hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of the relation of soils to climate and organic life and of the texture and composition of soils in the field and laboratory, $51,600.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding a new paragraph after line 15, page 54, as follows: "For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine a possible source of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, $12,500, $2,500 of which shall be immediately available."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered by me, if adopted, will inaugurate a most important line of work to the people of the United States, and especially those engaged in agriculture. Briefly, the purpose of the amendment is to give authority to the Department of Agriculture to conduct explorations and investigations throughout the country, with a view of determining the probable sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers. The amendment, if adopted, will enable the department to make a thorough investigation to locate deposits of nitrates, potash, and such other minerals as may be useful as fertilizers.

As the virgin soil of the country becomes more and more exhausted, as it is becoming more and more exhausted each year, the intelligent farmer—and they are all becoming educated more and more—adopts the system of intensification in his farm methods. This means that the farmer is planting less acreage and producing by intelligent methods larger results in the way of crops raised. The soil is a great storehouse, filled with the food and clothing of the human family. To manage the soil in such a way as to make it yield the most for humanity is the science of agriculture. This management consists in three methods of human control—rotation, tillage, and fertilization.

The use of commercial fertilizers is therefore recognized by the leading agricultural scientists of this day as a necessary method in the control and exploitation of the soil. At this time commercial fertilizers are used most largely in the South, and especially in the South Atlantic States, where, on account of the one-crop system prevalent in that section, the soil has been depleted in a measure of much of the necessary elements of plant growth. But it must not be overlooked that experiments prove that the richest soils yield most readily in increased crop production to the use of commercial fertilizers, and this matter of the use of these ingredients becomes each day more and more a question of nation-wide importance. The rich alluvial lands of the Mississippi Valley and the prairie lands of the West are just as much in need of the application of commercial fertilizers as are the worn-out lands of the older States.

Gentleman of the committee will understand the vast importance of this undertaking proposed in this amendment when the fact is called to their attention that the United States consumes commercial fertilizers to the amount of $120,000,000 every year and that the bulk of the supply of the raw material comes from foreign countries. A complete fertilizer consists of certain proportions, dependent upon the soil and the crop or plant, of nitrogen, phosphoric acid, and potash. The nitrogen supply of this country comes largely from Chili, while the entire supply of potash comes from Germany, and in the matter of potash alone this country, its farmers, pay to Germany an annual tribute of over $8,000,000. Germany has a complete and absolute monopoly upon the potash business of the world, with an absolute power to make the price of this essential ingredient of a complete fertilizer exactly what she pleases to make it. It seems to me inconceivable that a great agricultural people, that a nation whose wealth is dependent upon the producing capacity of its agricultural classes, should be willing to sit quietly down and continue without any effort to relieve the situation, and to permit a condition to exist which makes them dependent upon a foreign nation for one of the necessary elements which enters into the productive power of the soil. Why should we continue to remain at the mercy of the German monopoly in potash when a thorough investigation of our own great stretch of country might develop the fact that we have sufficient potash on our own soil to supply the needs of our agricultural classes? That Germany has such a monopoly as I have hinted at no one questions.

I presume most of us have read very much during the past six months of the controversy between our country and Germany on the question of certain contracts alleged to have been made by certain American buyers of potash with certain German corporation sellers of this article. I do not intend at this time to discuss the merits of this controversy. Time will not permit it, and it is not germane to the point under discussion. But at some future day, if I shall get the opportunity, I do propose to have something to say about it and to make inquiry to ascertain the reason for the continued delay upon the part of the State Department in bringing about a settlement of this question. I only mention this matter because the discussion of it directed my attention to the lamentable condition of the farmers of the country in their absolute dependence upon a foreign nation for their supply of one of the essential ingredients of a commercial fertilizer.

I do not know what the prospects are for discovering potash deposits in the United States, but I am satisfied that these prospects are favorable. I have taken the matter up with Dr. Whitney, Chief of the Bureau of Soils, and he has written me this letter which I desire to read for the information of the House:

FEBRUARY 9, 1911.

Hon. ASBURY F. LEVER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LEVER: In response to your letter of February 8, I am sending herewith memoranda which show the amounts of potash salts imported into this country, their value, and their distribution, for the year ending June 30, 1910. These figures are obtained from the reports of customs receipts to the Treasury Department, and can be accepted as approximating very closely to the truth and subject to but slight probable revision pending the issuance of official figures by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Of the items enumerated, the carbonates and hydrates enter into the manufacture of soaps, glass, ceramics, dyes, etc.; the cyanide in plating and mining, and a negligible quantity goes into the manufacture of fertilizers. The muriate, sulphate, and most of the nitrate go into the fertilizer trade, mainly in the preparation of mixed fertilizers. That is to say, that imports of fertilizer salts for agricultural use approximate 250,000 tons of a value of nearly $8,000,000. By far the larger portion of this material comes from the Stassfurt deposits in Germany, the production from all other sources in the world being almost negligible in comparison.

Reliable statistics are not available for giving the distribution of this material in the several States. Since by far the major part of it enters into the manufacture of mixed fertilizers, its distribution is probably not materially different from that for fertilizers in general. A recent estimate has been made by one of our experts from the best information he could gather from official sources and the confidential statements of manufacturers. It appears that about 80 per cent of the fertilizers sold in this country go to the Southern States, including Texas and Missouri; the Carolinas and Georgia being the heaviest consumers. About 15 per cent goes to the Northern and Middle Western States east of the Mississippi River. The remaining States use less than 5 per cent, of which the citrus fruit regions of southern California are the most important, the trucking areas around San Francisco and Seattle taking a small quantity, and the other areas in the trans-Mississippi States using at present only negligible quantities. It is, however, only a question of time, and probably a short time, when fertilizers will be used generally throughout the country.

Of the possible sources of potash in commercial quantities in this country three now seem worthy of consideration, although scientific inquiry may develop others as time goes on. It is possible that workable deposits of potash salts exist in the desert basins of arid regions. Depoits of alunite, a mixed sulphate of potash and alumina, are known, and considerable deposits of leucite, a potash silicate, have been reported in such regions which could reasonably be expected to lead to the formation of deposits of soluble potash salts. Field explorations by a chemist for the existence of such deposits and laboratory investigations of methods for the isolation of the valuable constituents are much needed and would prove valuable for the interests of this country.

A second possible source of potash salts is in the brines of our salt wells. Many of these brines are known to carry potash, but whether in workable amounts is not known. A field inspection of these salt wells is eminently desirable, and the laboratory investigations referred to above are as necessary in this case.

A third possible source of potash is in our potash-bearing rocks and minerals. Certain feldspars and other minerals like leucite contain relatively large percentages of potash which can be extracted by laboratory methods, which are at present of doubtful practicability on a commercial scale. Further investigation of this source of potash and methods for extracting it are eminently desirable and could very well be prosecuted by governmental agencies in the interests of the people at large.

Respectfully, MILTON WHITNEY, *Chief of Bureau.*

This letter encourages the hope that we may find either in the semiarid and arid regions of the West, in the salt wells of New York and Ohio, or through some process of extracting potash from minerals containing potash, the relief which we seek from the monopoly of a foreign nation in the supply of potash so necessary to the agriculture of this country. To make the investigation, even though it involves a considerable expenditure of public money, and even though no positive good comes from it, is still worth while. We shall at least settle the

question and know once and for all how to deal with this situation. If, however, we can find through this investigation some way by which to supply the potash necessities of this country it will mean millions and millions of dollars saved to the American farmer and to the American Nation. It is an opportunity for trying to do something to reduce the cost of crop production and to enhance the profits of our agricultural classes which I am certain this House will not neglect. I therefore most earnestly urge the adoption of this amendment, feeling that it contains possibilities for good that very greatly overbalance the expenditure involved. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have given some attention myself to the conditions which the gentleman from South Carolina has outlined, and I am convinced, if this proposition had been brought before the committee, it would have received a favorable report, because it seems to appeal to anyone that it would be wise to expend a reasonable sum of money when scientists inform us there is a prospect of success in endeavoring to locate and develop resources for materials which are now imported from abroad at very great cost. I therefore withdraw the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order, and I would like to give my reason in a moment for doing so. I do not doubt the fact we are expending $120,000,000 a year for commercial fertilizers. I want to call Prof. Whitney as a witness himself, who said more money was wasted in the United States in commercial fertilizers than any one of the things which concern agriculture. There is a very little soil in the United States but what has got enough potash in it to last a thousand years, so far as agriculture is concerned, except in some of our muck soils, and if at the time of the birth of Christ one had commenced farming land and had never put anything back, there would still be potash in the soil. Now, all it is proposed to do is to attempt to locate some minerals, and to that I object and make a point of order against it.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Kansas conceded the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear under what law this would be authorized.

Mr. LEVER. It is up to the gentleman who made the point of order to state why he makes it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, of course, I made it largely because I am opposed to the expenditure of this amount, and I made it largely because I do not believe it is any part of the functions of the United States Government to enter upon the question of an expenditure for the purpose of finding minerals. I am aware of the fact that what potash we now have comes from Germany, but after we have gone through more than a hundred years of agricultural development it seems to me we can expend our money to better advantage in the aid of agriculture than we can in going out to find some minerals in order to maintain——

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. That is true.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Now, would it not be a great deal better to permit this investigation? The amount is not large, and even going upon the theory of the gentleman from Indiana, if money is being wasted for this item would it not be a great deal better for us to waste our money right here at home than to waste this enormous sum of $8,000,000 a year, that goes out of the pockets of American farmers, in a foreign country? I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we are expending something like $15,000,000 a year in the Agricultural Department, and less than $3,000,000 of that amount is going to the agricultural interests of the country, so far as that is concerned, and therefore I still object.

Mr. LEVER. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. MOSS. I am giving the reasons which I entertain and upon which I base my objection. If the point of order is well taken, I understand you can not legislate upon an appropriation bill, but whether you can authorize the expenditure of the money may be a doubtful question. I presume, perhaps, you can.

No one would welcome more cordially than I any improvement in our agricultural conditions, but our Government has no business in exploring to find mineral wealth. If found on private premises, the resulting benefit can not go to the public, and this proposition is not to be limited to the public lands.

We get busy every once in awhile and go off chasing visionary projects. A few years ago we undertook to teach the people to distill alcohol cheaply and use it as a fuel to break down the monopoly of the Standard Oil. We have spent many thousands of dollars on this project and to-day there is only one still in the United States and the Government owns that. Still we go on appropriating public money every year, and this year more than usual, to support this project, which has proven a complete failure. Not a gallon of denatured alcohol has been produced for commercial purposes in the United States as a result of this adventure, and so little interest has grown out of it that we can not secure any students to come here and study the process of distilling under free Government instruction.

A few years ago the dual-purpose cow was much talked about in the agricultural press, and we promptly started our Agricultural Department in search of the milk-and-beef cow. Since then we have been supporting, out of the Public Treasury, a project to develop a strain of shorthorn milch cattle. Private breeders have produced since then shorthorn cows which have been known all over the world, but not one farmer in ten thousand ever heard about this governmental project, and not a dollar has been added to our agricultural wealth as a result. But every year we appropriate money to sustain the project.

Likewise, we are making an effort as a Nation to develop the gray draft horse. One of the oldest breeds of draft horses is the gray Norman or Percheron, and thousands of good stallions of this color and breed have been imported from France by private individuals; yet we are spending public money year after year to keep up this project, which is practically without results and is practically unknown to the live-stock men of our country.

These examples need not be multiplied. At the present moment, because of an excitement over a potash contract, we propose to create a new activity of Government and send men at public expense to explore the earth for a deposit of potash salts, which, if discovered, will most probably belong to some private individual who can maintain monopoly prices if he has the monopoly of supply. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss further the merits of this proposition with the gentleman who has made the point of order, for I have not the time, but I think I can convince this House of it merits without any difficulty, notwithstanding the objection of the gentleman from Indiana. I would like to call the attention of the Chair to the broadness of the language creating the Department of Agriculture, as set forth in section 526 of the Revised Statutes:

> The Commissioner of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain by means of books and correspondence, and by practical and scientific experiments, accurate records of which experiments shall be kept in his office, by the collection of statistics, and by any other appropriate means within his power.

I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Department of Agriculture was established in the interest of the agriculture of the country, and that whatever is in the interest of the agriculture, whatever we may do to better agricultural conditions, would not be subject to a point, but proper under the rules of the House. That is all I care to say on that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to see a copy of the provision of the act just read by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. May I call attention further, Mr. Chairman, to this other language in the statute creating the departmen?

> That there shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Now, then, it seems to me that if the Chairman understands that phosphate and many more fertilizers are related in the closest possible way to agriculture, the point of order does not stand.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina contend that the only use of potash and nitrates is for agricultural purposes?

Mr. LEVER. I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the largest use of potash and nitrates is as commercial fertilizer, and that is the purpose, and only purpose, of this amendment. The department would not have the right under my amendment, as I understand it, to make these investigations except as the result might relate to agriculture.

Mr. MOSS. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Suppose they were to find a great deposit of potash; have you any way of knowing that the farmers would get the benefit of it or that it would advance agriculture in any way?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know that the sun is going to rise to-morrow morning, but I have every reason to believe that it will. I have every reason to believe, likewise, that if a great deposit of potash were found in this country the farmers would get the benefit of it. Of course, I think so. What else would you do with it? Would you eat it? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOSS. Most of the fertilizers that I know of in this country are said to be controlled by combinations.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman would direct us where some of these potash deposits are, he would get rich.

Mr. MOSS. I said most of the fertilizing deposits. At least that charge has been made in regard to fertilizing deposits in the South, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. It is quite apparent from the language of the fundamental law that the Secretary of Agriculture is given very broad powers for making different investigations here in furtherance of the interests of agriculture, and the Chair is inclined to think, from a careful reading of this amendment, and especially the words "and other natural fertilizers," that it is clear the investigations as to the source of supply of potash and nitrates are clearly in furtherance of the interests of agriculure. In other words, that it comes within the very broad powers given to the Secretary.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the amendment ought not to be adopted. It is proposed to place upon the Agricultural Department the carrying on of an entirely new class of research and investigation.

The geological survey and classification of the lands of the United States and investigations with regard to minerals are placed under the Geological Survey of the Interior Department. The Agricultural Department has never carried on any work looking to the discovery of mineral wealth or of mineral deposits. It is true that potash is used in fertilizers, but it is nevertheless true that potash is a mineral, the locations of deposits of which are properly investigated by the Interior Department and not by the Agricultural Department.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman understand that this is a scientific investigation, and not a hunt?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not so understand it.

Mr. MANN. It is not expected to find potash deposits, but to see whether it is possible to produce potash from some of the natural resources of the country which are easily found.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, that may be the gentleman's view of it, but I do not think that is what is contemplated at all. What is contemplated by the amendment which, I understand, will be presented to the House on the sundry civil bill is a hunt, as the gentleman styles it, for potash deposits.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the sundry civil bill is going to carry, but we have this matter before us now.

Mr. MONDELL. We all know that potash is not found in any considerable quantities except in the form of a deposit, and an investigation for the purpose of determining whether potash can be produced from some of the known products of the country is entirely unnecessary, for that field has been thoroughly gone over by those interested in the production of fertilizers and the manufacture of fertilizers and others, and there is no excuse for spending money with a view of determining whether it is possible to produce potash in commercial quantities from any known products in the country.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Is it not just as well to investigate this matter as it is to see whether paper can be made out of other material than wood, and is it not much in the same line?

Mr. MONDELL. The Forest Service is under the Agricultural Department. There is no other department of the Government which has jurisdiction over investigations relating to forestry.

Mr. COCKS of New York. What difference does that make?

Mr. MONDELL. All the difference in the world.

Mr. COCKS of New York. You propose to have an investigation of it by some other department?

Mr. MONDELL. By all means.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Oh, the gentleman does not object to the work, but he wants it done by some other department.

Mr. MONDELL. I object to the work if it is to be carried on as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] understands that it is going to be carried on.

Mr. MANN. We will do it both ways.

Mr. MONDELL. A simple investigation with a view to determining whether or not potash can be produced from products already in existence and the present locality of which is known, I think is altogether a useless sort of an investigation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GAINES). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that my time be extended five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Let us have debate closed. I ask unanimous consent that debate be closed in five minutes, and the gentleman from Wyoming have that five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that debate be closed in five minutes, and the gentleman from Wyoming have the five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Illinois assumes, evidently, that what the gentleman from Wyoming says on the subject will in no way affect the vote. I am rather inclined to agree with him, for this so-called farmers' appropriation bill has become so popular that no matter what sort of appropriation is proposed in the name of the farmer is carried. I want to call attention to the fact that we are proposing a very serious and unnecessary duplication of work.

If we are proposing to do what the gentleman from Illinois understands it is proposed to do, we are to do something that will have no practical value. If, on the other hand, we are proposing to make explorations for the purpose of discovering deposits of this material, then that is a class of work that does not properly come under the Agricultural Department. It seems to me that the House ought to stop and consider before it appropriates here for carrying on a class of work clearly within the jurisdiction of another department of the Government and for carrying on which the Department of Agriculture has not the necessary data, has not the necessary field force, whereas the Department of the Interior, under the Geological Survey, has the data and has the field force for making the explorations.

I do not think there is anyone who has studied the question of potash but that understands that practically all the commercial potash of the world, the great bulk of it, is found in a few great deposits, mostly, unfortunately, in Germany. It is hoped and believed by the Geological Survey that deposits of potash may be found on the public lands, but unless we shall find such deposits on the public lands, or private lands, if you please, there is no hope of a largely increased product in the United States. The chemists of the world have been for a generation searching for known and possible sources for potash.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Does the gentleman contend that the investigation should be left to another department; and, if so, what department?

Mr. MONDELL. To the Interior Department—to the Geological Survey.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Does the gentleman contend that the Geological Survey now has the right to make that investigation?

Mr. MONDELL. I am sure that it has.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Why have they not done it, or why are they not doing it?

Mr. MONDELL. Until very recently we have been getting our potash from Germany, and the conditions have been such that potash could be obtained at a reasonable price. These large deposits in Germany have been furnishing the world with commercial potash, and the chemists of all the world have been endeavoring to find material from which potash could be produced in commercial quantities at a reasonable price, and have been unable to do so. Now, no investigation that the Department of Agriculture could carry on would illumine the situation. Another thing, this appropriation will mean the inauguration of a new line of work under the Agricultural Department—the making of investigations with a view to discovering new sources of mineral wealth in the deposits of this class of mineral—a work which belongs to the Geological Survey. It is a work that ought to be confined to one bureau, and that a scientific bureau, charged under the law with the investigation of these matters. I do not believe any practical good will come from the expenditure of this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of soils, and for indicating upon maps and plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations, $145,000: *Provided*, That not more than 10 per cent of this sum shall be expended in any one State.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of order on the proviso.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this proviso is not obnoxious to the rules. It is merely a limitation upon the appropriation, upon the manner in which it may be expended, and I will ask the Chair to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the paragraph just read, providing for investigations and indicating upon maps, and so forth, the result of those investigations, the investigations are practically worthless unless the reports are printed and put in such form that they can be distributed. I would like to ask what provision is made for the printing of those reports, as to the number of the reports and the distribution of them.

Mr. SCOTT. The rule or practice, as I understand, in relation to these reports, is that 2,000 copies are printed and they are commonly placed at the disposal of the Representative—that is, the greater part of them—in whose district the survey is made.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. That is a rule or the law?

Mr. SCOTT. I think it is a rule.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I want to say to the gentleman—and this is the reason why the question comes up in my mind—that a soil survey was made several months back in Bullock County, Ga., in my district, and the report has not yet been printed. I am advised that when it is printed I will have for distribution only 1,000 copies. That is not nearly enough to go around in the county and to parties who have already requested them of me. I understand, of course, that the chief of the bureau will very kindly loan me some copies; but even with the number that is allowed under the rules, it will not be sufficient. I think that a rule of this kind is rather arbitrary, and I would like to know if the chairman does not think that a provision ought to go in here fixing the number by law that should be published.

Mr. MANN. It is fixed by law.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not believe it would be practicable to fix upon this appropriation bill a limitation upon the number that could be published of any particular report. The gentleman knows, of course, that there are a great many different publications of the Department of Agriculture—in the neighborhood of a thousand last year—and we certainly can not assume to fix the number that shall be printed of each one of those reports. We must trust to the general regulations and to the discretion of the Secretary. I think that a very large discretion lies with the Secretary, because when the first edition of any publication has been exhausted he may order a reprint if he thinks there is a sufficient demand to justify it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. That is within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The number he can print in the first instance, I think, is fixed by law. I think it is 2,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if I properly understood the Chair to sustain the point of order that was made against the limitations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Kansas to concede that it was obnoxious to the rule, and the Chair did sustain the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not mean to be so understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does his best to hear what the gentleman from Kansas says.

Mr. SCOTT. I apologize to the Chair for not speaking so as to be heard. I did not argue the question at length, because it seemed to me so clear that the provision was not subject to the point of order.

In order that the matter may be again passed upon I offer the language which has been stricken out as an amendment to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman who made the point of order not now being present, if the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture desires to be heard on the point of order, he may ask unanimous consent to return to it when the gentleman who made the point of order is present in the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in order to bring the issue before the House, I make the point of order, so that we can have a new ruling.

Mr. SCOTT. I merely reoffer the amendment in the interest of expedition, so that the question might——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that immediately after——

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is now here.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the proposition, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SCOTT. For the information of the gentleman from Illinois, who has just returned to the Chamber, I desire to state that believing the ruling by which the proviso beginning in line 20, page 54, was stricken out was due to a misapprehension on the part of the Chair as to the position of the chairman of the committee, I have reoffered the amendment in order that it can again be considered.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order against the amendment, and I wish to suggest——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, in the first place, the proviso which authorizes the expenditure of 10 per cent of the total appropriation provided in the paragraph might result in an expenditure of a sum vastly more than the whole appropriation if each State of the Union demanded the expenditure of 10 per cent of the appropriation. We have 46 States now and will soon have 48——

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Let me suggest to the gentleman that I do not think the language is open to his criticism. This amendment was put in by the committee for the purpose of requiring this work to be done in the various States and not all in one State. The purpose of placing this limitation on expenditure of the amount appropriated is to guarantee the work is done in various localities rather than have it all done in one or two localities. I will say to the gentleman there seems to be well-founded grounds for the criticism against those in charge of the work that too much of it heretofore has been done in one or two communities to the sacrifice and neglect of other communities. That is the purpose of this limitation and the only purpose, and I think the proviso is wise legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, if the proviso should be stricken out, and as a result of its having been stricken out, the department would be permitted to expend the whole appropriation in any one State, of course that would be a great misfortune, and I have no desire to embarrass the States which are entitled to a part of the expenditure of this appropriation. At the same time I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that no one State should be permitted to absorb it all.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman, further, that I offered the amendment in the very best of faith, because after looking at a great many of the maps brought here for our edification and entertainment it became absolutely apparent to me that the work of this bureau is being done in a certain section, and I want to say to the gentleman it did not affect his section or mine either, and that is the reason I want to see the department broaden out and expend some of its activities in sections of the country which produce largely of the great farm staples, but which in the past seem to have been neglected.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, with the light thus thrown upon the question by the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri and the statement made by the gentleman from Kansas in charge of the bill, I desire now to withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Illinois to withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if the point of order is reserved, can I be heard for just a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri on the point of order.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. It seems to me this amendment, as was said by the chairman of the committee, is not subject to the point of order because it is simply a limitation upon the expenditure of the money appropriated in this paragraph, and it can not be otherwise construed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the circumstances existing with reference to this point of order, the Chair will make this statement to the committee: The Chair understood that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture admitted that the point of order was well taken, and on that account the Chair sustained the point of order. In view of the discussion, however, the Chair is in considerable doubt as to whether the point of order ought to be sustained or not, therefore the Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY.

Salaries, Bureau of Entomology: One entomologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,500; 1 executive assistant, $2,250; 1 chief clerk, $1,800; 1 clerk, class 4; 2 clerks, class 3; 6 clerks, class 2; 4 clerks, class 1; 5 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk,

$720; 1 artist, $1,400; 1 superintendent of moth work, $2,750; 1 assistant superintendent of moth work, $1,080; 1 entomological assistant, $1,800; 1 entomological draftsman, $1,400; 1 entomological draftsman, $1,080; 3 foremen, at $1,080 each; 1 entomological assistant, $900; 2 entomological preparators, at $840 each; 1 entomological preparator, $720; 6 entomological preparators, at $600 each; 2 student assistants, at $300 each; 1 messenger, $840; 2 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 1 mechanic, $840; 1 mechanic, $750; 1 laborer, $540; 2 charwomen, at $480 each; 1 charwoman, $240; in all, $60,130.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the words "five hundred" to be found on line 5, page 55, it being an increase of salary to that amount. The present salary authorized is $4,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting forests, $44,750.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether this appropriation is new or whether it is substantially the same as it was last year?

Mr. SCOTT. The paragraph has been carried in the bill for a number of years. The appropriation this year shows an actual increase of $31,650 over the appropriation which was provided for the current year.

If the gentleman will permit me, I will state the reason why that large increase is made. Up to this time there has been an appropriation only for the purpose of carrying on investigations and experiments as to the best methods of controlling forest insects. It was a question upon which there was but little information to begin with, and necessarily a great deal of research was required before the very best methods could be determined. As a result of this research the scientists who have the work in charge are now of the opinion that they have succeeded in developing entirely effective methods for the control of forest insects, and they therefore ask for a larger appropriation in order that they may demonstrate those methods, and in order that they may send a number of scientists into the field in different sections of the country to show the people how these insects may be controlled, and particularly to cooperate with the Forest Service in efforts for the extermination of insects in the national forests.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would there be any cooperation with the State forest services?

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We have heard a great deal during the past year about the blister rust of the white pine and about the chestnut blight; especially in the Middle States with regard to the chestnut blight. I want to ascertain if this appropriation as extended was intended to cover investigations of that kind.

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly under this appropriation the work to which the gentleman refers can be covered.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The chestnut blight has become quite prevalent in Pennsylvania and in some of the other Middle States. Efforts have been put forth by the State officials to check it, but they need cooperation. I merely wanted to inquire if this cooperation was contemplated by this appropriation.

Mr. SCOTT. I am quite sure it is.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, the Forestry Association of the State of Ohio met in Columbus a few days ago and passed a resolution calling upon Congress to provide an appropriation to investigate this insect which is destroying the chestnut trees in the State of Ohio. I presume the same pest extends through the neighboring State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. It is killing our chestnut trees, particularly in the eastern part of the State.

Mr. COLE. And it was to extend this work, as I take it, to the Middle States that this appropriation was increased from $14,000 to $44,750 in the appropriation bill.

I called up the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology, Mr. Howard, and he informed me that scientists would be sent to the States of Ohio and Pennsylvania, and to any other place where this blight was attacking the forest trees, especially the chestnut trees, and that they would cooperate with the various States with a view to ascertaining some remedy and applying it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am sure the department of forestry in Pennsylvania will be glad to cooperate, and that that arrangement will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the House whether the State forester of Ohio, or the department of forestry in Ohio, has done anything toward restricting or killing off these blights by insects—and not only as to Ohio, but as to any other State?

Mr. COLE. I am unable to say as regards this one particular item, but I know that the department of agriculture in the State of Ohio is very well organized and that it has a large appropriation each year and that it does cooperate in every way with the National Government in all its various functions and operations. And the association out there is taking very active steps in combating this insect, and at the same time the National Government has valuable information and has men well equipped for this work, and it is for the purpose of getting the benefit of the information and knowledge of the National Government that it calls upon us to increase this appropriation.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of miscellaneous insects, inspection work, study of insects affecting the health of man and animals, insecticides, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, $19,740.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the following amendment: Page 57, line 12, after the word "of" in that line, insert "mosquitoes," so that that section will read:

For investigations of mosquitoes and miscellaneous insects, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 57, line 12, after the word "of," insert "mosquitoes."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the item. It is covered by what is in here, and they are investigating mosquitoes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted just a few remarks, that investigations are not very extended in this line. As was stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], this is a rather important matter. If it is the opinion of the chairman of the committee [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that it is covered by this section, I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. A bulletin has been recently issued on the subject, and the matter has been under investigation for a long time.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Salaries, Bureau of Biological Survey: One biologist, who shall be chief of bureau, $3,500; 1 chief clerk, $1,800; 1 clerk, class 4; 1 clerk, class 3; 1 clerk, class 2; 4 clerks, class 1; 3 clerks, at $1,000 each; 2 clerks, at $900 each; 1 photographer, $1,400; 1 warden, $1,200; 1 messenger, $720; 1 messenger, messenger boy, or laborer, $480; 1 laborer, $600; in all, $24,100.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the words "five hundred," to be found in lines 8 and 9, page 58, it being an increase of salary to that amount, the present salary being $3,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman submit to an inquiry at that point?

Mr. MACON. With all due deference, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman, I must, in order to hasten through with the bill, decline to yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. It will only take a minute.

Mr. MACON. I have not time to yield. I make the point of order. And on the same page, beginning on line 12——

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman will yield.

Mr. MACON (continuing). I find "one photographer, $1,400." The present salary is $1,200. I make a point of order on the increase of $200.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede both points of order, and offer an amendment inserting the word "two" in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kansas that it seems to the Chair that no amendment is necessary, the point of order having been made only as to the increase.

Mr. SCOTT. No amendment is necessary as to the first salary mentioned in lines 8 and 9. My amendment goes to line 13, where the word "four" has been stricken out by the point order, and in place of that word I wish to substitute the word "two," so that the present salary will be restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 58, line 13, strike out the word "four" and insert "two," so that it will read "two thousand dollars."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the enforcement of sections 241, 242, 243, and 244 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," and for the enforcement of section 1

of the act approved May 25, 1900, entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes," $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I notice an appropriation of $12,000, an increase from $9,420 of last year. Does the National Government make a business of attempting to prohibit the violation of the law for shipping of game in all the States—that is, from one State to another?

Mr. SCOTT. It endeavors to enforce the law prohibiting the interstate shipment of game. I will say to the gentleman, however, that a large portion of the increase of $3,580 which is provided in this paragraph was asked for in order to more effectually enforce the law relating to the importation of injurious birds and mammals.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Does the Government, under this appropriation, attempt, in all the States, to prevent the interstate shipment of game?

Mr. COCKS of New York. The illegal shipment.

Mr. SCOTT. What is known as the Lacey Act forbids the interstate shipment of game in violation of law.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I understand that.

Mr. SCOTT. To the best of its ability, the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Biology, enforces that act.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think that the local laws are sufficient to stop the interstate shipment of game?

Mr. SCOTT. I presume that Congress must have been of a different opinion or the Lacey Act would not have been enacted. It is now on the statute book, and it would seem as if it ought to be enforced, and this appropriation is made for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Does not each State look after the shipment of game illegally shipped out of the State?

Mr. SCOTT. I think a good deal of the work done by the bureau is to enforce the law in relation to the Territories, particularly the district of Alaska, where, of course, local regulations can not very well be enforced.

Mr. MANN. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, that where game is shipped from one State to another in violation of the laws of the first State, the first State can not enforce the law, because the game has gone beyond it, and the second State does not have any special reason for enforcing it, and in such a case it is the duty of the General Government to enforce the law, if they know of a violation.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I will ask my colleague if in our State, where we have an army of game wardens—who are familiarly called there "rabbit shepherds"—if he does not think that they are sufficiently able to enforce the law, and if a man gets by them, if he does not think he ought to be permitted to go? Is not there a sufficient army to enforce the law?

Mr. MANN. These people get on to the violations of the law and notify the Government, and in cases of interstate shipment it is wholly without the power of the local game wardens to prosecute.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. It occurs to me that the local laws would be able to take care of it, but I see where the importation of harmful birds ought to be taken care of.

Mr. SCOTT. In further reply to the gentleman's question, let me read a brief statement from the Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey:

The CHAIRMAN. Do not all the States now enforce their game laws pretty rigidly, so that there is really not much left for the Federal Government to do in the way of interstate commerce?

Mr. HENSHAW. I think there is a very large amount of work to do in the enforcement of the Lacey Act. We have really just begun that work. If we undertake to carry it through much larger appropriations will be necessary in the future. The law is being violated quite largely in some game centers, and our efforts hitherto have been concentrated chiefly in St. Louis and Chicago. These cities were formerly great markets for the receipt of illicit shipments of game.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Kansas permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have recently received communications, and I presume the gentleman himself has, from local Audubon societies, complaining that meadow larks, robins, and many other migratory birds are being exterminated and sent north and sold in restaurants under other names. Does the gentleman know how extensively that sort of trade is going on?

Mr. SCOTT. No such complaints have been brought to me, but they are no doubt well founded.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I received a letter from Milwaukee, and also three other letters, complaining that these birds are being exterminated. They used to go South in the fall in great numbers and return North in the spring, but now they are slaughtered in the South and shipped under other names by thousands.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course, the best remedy for that would be for the State legislatures to enact laws and then strictly enforce them. The Lacey Act is merely to supplement the State laws.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. The States ought to take care of that work altogether.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Dealers in Chicago and other large cities get these birds from the Southern States.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Every State has a law preventing the shipment of game out of it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think that the best remedy would be a rigidly strict enforcement of the Lacey Act.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes; but it would take two or three million dollars to do it.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION OF ACCOUNTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

Salaries, Division of Accounts and Disbursements: One chief of division and disbursing clerk, who shall be administrative officer of the fiscal affairs of the department, $4,000; 1 assistant chief of division, $2,750; 1 chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, who may be detailed to the Forest Service for duty in or out of the city of Washington, $2,500; 7 district fiscal agents, at $2,000 each, who may be detailed to the Forest Service for duty in or out of the city of Washington, $14,000; 1 supervising auditor, $2,250; 1 auditor, $2,000; 1 cashier and chief clerk, $2,250; 1 deputy disbursing clerk, $2,000; 1 supervising bookkeeper, $2,000; 2 clerks, class 4; 10 clerks, class 3; 16 clerks, class 2; 9 clerks, class 1; 4 clerks, at $1,000 each; 6 clerks, at $900 each; 1 custodian of records and files, $1,200; 1 messenger, $720; 1 messenger, $600.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the increase in salary to be found on page 60, in line 11. I notice they provide for one clerk—a disbursing clerk—who shall be an administrative officer of the fiscal affairs of the department, at $4,000. His present salary is $3,225.

Mr. LAMB. Will my friend withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. MACON. To withhold a point of order, I will say to my friend from Virginia, simply prolongs debate on this bill, and brings on controversies that sometimes lead to something else.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MACON. In line 11, one assistant clerk of division, $2,750. The present salary is $2,500, and I make the point of order on the increase. In line 18, one supervising auditor, $2,250, where the present salary is $2,000, and I make the point of order on the increase. Beginning on line 19, one cashier and chief clerk, $2,250, the present salary being $2,000, and I make the point of order on the increase. In line 22, one supervising bookkeeper, $2,000, present salary $1,800, and I make the point of order on the increase.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I again ask my friend to withhold his point of order just for a few moments.

Mr. MACON. I stated to the gentleman, with all deference, that I could not afford to reserve the point of order, because that sometimes brings on trouble. I therefore make the point of order.

Mr. LAMB. Oh, there can not be any trouble between two such small men as the gentleman and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the following amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 11, before the word "dollars," insert the words "thirty-five hundred."

Page 60, line 12, before "dollars," insert "five hundred."

Line 22, before "dollars," insert "one thousand eight hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I also offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read, to correct a clerical error.

Mr. MANN. Ought not the gentleman to provide for two auditors instead of one?

Mr. SCOTT. I did not observe that the point of order had been made against two auditors.

Mr. MACON. I made the point of order against one supervising auditor at $2,250.

Mr. SCOTT. I thought the point of order went only to the salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that the Chair understands the point of order was made against the words "two hundred and fifty" as being an increase. The Clerk will report the amendment which the gentleman from Kansas sends to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 60, at the end of line 17, and at the beginning of line 18, strike out the comma and the words "fourteen thousand dollars."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS.

Salaries, Division of Publications: One editor, who shall be chief of division, $3,500; 1 editor, who shall be assistant chief of division, $2,250; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 2 assistant editors, at $2,000 each; 3 assistant editors, at $1,800 each; 1 assistant editor, $1,600; 1 assistant editor, $1,400; 1 assistant editor in charge of indexing, $2,000; 1 indexer, $1,400; 1 assistant in charge of illustrations, $2,000; 1 draftsman or photographer, $1,600; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,500 each; 6 draftsmen or photographers, at $1,200 each; 1 assistant photographer, $900; 1 assistant in charge of document section, $2,000; 1 assistant in document section, $1,600; 1 foreman, miscellaneous distribution, $1,600; 1 foreman, farmers' bulletin distribution, $1,200; 1 forewoman, $1,400; 1 forewoman, $1,200; 1 clerk, class 2; 5 clerks, class 1; 12 clerks, at $1,000 each; 10 clerks, at $900 each; 40 clerks or skilled laborers, at $840 each; 15 clerks or skilled laborers, at $780 each; 50 clerks or skilled laborers, at $720 each; 1 chief folder, $1,000; 1 folder, $900; 3 folders, at $840 each; 2 skilled laborers, at $1,000 each; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 4 messengers, at $720 each; 3 messengers, at $600 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $480 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $420 each; 2 messengers or messenger boys, at $360 each; 2 laborers, at $660 each; 1 laborer, $600; 4 charwomen, at $480 each; 3 charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $176,810.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CARY. I wish also to reserve the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman from Arkansas yield to me for just a moment in order that I may make a correction in the preceding paragraph?

Mr. MACON. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to the fact that in offering the amendment to restore the salary of the Chief of the Division of Accounts and Allowances, I fixed it at $3,500. It should have been fixed at $3,250. That was an error on my part; and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as $3,250 instead of $3,500, in line 11 on page 60.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to return to line 11, page 60, for the purpose of making the correction suggested. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made in accordance with the statement of the gentleman.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CARY. I wish to make the point of order, and reserve it on lines 21 and 22, page 61.

The CHAIRMAN. Points of order have already been reserved on the paragraph by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the increase of salary to be found on page 61, in line 17, "one editor, who shall be chief of division, $3,500." His present salary is $3,000. By making the point of order against the $500 it will leave the salary in this bill as it is in the existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture before proceeding, in order to keep points of order straight, if he concedes the point of order?

Mr. SCOTT. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. And if the gentleman from Arkansas will pause when he has made his point we will settle that at the time.

Mr. MACON. The next is to be found in line 22, "three assistant editors, at $1,800 each." Their present salaries are $1,600 each.

Mr. SCOTT. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. And I offer to substitute the word "six."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "thousand," in line 22, page 61, insert "six."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. In line 25, "one assistant editor in charge of indexing, $2,000." One thousand eight hundred dollars is the present salary, and I make the point of order on the increase of $200.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer the necessary amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will report the amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 25, after the word "indexing" insert "eighteen hundred."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. Page 62, line 3, "one draftsman or photographer, $1,600." His present salary is $1,500, and I make the point of order against the increase.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer the necessary amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, line 3, after the word "thousand" insert "five."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. In line 4, "two draftsmen or photographers, at $1,500 each." Their present salaries are $1,400, and I make the point of order against the increase.

Mr. SCOTT. I concede the point of order and offer the necessary amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5, page 62, insert after the word "thousand" the word "four."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. In line 10, same page, "one foreman, miscellaneous distribution, $1,600." His present salary is $1,500, and I make the point of order against the increase.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer the necessary amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 10, page 62, after the word "thousand," insert the word "five."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. Now, Mr. Chairman, in consideration of the fact that the next salary to be affected seems to be a forewoman, I am going to reserve the point of order, if the gentleman from Kansas desires to make a statement in regard to her compensation, out of deference to the fact that she is a woman. It says "one forewoman, $1,400," and her present salary is $1,200.

Mr. SCOTT. I think the gentleman must have a misprint. There was no change in the salary. The language of the bill I have is "one forewoman, $1,200," which is the present salary.

Mr. MACON. The bill I have says "one forewoman, $1,400."

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, there are two forewomen at different salaries, but according to the notes which I have there has been no change. I have the law before me now and I find that these women are now carried on the rolls at the rates given in this bill.

Mr. MACON. At $1,400?

Mr. SCOTT. At $1,400 and $1,200.

Mr. MACON. I do not know how I made that mistake in marking.

Mr. SCOTT. It is very easy to make a mistake of that kind.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a point of order, on page 62, lines 21 and 22, and I will ask the chairman of the committee if he will acept the amendment which I send to the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment, or does he raise a point of order?

Mr. CARY. I will reserve the point of order and ask the chairman of the committee to accept that amendment.

Mr. MANN. The amendment is to be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 62, lines 21 and 22, after the word "dollars," amend so as to read: "Four folders at $900 each; one skilled laborer at $1,000."

Mr. CARY. Now, Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment and have it read for information is to equalize the positions and salaries of those four ladies who occupy positions in that room, Miss Fowler, Miss Quinn, Mrs. Wanstall, and Mrs. Ida Smith. They do exactly the same work. Three of them have been there for over 11 years, and one of them has been there for less than seven years. This increase to $1,000 salary is meant for the one who has been there for less than seven years. Now, I think by striking out one skilled laborer and reducing $100 there, and putting that amount substantially in the other line, giving four folders $900 each, it makes an increase of only $80 and equalizes the four positions and salaries, and makes a little more harmony in that particular department. I trust the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will accept it.

Mr. SCOTT. I will not object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CARY. Eighty dollars is all that is involved in it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been withdrawn, and the gentleman from Kansas accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 62, line 11, after the word "dollars," insert "assistant foreman, miscellaneous distribution, $1,100."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

[Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HAMER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 32004. An act providing for the quadrennial election of members of the Philippine Assembly and Resident Commissioners to the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 28214. An act providing for the levy of taxes by the taxing officers of the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 9566) to reserve certain lands and to incorporate the same and make them a part of the Pocatello National Forest Reserve.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 10594. An act to authorize S. G. Guerrier, of Atchison, Kans., to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of Atchison, Kans.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

Salaries, Bureau of Statistics: One statistician, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000; 1 assistant statistician, who shall be assistant chief of bureau, $2,500; 1 chief clerk, $1,800; 6 clerks, class 4; 9 clerks, class 3; 12 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at $1,300 each; 17 clerks, class 1; 11 clerks, at $1,000 each; 10 clerks, at $900 each; 11 clerks, at $840 each; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at $720 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at $660 each; 1 messenger or messenger boy, $480; 1 charwoman, $540; 2 charwomen, at $360 each; in all, $180,720.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the increase of salary to be found on page 64, beginning in line 10, "One statistician, who shall be chief of bureau, $4,000." The present salary is $3,500.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 11, before "dollars," insert "three thousand five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. In line 13, same page, "one chief clerk, $1,800." The present salary is $1,600. I make the point of order on the $200 increase.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman state that again?

Mr. MACON. Beginning at line 13——

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to say to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] that there is no raise of that salary.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I see where I made an error, and withdraw the point of order on that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] withdraws the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

General expenses, library: For books of reference, technical and scientific books, papers, and periodicals, and for expenses incurred in completing imperfect series; for rent and the employment of additional assistants in the city of Washington and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, and for library fixtures, library cards, supplies, and other material, $15,500: *Provided*, That hereafter employees of the library may be temporarily detailed by the Secretary of Agriculture for library service in the bureaus and offices of the department, and employees of the bureaus and offices of the department engaged in library work may also be temporarily detailed to the library.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the purpose of authorizing the transfer of these employees connected with the library so that they may be interchangeably used as here provided?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom always to permit books to be withdrawn from the general departmental library to the various bureaus, and there are therefore, as it were, branch libraries in each of these bureaus. Of course a librarian must be placed in charge of these books, and up to the present time that librarian has been detailed from and carried on the rolls of the bureau where he or she was employed, and, of course, has been directly under the control of the chief of that bureau. It is believed, however, that it would result in better administration if all of the employees who have to do with the books of the department should be under the control of the librarian, so that they might be placed here and there as would seem to best promote the convenience of the service, and it is in order that this may be done that the proviso has been inserted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand from the chairman that in each of the bureaus connected with the Agricultural Department there is a separate library which is maintained as a separate institution?

Mr. SCOTT. There is a general library in the Department of Agriculture which, as the result of legislation many years ago, is a strictly technical, scientific library. It is probably the best library relating to the science of agriculture that exists anywhere in the world. In that, of course, are gathered books which are useful to all of the various bureaus of the department, and as a matter of convenience shelves have been put up in rooms provided in the various bureaus for the books which cover subjects directly under investigation by those bureaus. Naturally, there must be some one to look after those books, and what we desire is that such persons may be detailed from the library force.

Mr. STAFFORD. What, in the nature of the work of the department, requires the maintenance of distinct libraries connected with each bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. Purely a matter of physical convenience. The gentleman probably is aware that the Department of Agriculture rents 17 different buildings. Here is the Forest Service, for instance, in a building over on F Street, a mile or more away from the department proper. Other buildings are scattered at long distances. The gentleman will realize that a scientist, engaged in research in the investigation of some particular subject, would like to get all the books relating to that subject which he can find immediately before him so as not to have to send for a book when he wanted to look up a certain reference or go a long distance to get that book. It is purely a matter of convenience.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand wherein there might be need for separate libraries, with bureaus separated by distance as the gentleman has pointed out. I can not conceive wherein it is not practicable and feasible to have one general library for all the bureaus under one building or within a near radius.

Mr. SCOTT. There is just one general library, and this proviso is inserted here with a view to still further concentrating the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. No book is ordered or purchased now except through the librarian. No book is given out from the library except through the librarian. So that there is practically but one library in the department.

Now, as I have already explained, when for purposes of convenience a large number of books of this library are required in the Bureau of Chemistry, we will say, which need not be left in the general library room, because nobody except chemists have any particular interest in them, it has been the custom to detail a clerk in that bureau to look after the books. It is believed, however, that it would tend to better administration if, instead of having a clerk in the Bureau of Chemistry, we will say, detailed to look after the books which are brought in for the use of that bureau, there should be a clerk carried on the rolls of the librarian to follow these books.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Bureau of Chemistry is within a short distance of the new Agricultural Building. Can the gentleman conceive of any reason why there should be a library for the Bureau of Chemistry separate from that of the main library in the Agricultural Building proper?

Mr. SCOTT. I presume it is 10 minutes' walk from the chemistry building to the library of the department. I am sure it would be a great inconvenience for a chemist engaged in research upon some subject to be obliged to drop work whenever he wanted to consult some authority and spend 20 minutes walking to and from a book.

Mr. STAFFORD. He might do the same as we do when we wish to get a book from the Library of Congress, send a page over to the library and have the book brought to him.

Mr. SCOTT. The cases are hardly analogous. We only have occasion for a book now and then, and then for a special pur-

pose for a small part of our general duties. The gentleman knows that when a scientist is engaged in research he assembles about him a library of books, a score or more of which he is liable to consult within an hour; and surely he would not wish to put men to the inconvenience of traveling to another building in order to consult books which he might just as well have within reach of his arm.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman's erudition has been great enough to know that it is much better for a scholar engaged in research in scientific work to have a general library rather than a separate library of limited capacity; but as this provision is for the improvement of administrative work I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so for the purpose of calling attention of gentlemen who have not been present before and who are not on the Agricultural Committee to these increases in salary. This committee has been careful in recommending these increases of salary, and I want to say further that in every instance save one the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture was cut down about 50 per cent, so that where salaries were recommended with an increase of $800 or $1,000 they have been cut down one-half. It touches a class of people who can not have an increase of salary save through the action of the Committee on Agriculture, because they are on the statutory rolls.

Employees who are paid out of the lump-sum appropriation can have their salaries increased within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, as the hearings before our committee show. Many of these men who are recommended for increase can find positions in commercial houses and private life at a much higher rate than they obtain in the Agricultural Department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another fact that is striking: There has been no increase in this agricultural appropriation for three or more years. During that time all these salaries have increased just $10,000. Two thousand dollars a year for an increase of salaries of this kind of the heads of departments and some of the other clerks. Can any charge of extravagance hold against a committee that has been so careful in making up its appropriations?

And I want to say by way of parenthesis that the observation applies just as well to increases that have been attacked to-day in the Department of Chemistry. I want to refute the suggestion that has come during this debate on various occasions that the Department of Agriculture has been extravagant in these appropriations, for we have held them down to a degree, and we say that with the development of the country and the increased business that this increase in the agricultural appropriations has not kept up with the business of the country.

What is the effect of the points of order that have been raised here? These salaries very likely will be restored in the Senate. Mr. Chairman, a point of order may be a good thing, and sometimes it is, and at other times it is distressing. Many things that are in themselves good can be carried to extremes. I have heard that a Virginia mint julep was a very good thing, and some people think so. [Applause.] But woe betide the man that puts too much grass in his whisky and does not call a point of order on himself. [Applause.]

We know that orators and poets have exhausted the language in apostrophizing love. The greatest thing in this world is love; yet we know this holy sentiment has been prostituted to wicked ends. A noble American poet said:

Nor suffer the majesty of love to be likened to the meanness of desire;
For love is no more such than seraphs' hymns are discord,
And such is no more love than Etna's breath is summer.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against these repeated points of order here, that it is destroying our opportunity to confer upon these people the compensation for their services that they well deserve and that they could secure in private enterprise. I make this statement now in fairness, in justice, as I see it, to the Department of Agriculture and the committee whose bill you are considering. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, Department of Agriculture: For stationery, blank books, twine, paper, gum, dry goods, soap, brushes, brooms, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, ice, fuel, water and gas pipes, heating apparatus, furniture, carpets, and matting; for lights, freight, express charges, advertising, telegraphing, telephoning, postage, washing towels, and necessary repairs and improvements to buildings and heating apparatus; for rent in the District of Columbia; for the purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and the purchase and repair of harness and vehicles, for official purposes only; for the payment of duties on imported articles, and the Department of Agriculture's proportionate share of the expense of the dispatch agent in New York; for official traveling expenses; and for other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for, and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the department, $110,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. I would like to ask the chairman how much rent this department pays now in the District.

Mr. SCOTT. The department paid during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, rent to the amount of $69,929.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS.

Salaries, Office of Experiment Stations: One director, $4,000; 1 chief clerk, $2,000; 1 computer, $2,000; 1 draftsman, $1,800; 1 clerk and proof reader, $1,800; 1 editorial clerk, $1,400; 1 editorial clerk, $1,200; 1 draftsman, $1,200; 5 clerks, class 2; 7 clerks, class 1; 6 clerks, at $1,000 each; 4 clerks, at $900 each; 9 clerks or messengers, at $840 each; 1 clerk or messenger, $720; 3 clerks, messengers, or laborers, at $600 each; 4 mesengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at $480 each; 1 copyist or laborer, $720; 5 laborers or charwomen, at $480 each; 2 laborers or charwomen, at $240 each; in all, $56,000.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the increase of salary to be found on page 67, line 24, 1 chief clerk, $2,000, the present salary being $1,800.

Mr. SCOTT. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 24, page 67, after the word "clerk," insert the words "one thousand eight hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, on page 68, beginning on line 1, "one chief clerk and proof reader, $1,800." The present salary is $1,600, and I make the point of order on the increase.

Mr. SCOTT. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 2, page 68, after the word "reader," insert "$1,600."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 16, 1906, entitled "An act to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations and regulating the expenditure thereof," the sums apportioned to the several States and Territories to be paid quarterly in advance, $720,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 shall be paid to each State and Territory under this act.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman in reference to this: Has there been any ruling of the comptroller in regard to it?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it is the opinion of the comptroller that under the Adams Act it would be necessary to pay $30,000 a year to the experiment stations in addition to the $15,000 a year which is now carried under the Hatch Act. I am quite sure the gentleman's recollection will agree with mine, that at the time the Adams Act was passed, in 1904, it was the understanding of Congress that when it matured it should contribute $15,000 a year to the experiment stations, so that, taken together with the appropriation carried under the Hatch Act, the total should be $30,000 a year; but the language of the act is such as to make it very reasonable that it should be construed to give them $30,000 under the Adams Act alone, which, with the $15,000 under the Hatch Act, would be $45,000 instead of $30,000. I will say that representatives of the experiment stations have come before the committee and stated that they do not desire $30,000 a year, even if Congress should be disposed to give it to them, at this time. Furthermore, until this year the amount carried under the Adams Act has been provided in a permanent appropriation, so that it was not necessary for the amount to appear in this bill at all; but it is the opinion of the comptroller that the language of the permanent appropriation will not carry beyond this year unless, as I have said, it carries the total sum of $30,000.

It was therefore believed to be necessary, in order that the experiment stations should get the $15,000 a year each to which they are plainly entitled under the Adams Act, and should not have the $45,000 a year each in total sum which we believe Congress did not intend to give, that this provision should appear in the bill.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the comptroller has held that under the Adams Act the States were entitled to $30,00 each?

Mr. SCOTT. The Comptroller of the Treasury, under date of April 28, 1910, rendered a decision to the effect that the special appropriation carried under the Adams Act expires with the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911.

Mr. MANN. That was my understanding. But he did not hold, and I do not believe that any other reasonable being would hold on reading the Adams Act, that it provides for $30,000 a year. However, that is not a matter in controversy here, and I do not wish to detain the gentleman or the House.

Mr. SCOTT. I have read the Adams Act quite carefully——

Mr. MANN. I have just read the Adams Act over four or five times in the last two or three days in order to see if it is possible to have any such construction, and while I do not say it is not possible, it does not seem to me it is.

Mr. SCOTT. The comptroller held——

Mr. MANN. No; the comptroller did not hold that. Quite the contrary. The comptroller held the permanent appropriation expired with the end of this fiscal year. That is what the comptroller held.

Mr. SCOTT. He held that, and I understood also, but I may be mistaken in this, that he expressed a view that it was a question whether the Adams Act did not by its terms carry $30,000 a year in addition to the sum carried by the Hatch Act. I may have received that information from some other source.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the comptroller might have said, but I think he did not say anything about it. I am quite sure he did not have any holding, because he had no occasion to make a holding; nobody was proposing to pay $30,000. Is it necessary to make this appropriation now?

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. To carry out the purposes of the Adams Act?

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly. If the appropriation were not carried in this bill experiment stations would get only $15,000 next year instead of $30,000 to which they are entitled.

Mr. MANN. I understand it is clearly settled that the permanent appropriation can not provide any additional sum.

Mr. SCOTT. There does not seem to be any doubt about that whatever.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, to prepare, publish, and distribute original technical reports of the scientific investigations made by the agricultural experiment stations established in accordance with the aforementioned act approved March 2, 1887, and the acts supplementary thereto, including rent and the employment of clerks, assistants, and other employees in the city of Washington and elsewhere, printing, illustrations, and all necessary expenses, $20,000: *Provided*, That said reports may be issued in editions not exceeding 2,500 copies and distributed without charge to libraries, colleges, scientific institutions, and persons actually engaged in teaching or in scientific investigations relating to agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, and I wish to inquire as to the work that is being performed by this association of agricultural colleges and experiment stations, and particularly as to whether the association publishes these bulletins and distributes them throughout the States.

Mr. SCOTT. The Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, as such, does not do any work. It is simply an organization composed of the presidents of the various agricultural colleges. This provision has been inserted by the committee upon the very earnest solicitation of representatives of this association, who argued that a great deal of the scientific literature of the country was practically lost because there was no publication in which it could be collected; that scientific students of agriculture in all the various States wrote articles that would be of great value to other students of agriculture, but some of them are published in one periodical and others in another, so that the student who is attempting to find all that may have been written upon any branch of research may be obliged to assemble a score or more of periodicals.

The result, therefore, is that it is practically impossible for any scientific student of agriculture in the United States to avail himself of the work of other students in our country. Another result is that all the work which is done in America is practically lost so far as recognition in Europe is concerned. The very fact that it is scattered through a great number of periodicals discourages the bibliographers of Europe, so they make practically no reference to any work that is done by American scientists. Those are the reasons, in brief, why this periodical is desired.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, if this new arrangement should be established, following the argument advanced by the gentleman, there would be no limit as to the number of publications that would be issued by the department. For if the argument should extend to publications of all kinds of scientific institutions, such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Lawrence Scientific School, connected with Harvard University, it could be extended to juridical societies and chemical societies and other organizations of that character.

Mr. SCOTT. Does not the gentleman think that the moderate appropriation provided here would afford a satisfactory limit to the expenditure?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that when an appropriation is once started it almost always goes beyond the original limits.

Mr. SCOTT. The expectation is that a board of experts representing different branches of agricultural science would be organized who would pass judgment upon the various articles submitted and publish only such as would seem to be of widespread and permanent value. I do not care to discuss the matter at length.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Are all the appropriations for printing for the Department of Agriculture carried in this bill?

Mr. SCOTT. No; none of them is carried in this bill.

Mr. MANN. Why does the gentleman think this provision should be carried in this bill?

Mr. SCOTT. Because there is no provision elsewhere for the publication, and the committee desired to set out specifically the amount that it would probably cost.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, I think this information ought to be published, but the appropriation to publish it ought not to be carried in this bill. It properly belongs under the sundry civil appropriation bill, which carries the general appropriations for printing. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I shall not now insist upon the point of order, but I hope that next year whoever has charge of this work will see that it is here in the proper bill. If it is not carried on the proper bill and I am lucky enough to be here at that time, I will make a point of order then.

Mr. SCOTT. It came from the Department of Agriculture in the proper and ordinary way.

Mr. MANN. The gentlemen in the Department of Agriculture knew that the Committee on Agriculture does not make the appropriations for printing. The appropriations for printing ought to be segregated and made by themselves.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman from Illinois is right.

Mr. MANN. I think this information, for which we pay nearly $1,500,000 to obtain, should be published.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not opposed, Mr. Chairman, to the publication of articles under the direct supervision of Government experts, but I am opposed to the Government entering upon a policy that may eventually involve wholesale expenditures.

Mr. MANN. We have just made an appropriation in this bill—two items, each of $720,000; that is, $1,440,000—for the purpose of aiding in this experiment-station work. By this item it is proposed to spend $20,000 a year to publish that information which we spend $1,440,000 a year to obtain.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am well acquainted with the provisions of the Adams Act. I recall the great work which was done by my lamented colleague, the late Henry Cullen Adams, in obtaining the enlarged appropriation for the State agricultural colleges, but it does not contemplate that the National Government should take entire control of all that work undertaken by these State institutions, nor pay for the publication of the reports giving the results of their experimentation. I therefore make the point of order against the paragraph as being new legislation.

Mr. SCOTT. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, $105,000, as follows: Alaska, $30,000; Hawaii, $30,000; Porto Rico, $30,000; and Guam, $15,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the island of Guam, and to apply the money received from the sale of such products to the maintenance of said stations, and this fund shall be available until used.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Colorado rise?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I wish to offer amendments to this section. The first one is on page 70, line 14, to strike out the words "and the island of Guam."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 70, line 14, strike out the words "the island of Guam."

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. And in line 19 strike out the words "and Guam."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19, strike out the words "and Guam."

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. And in line 23 strike out the words "and the island of Guam."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 23 strike out the words "and the island of Guam."

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of any report from this committee concerning what has been done at Guam with the appropriations that have heretofore been made for this purpose, there being in the first instance, I think, in 1898, $5,000, and in 1909, $15,000, and now another appropriation for $15,000, I would like to ask what has been done and is being done with these appropriations.

I have some personal knowledge, Mr. Chairman, of what appeared to me was being done with the money when I was over there a little over a year ago. There are 26 hectares in this tract set apart for agricultural experiments. There was about an acre and a half of kaffir corn raised that year, and I was told there was not an excess of that raised the year before. There had been a few pear trees set out, and I am reliably informed that in the past year, 1910, the acreage was not increased and that no more pear trees were set out.

There have been a few houses, shacks, built here and there, and the man who is in charge has built himself quite a commodious residence. There is absolutely no necessity for this station in the island of Guam, because it is in the same climate and latitude and all conditions both with reference to soil and otherwise are about the same as those of the Philippines.

Now, I suggested to the chairman of this committee a year ago that I would ask for this item to be stricken out, for the reasons that I then had. I have additional reason now, having some information—not, of course, at first hand, but perfectly reliable, in my judgment—that it is a perfect waste of money to undertake to maintain this station there. It must be known, too, that, politically considered, this is a very peculiar island—the most so of our possessions. It is a naval station, and all the expenses outside of this particular item of $15,000 furnished by this Government are furnished through the naval appropriation bill—their shortage in school funds and their building of hospitals, and so forth. It is an island infested with more lepers, compared to the number of inhabitants, than any other section of the world, I suppose, and they have several kinds of diseases incident to and closely connected with leprosy, so the greatest safeguard has to be put around the island, because it is a naval station, and the Navy Department has taken entire care of it. A Navy officer is stationed there and he is ex officio governor.

Now, I suggested to the gentleman, as I say, a year ago, if he would leave this item out I would see the other committee, the Committee on Naval Affairs, and have an additional appropriation made there in lieu of this. Since that time one of their hospitals has been destroyed by an earthquake, and the Navy Department, at my instance, telegraphed over there, I think, some $6,000, and the building was reerected immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. May I have three minutes more, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER] asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. We will close debate in what time?

Mr. SCOTT. I would like five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I ask that debate on this paragraph close in eight minutes, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. RUCKER] to have three minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] to have five minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. With the understanding that I have five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I want to call the attention of the committee to the further fact that I have the reports of 1908 and 1909 from the governor of Guam. I am not possessed of information as to what is contained in the last report due now, but I can undertake to say it would not shed any more light upon the agricultural situation there than the report of 1909 and nothing whatever concerning any improvement in conditions. The governor says, among other things, that he very much deprecates the fact that the very liberal sum allowed for the agricultural station was not duplicated for some good purpose.

This is his language, and this is the only thing he says with reference to this item or station, and nothing concerning the agricultural resources of the island in any of his reports.

Mr. COCKS of New York. What is the name of the governor of Guam?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. The report is signed by Gov. Dorn. He says:

The governor can not but regret that the liberal appropriation of $5,000 and $15,000 made by the past two Congresses to establish an agricultural experiment station in Guam could not have been duplicated for the building of sorely needed schoolhouses and the payment of teachers of children of the people eager as are these to acquire the language and adopt the customs of the Nation to which they now belong.

Mr. Chairman, I insist on my amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the statement which has just been read by the gentleman from Colorado from the governor of Guam is certainly no reflection on the work that is being done in the island under this appropriation. The expression of regret that an amount of money could not have been spent for schoolhouses and teachers equivalent to that spent for agricultural education certainly does not condemn the expenditure for the latter purpose.

I may say, however, that unfortunately a certain amount of friction has arisen between the governor of Guam and the superintendent of the experiment station in the island. The governor seems to feel as if the expenditure of the appropriation should be placed in his hands. Therefore his relations to this experiment work have not been friendly, and therefore any report he might make upon that work should be taken with a grain of allowance.

The latest report we have from the superintendent of the station shows that—

Of the 32 acres which are adapted to general agriculture all but 5 or 6 are now under cultivation. The greater portion of the land is planted to forage crops of various kinds. One of the lines of work which it is desired to take up is the introduction of better live stock, but before this can be done a regular supply of forage must be assured. On this account especial efforts are being given to the production of forage plants, and Kafir corn, Egyptian corn, milo maize, Johnson grass, Guinea grass, *Paspalum dilatatum*, peanuts, jack beans, cowpeas, soy beans, and velvet beans have all been introduced and are under comparison. Kafir corn has produced large yields of green feed when planted during the dry season, and when cut the plants send out new shoots and quickly produce a new crop. Among the grasses, *Paspalum dilatatum*, a native of Brazil, gives promise of the greatest value. Guinea grass was taken to Guam from Hawaii, and it is believed that under favorable circumstances it will yield heavily.

And so I might continue with a long report of the very active and successful work that is being done in this island to improve agricultural conditions. Certainly these conditions are so pitifully poor now as to appeal to the sympathies of every American citizen, and I am sure that this House will not withdraw the very moderate appropriation which is now devoted to bringing about a happier situation. I have here a number of photographs of the experiment grounds which I should like to show gentlemen of the House, because they show conclusively that the information of my friend from Colorado is not reliable as to conditions existing there.

Mr. COCKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state that oftentimes Members of Congress visiting a place get entirely different views of things. The governor of Guam, when I was there in 1907, was very much interested in obtaining Federal aid for their agriculture, and took particular pains to show me what he had done with the limited means at his disposal and urged me strongly to ask the Federal Government for aid, saying that they were sorely in need of it. The only crop that they have now there is coconuts, and they sell the dried coconut or copra. They certainly do need our help. So far as the climate being the same as in the Philippines, I can not agree to that being any reason for withholding this appropriation. What they need is demonstration work, and as we are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in demonstration work in the South, we certainly ought to be able to help Guam and to show them by demonstration the possibility of what can be done in that island.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Can the gentleman state what the cultivatable area is in the island?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. It is about 10 miles by 16 miles and has less than 13,000 inhabitants.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. But my question is not the entire area of the island, but the cultivatable land.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Their only crop now there is coconut, and it will furnish a coconut 365 days in the year—food enough for every individual.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman from Colorado think that is all they ought to raise there?

Mr. COCKS of New York. In answer to the gentleman from Illinois, I will say that it is difficult to state the exact amount of cultivatable area.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

Irrigation investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the laws of the States and Territories as affecting irrigation and the rights of appropriators, and of riparian proprietors and institutions relating to irrigation, and upon the use of irrigation waters, at home and abroad, with especial suggestions of the best methods for the utilization of irrigation waters in agriculture, and upon the use of different kinds of power and appliances for irrigation, and for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on irrigation, including rent and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all necessary expenses, $80,000.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the word "eighty," in line 9, page 72, and insert in lieu thereof the words "one hundred," so as to read "$100,000."

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, under this section the Bureau of Irrigation Investigations is doing a work which commends itself to the whole American people, not only in the arid regions but in the humid regions also; and being a resident of the humid regions, of course my interest, primarily, is that something more be done in our part of the country. Last year under the appropriation that was made there were $3,600 used in the humid region. The balance was used in the arid regions. It is not my purpose or my wish that one dollar should be deducted from that which is being used in the West; but it is my wish that more money should be given both to the West and to the humid regions in these investigations. The Secretary of Agriculture, under the appropriation last year, was able to put one man in the field in the eastern, southern, and middle western part of the country with that $3,600. The appropriation at that time for all the investigations everywhere was $70,000.

It has been suggested to the chairman of the committee and to me that if the $10,000 additional, which is provided for in the bill, passes, $1,400 will be used in the humid regions, making altogether $5,000. Now, that will not be enough to put two men in the field. My amendment, proceeding on the same ratio, would provide $4,200 in addition to the $3,600, which, I believe, would put another man in the field and pay his expenses. To show that this is necessary, I will read to you from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, page 152, "Irrigation in the humid region:"

The widespread drought of the past summer throughout most of the humid region has greatly increased the interest in the irrigation of gardens, truck farms, and orchards, and the demands on the one agent we have been able to detail to this work have been far greater than he could meet.

Now, certainly under that statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, there should be one other man in this field. I know something personally of what the man already assigned to this work is doing. I have had him in my district, and I would have had him there many times more but for the fact that the demands upon his time were so great that I could not get him. The interest in supplemental irrigation in the South, in the East, and in the Middle West is growing all of the time, and I wish to read just a little further along in this report of the Secretary of Agriculture to show the general interest that is being taken in the work:

The advantage of irrigation as an insurance against the long dry spells for some of the common crops has been brought out in a striking manner on several farms where experiments were conducted this summer. As a result of adding both moisture and fertilizer to the soil on experimental plats in Iowa by irrigating with sewage, the yield of beets was increased one and one-half times, that of timothy was doubled, while the yield of bluegrass was 10 times as great as on the nonirrigated plats.

At Neenah, Wis., it was found that irrigation prolonged the bearing season of strawberries 10 days and increased the yield 50 per cent. On the same field irrigated carrots yielded 50 per cent and irrigated onions 150 per cent more than the nonirrigated crops.

The utilization of a flowing well at Albany, Ga., in irrigating corn the past season quadrupled the yield, and as the result of an experiment conducted by this department wells are now being sunk in this district for the irrigation of corn, cotton, and legumes in order to insure against droughts, to introduce scientific rotation, and to increase the profits from small farms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CANDLER. Will not the gentleman make it 15 minutes? There are one or two other gentlemen who desire to speak on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that debate on the paragraph close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAIG. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary goes on further and discusses a proposition which vitally affects the people of the South, namely, that wherever the boll weevil has made its appearance it is absolutely necessary to insure the food crops; and they can not be insured absolutely unless something is done to supplement the rainfall. Droughts of more or less duration occur not only in the South, where the most interest in supplemental irrigation has been shown, but in practically all of the humid region. It is true that our rainfall is large and that it would be ample for all purposes if we could control it so as to distribute it properly when it is most needed. Of course that can not be done; and a very large part of our annual rainfall is lost because it comes in such great quantities at times that the earth can not absorb it and it runs off into the streams. At other times, and frequently during the growing season, there are prolonged periods of drought when vegetation suffers and crops are greatly curtailed and sometimes lost.

As an evidence of the widespread need of something to assist the farmer in his fight against the vagaries of the elements, I call your attention to the following tables of droughts, one compiled from the weather observations taken at Vineland, N. J., one from observations at Selma, Ala., and one from observations taken at Orlando, Fla. I think these three compilations will give a fair idea of conditions all over the humid regions. The tables are as follows:

Record of droughts at Vineland, N. J.

Year.	Duration of drought.			Rainfall (inches).	Remarks.
	From—	To—	Number of days.		
1893	May 6	July 17	71	2.58	Light scattered showers.
1894	June 20	Aug. 12	53	1.13	Do.
1895	July 28	Sept. 6	40	1.09	Do.
1898	Aug. 20	Sept. 22	34	.37	One shower.
1899	Apr. 9	May 7	28	.27	Do.
1901	June 17	July 6	20	.....	
1902	May 1	June 13	40	1.57	1.25 inches in one storm.
1903	Apr. 17	July 10	85	3.58	Light scattered showers.
1906	Aug. 31	Oct. 16	47	2.45	Do.
1907	June 30	Aug. 3	35	1.80	0.71 inch in one storm.
1908	June 17	July 21	35	.35	
1908	Sept. 8	Oct. 25	48	.78	
1909	June 29	Sept. 9	73	4.07	

United States Weather Bureau record of droughts at Selma, Ala., from 1891 to 1910.

Year.	Duration of drought.			Rainfall (inches).	Remarks.
	From—	To—	Number of days.		
1891	Mar. 14	June 4	83	0.50	0.50 inch Mar. 31.
1891	Sept. 13	Nov. 9	58	.40	2 showers.
1892	Sept. 28	Nov. 1	35	.21	Do.
1893	Sept. 7	Oct. 8	32	.13	1 shower.
1894	Apr. 11	May 12	32	.54	4 showers.
1894	Sept. 15	Oct. 28	44	.72	1 rain of 0.67 inch and 1 shower.
1895	Aug. 28	Oct. 7	41	.30	2 showers.
1896	Aug. 26	Oct. 22	58	.42	1 shower.
1897	Sept. 1	Oct. 31	61	.60	6 light showers.
1898	Apr. 25	June 2	39	.38	3 showers.
1899	Apr. 8	May 12	35	.25	1 shower.
1899	Sept. 2	Oct. 4	33	.13	Do.
1900	Nov. 3	Dec. 2	30	1.00	2 showers.
1900	Apr. 24	May 22	30	.64	3 showers.
1901	June 8	July 16	39	.25	Do.
1901	Sept. 29	Nov. 3	36	.21	2 showers.
1902	May 22	July 3	43	.83	5 light showers.
1902	Apr. 9	May 7	29	.20	3 light showers.
1903	Oct. 8	Dec. 1	55	.53	4 light showers.
1904	Sept. 10	Nov. 1	52	.00	
1905	Mar. 24	Apr. 21	29	.30	3 showers.
1905	May 17	June 12	27	.41	Do.
1906	Apr. 1	May 3	54	.33	Do.
1906	July 31	Jan. 30[1]	184	5.12	Sept. 28, 2.22; Sept. 29, 1.26; remainder in light showers, less than 0.14.
1906	Oct. 1	Jan. 30[1]	122	.76	18 showers.
1907	Jan. 1	Jan. 30	30	.13	3 showers.
1908	Nov. 5	Nov. 30	26	.21	Do.
1909	Sept. 24	Nov. 1	39	.20	4 showers.
1910	Mar. 12	Apr. 4	24	.....	

[1] 1907.

United States Weather Bureau record of droughts at Orlando, Fla., from 1892 to 1910.

Year.	Duration of drought.			Rainfall (inches).	Remarks.
	From—	To—	Number of days.		
1892	Oct. 25	Dec. 12	49	.....	
1893	Sept. 14	Nov. 22	70	0.05	1 shower.
1894	Jan. 1	Jan. 24	24	.01	Do.
1894-95	Dec. 13	Jan. 8	27	.19	3 showers.
1895	Mar. 9	Mar. 31	23	.01	
1896	Mar. 25	Apr. 30	37	.....	
1897	Jan. 1	Jan. 25	25	.05	1 shower.
1898	...do.....	Feb. 14	45	.64	7 showers.
1898	Mar. 9	May 6	59	.19	4 showers.
1899	Nov. 1	Dec. 11	41	.15	6 showers.
1900	Nov. 13	Dec. 19	37	.73	9 light showers.
1901	Nov. 2	Dec. 1	30	.34	5 light showers.
1901-2	Dec. 16	Feb. 19	66	2.04	1 rain, 1.25 inches, and 6 showers.
1902	Apr. 21	May 30	40	.42	5 showers.
1902	Oct 27	Dec. 3	38	.52	6 showers.
1903	Mar. 28	May 3	37	.....	
1903-4	Nov. 29	Jan. 11	44	1.00	1 rain, Dec. 25.
1904	June 1	Sept. 2	94	.....	
1904-5	Dec. 16	Feb. 1	48	.44	3 showers.
1905	Oct. 29	Nov. 30	33	.33	5 showers.
1906-7	Nov. 4	Mar. 31	148	.32	Do.
1907	Oct. 11	Dec. 8	59	.....	
1908	Feb. 21	Apr. 12	52	.25	1 shower.
1908-9	Nov. 15	Jan. 3	50	.68	3 showers.
1909	Jan. 6	Feb. 15	41	.05	1 shower.
1909-10	Nov. 25	Jan. 20	57	.78	6 showers.
1910	Mar. 5	May 7	64	.53	Do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that the man who attempts to farm against conditions such as shown in these tables, not knowing at any time how much or at what time he is going to be blessed with the rains of heaven, or how often or how long or how many times he is going to be cursed with droughts that destroy the profits, is simply playing a game of chance with nature. What does good business sense suggest in such a case? It suggests just exactly what it does in all matters that are of doubtful determination, namely, to insure against a loss. There are no insurance companies that will take the risk; but nature has supplied us with underground and surface water courses that will amply insure an industrious, intelligent farmer against loss caused by a lack of rain. With supplemental irrigation he may protect his crop from drought and put his business upon a basis of certainty instead of continuing to gamble on the weather from one year's end to another. Of course, irrigation in many places is impracticable because of adverse conditions; but in many localities of the humid regions of the United States it is altogether practical, and is being practiced now.

Mr. Milo B. Williams discussed this subject very ably before the Denver Irrigation Conference on September 24 last, and I read from his report:

IRRIGATION IN THE HUMID SECTIONS.

[By Milo B. Williams.]

I have prepared a brief outline and my survey of the territory will necessarily be of a very general nature owing to the large area under discussion. I will first outline the fields where irrigation has made its greatest development and from where the largest number of inquiries are coming for information regarding the subject.

The humid section of the United States may be divided into three territories with respect to irrigation. The most inquiries are made from, and probably the greatest possibilities lie in, the Southern States. I am not including the irrigation of rice, nor the irrigation of cranberry marshes, as we have had no opportunity to investigate them and the inquiries are few regarding their irrigation. The territory comprising Alabama, Georgia, the Carolinas, and Florida may then be taken as the first division.

The second important division is made up of the Northeastern States lying along the Atlantic coast, from New England to Virginia, and extending back to the western boundary of New York and Pennsylvania. This section, although the topographical conditions are not uniformly adapted to irrigation from the standpoint of water practice, yet the great demand for intensive farming created by the nearby eastern markets makes it desirable to adopt irrigation in some form.

The third section or Northwestern States, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, and the upper ends of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, complete the humid section outside of the southern rice district. The territory including Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia is not so well suited for irrigation because of its mountainous topography, while the southern ends of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio practice more general farming in the way of hay and grains and is not the intensive type of farming that will probably justify irrigation development.

After this brief outline I desire to take up the possible water supplies for irrigation in the humid section, and will begin with the South as it is most important. The water supplies of Florida are great. The rivers are very flat, wide, and have slow velocities, while there are large tracts of land gently sloping back from the streams. The rivers, lakes, and springs make up the surface supplies. In the higher portions of the State the lakes are very numerous. In the small county of Orange there is said to be over 1,300, and the little town of Orlando has seven lakes within its limits. On the banks of these lakes are the greatest citrus districts. The lifts range from 10 to 50 feet to deliver the water to the high points. Florida also has a reenforcement of the water supply in its underground flow. There is probably no State in the Union which has such an abundant underground supply, especially in the peninsular portion. This entire section has a stratum of lime stone made up of marine deposits and full of great cavities and creases, through which the water flows readily. In a great many localities, yes, practically all over the State, this water is under pressure and along the coast and heads of streams you can find water boiling up which is fed from the interior of the State. This pressure is great enough to raise it in general 25 to 30 feet above sea level, so that in a great many sections along the coast and banks of streams it is possible to sink wells and obtain a flow, while in the higher portions of the peninsula it is possible to have the water raise within suction lift of the surface. The wells seem to be almost inexhaustible in the amount of water they will either take in or give up. I have seen three large fire hose turned into a well for hours and not fill it. Sewage is often disposed of by running it into highland deep wells.

Coming north we get into Georgia and Alabama and here the rivers are different. They are on steep grades as they come from the mountains and get flatter as they approach the ocean, with wide bottom lands. The bottom lands are used extensively for hay and grain, and probably will be farmed intensively without truck until they are better protected from overflow by the rivers, but in the uplands there are many fine opportunities to irrigate from flowing wells and artesian wells which do not flow. From Montgomery in Alabama, then running southeast to Albany, Ga., there is a wide strip of country where flowing wells can be obtained on the highest elevations with sufficient flow in connection with a storage to irrigate large tracts.

In the Northern States rivers and wells make up the available water supplies for irrigation purposes, while we have in Minnesota and Wisconsin a large number of lakes. Along the banks of the rivers and lakes there are great bodies of good farming land, and as we must think of irrigation in the humid region as a great number of small individual projects and not large cooperative affairs, this condition makes it possible for a great many farmers to utilize the water which bounds or lies beneath his land.

An unfavorable condition exists, however, in the use of river water in the humid sections, because most streams, being heavily appropriated for power purposes, and the deficiency of water for power coming at the same time irrigation is most needed. It undoubtedly will prove much more difficult to obtain laws regarding the diversion of water for irrigation purposes in the humid region than it has been in the West, while in most sections probably far beyond the reach of the few individuals who will wish to irrigate.

In investigating the soils of the eastern half of the United States we find wide extremes being farmed, ranging from the sterile, sandy soil of Florida, which takes water very greedily, to the black muck lands of Iowa, Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana, which take water slowly, while in the Eastern Atlantic States we get the clay, gravelly, and sandy loams, and in Georgia and Alabama the red clay. In Wisconsin and Michigan we have the sandy glacial drift, and in the river bottoms of the entire regions clay and sandy alluvial soil. But nowhere do we find the depth of fertile soil that has made the great arid West so rich, and this enters in as one of the strongest factors in making the western farm methods of irrigation unadaptable, because you can not level the land for surface application without doing great injury in exposing the "locked up" under soil in places and accumulating the fertile surface soils in others.

Taking up the climate Florida is practically the only State included in the humid section that has a distinct wet and dry season. The wet season comes in the summer and the dry in the winter. It receives an annual rainfall of 40 to 70 inches, practically all of which comes between the months of April and October. They are apt to have a shower any time during the dry season, but it can not be counted upon. During the winter of 1906–7 they had less than a half inch in 5 months, while the total for the 2 years was over 130 inches. The usual winter rainfall is 4 or 5 inches, but it may all come in one storm.

As we come north in Florida we cross the frost line or the line below which they consider it safe to raise citrus fruit—about half way up the peninsula—and as we come still farther up into Georgia and Alabama, the crop can be planted to catch the market early or late and the irrigation becomes a matter of insurance, while as we come farther north irrigation is still more a matter of insurance. In the short northern season the grower can not afford to run the risk of losing two or three weeks in the middle of his growing period by a drouth, as he may be caught later by a frost, so it is desirous to rush his crops through to maturity as fast as possible.

The irrigated crops of Florida are truck and citrus fruits. This State has the largest irrigated area in the humid section, not including rice and cranberries. There are probably between 4,000 and 6,000 acres irrigated, the bulk of it being at Sanford in the noted celery fields. The citrus fruit is being irrigated in all the districts to a large extent, although many growers make good crops by intensive cultivation alone.

Georgia and Alabama, and the Atlantic coast States extending north, irrigate for early truck to come into the markets after the winter stuff of Florida and before the Northern States, while in the past two years our experiments have shown that it is profitable to irrigate the old stable crops of corn, cotton, potatoes, etc., in the Southern States.

The principal crops irrigated in the Northern States are truck, small berries, and apples. Most pleasing results are being obtained in all these crops, while there are a few localities where meadows and forage crops and grains are showing up well under irrigation. In fact, any crop will give wonderful results if the farmer irrigates when the drouth comes at a dangerous period of plant growth.

One of the greatest problems in eastern irrigation is to find the proper method of applying the water to the land. A great many new factors enter in that are not in evidence in the arid West. In the beginning it must be remembered that practically all irrigation done in the humid region is done by individual plants, scattered about through the entire country; therefore one farmer does not have the opportunity to learn from old, experienced irrigators as the new western irrigator does, and this has brought about a great diversity of methods worked out independently by individuals. Then you will find that the eastern farmer has not been educated to have open ditches cutting his beautiful fields, and many condemn the western method for that one feature. Again, the average topography of the Eastern States is not as adaptable for irrigation, and the water goes to a depth where it is doubtful if the shallow-rooting plants ever receive any benefit from it, especially if a western head of water is furnished to the surface.

Because of the topography and other factors brought out very little flood irrigation will be done in the Eastern States, excepting in a few localities where the natural lay of the ground and the nature of the soil permit; for forage crops and meadow irrigation the surface method

that can be used the most extensively is furrow irrigation and it can be used in row crops, such as the bush berries, strawberries, corn, cotton, potatoes, cantaloupes, etc., provided the land has the natural grades and soil conditions. The use of furrows needs some peculiar obstructions. For instance, in strawberries a large percentage of growers wish to keep the entire ground surface covered with a straw mulch during the full bearing season and object to having it destroyed to run furrows for irrigation that would tend to put loose earth in the patch. Again, it is the custom in many sections for apple growers to raise hay in their orchards and not cultivate clean only, say, two years out of five.

Mr. BARK. Do you find much alfalfa?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Alfalfa is being grown successfully in many States, while the State institutions are doing extensive experimenting with it. There are difficulties in curing it, and it is necessary to use a great deal of lime on the land in nearly all sections. We are trying alfalfa under irrigation in New Jersey and expect good results.

The two principal systems of application developed in the humid section differ radically from western methods. These are the overhead spray irrigation and subirrigation. The spray irrigation to which I refer is outside law sprinkling, and where plants are put in to spray 10 to 30 acres, spraying 5 to 10 acres at one operation. The first systems were designed to use circular spray nozzles similar to the lawn sprinkler. Individual nozzles were mounted on standpipes, which were located at distances so the spray would meet while being fed from a system of underground piping. This proved to be a most expensive system to install and is now being replaced by a more successful overhead-spray system. I refer to what is known in the East as the Skinner method, which is a system devised and first used by a Mr. Skinner, of Troy, Ohio, in greenhouse irrigation and later to irrigate outdoor trucking crops.

Mr. ROCKWELL. What is the cost of installing nozzles?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It runs very high on account of the necessary network of underground pressure pipe. From $200 to $300 per acre would probably cover the cost, independent of the pumping plant.

Mr. ADAMS. What size pipe do they use?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very seldom over 6-inch for main distribution pipes and ¾-inch for standpipes to the nozzles.

The Skinner system consists of laying one main feed pipe across the end or through the center of a field, depending upon the area to be irrigated, from which at intervals of 50 to 60 feet standpipes are brought up, each to feed a lateral pipe line supported on posts at an elevation of 7 feet above the ground. These laterals parallel each other across the field, each spraying a certain strip of land.

Mr. ADAMS. How wide apart are they placed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. From 50 to 60 feet, depending upon the pressure obtainable. In the shell of each lateral pipe line is screwed a set of small brass nozzles 4 feet apart, each throwing a fine straight stream, and all located in a direct line on the same side of the pipe. Then, as the pipe is so supported on posts that it can be rolled in its bearings, this line of nozzles can be turned to throw the water to any desired location in the lateral's zone.

In considering the installation of a system of this nature it first must be planned to grow a crop that will pay interest on the investment from its net returns; the system will cost $80 to $100 per acre, independent of the pumping plant.

Mr. BARK. The cost of pumping must be high.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the direction from which you can attack the system, but I find that the amount of water needed at one time to irrigate the delicate truck crops of the humid States is very small and you can get along with so much less water by this absolute control and so little labor is required that it goes a long way to balancing up for the extra power needed to do the work. Such crops as celery, lettuce, onions, etc., generally pay well under this system.

The spray system has many advantages in operation. It gives the irrigator absolute control of the amount of water he applies, which gives him a much better opportunity to fill in small or large deficiencies of rainfall at any time and not be subject to injury from an unexpected rain. Heavy soils that have a tendency to bake can be touched up with a light spray and made cultivable, while the gardener can set out delicate plants at any time and make them grow by many light irrigations that would be impossible by furrow methods of application.

Mr. ROCKWELL. What effect does the wind have?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is generally desirable to apply the irrigation in the evening or the morning when there is very little wind. A light wind sometimes proves an advantage in diffusing the water. We have had no opportunity as yet to investigate evaporation losses, etc. The Skinner Irrigation Co. is seeking for advantages outside of irrigation to supply the plant with moisture. They claim the spray is a preventative of damage by light frosts, on the theory that many crops are not hurt by a freezing temperature, and that by constantly spraying through a cold spell freezing ice over the plants and never letting the ice get dry or below freezing, the plant will come out without injury. The control of certain diseases and insects is being investigated also. I understand that Mr. Skinner will spend the coming winter on a model plant in Texas studying the control of the onion thrip by spray irrigation.

Mr. BARK. The freezing theory does not seem plausible.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A number of farmers have tried it out but have failed because the forming of ice frightened them and they stopped spraying. I think that celery can be saved through several degrees below freezing if handled right.

The second system, the success of which is probably peculiar to the humid sections, is, as I have mentioned, subirrigation by drain tile. I have had opportunity to study a large acreage of subirrigated lands at Sanford, Fla., where it is pronounced a general success by its users. The subirrigated lands lie along the bank of Lake Monroe, which is an enlargement of the St. Johns River. The slope is very gentle from the river back toward the high lands and the upper boundary of the present subirrigated district is at an elevation where flowing wells can be obtained for the water supply.

The few factors noted which enter into the success of subirrigation at Sanford are as follows: 1. A valuable crop is grown that will pay interest on a large reclamation outlay, winter celery, lettuce, etc. 2. The land needs thorough drainage as well as irrigation, so that one-half the expense can be counted against drainage. 3. The surface soil is nothing more than the most sterile fine sand, and fertility is applied to the surface mostly in commercial form. 4. The land is underlaid with an impervious stratum from 18 inches to 4 feet below the surface, which forms a bottom to the soil reservoir and aids in lateral percolation and maintenance of the water for the slow action of capillarity. 5. The crops grown are all shallow-rooting and do not reach the underground tile. 6. The topography of the surface is extremely continuous and even, which permits the tile lines being run parallel to the surface and at the same time straight and on very gentle grades. 7. Their water does not cost them in proportion to the amount used, and therefore large seasonal quantities can be run through the tile regardless of the underground waste.

The construction used is of the most simple design. For example, to irrigate a 10-acre plot a 5-inch vitrified sewer pipe would probably be led from a well bored at the center of the high side of the field and cutting the area into two 5-acre lots. The joints of this main will be cemented up tight and at every 18 or 20 feet perpendicular laterals of 3-inch common drain tile taken out. At the junction of main and laterals a manhole is inserted, so that the amount of water that goes into each lateral can be controlled by a system of plugs. At intervals in each lateral is placed a "stop box" built of cement and containing a small weir wall, in which another set of plugs is used for putting the desired pressure on the section of lateral just above. The joints of the drain tile are left open, but cinders, waste fiber, or some other material is used to keep the fine sand out but still allow the water to pass readily. Each lateral wastes into a drainage ditch at its lower end. The laterals are spaced 18 to 20 feet apart 18 inches below the surface and have 1 to 2 foot fall per 100 feet.

There are some failures in this section, which, I believe, are caused by careless laying of the tile, the lack of the proper underground conditions, or laterals not having been run properly with regard to the contours of the natural surface.

Mr. Samuel Fortier, the Chief of the Bureau of Irrigation Investigations, addressed the Farmers' Demonstration Society at Vineland, N. J., last November upon the subject of irrigation in that locality. From his address I quote as follows:

THE NEED OF IRRIGATION IN NEW JERSEY.

If the land of southern New Jersey is to be farmed in the old way, it is questionable if irrigation is either necessary or desirable. The small revenue annually received from the land would scarcely pay for the extra water. On the other hand, if the land should be farmed in accordance with the latest scientific methods, irrigation during dry spells will become, I believe, a necessity for all crops having a gross valuation of from $50 to $250 and over per acre. Some light is thrown on this point by reference to the records of rainfall and the water requirements of the most valuable crops. For a period of 32 years the average rainfall at Atlantic City has been 40.82 inches. If this amount of moisture was evenly distributed, the need for any artificial supply would not be keenly felt. It is, however, very irregular in its distribution, as may be seen in reviewing the precipitation at Vineland, N. J., during the past 17 years. On frequent occasions the monthly rainfall in this city (Vineland, N. J.) has exceeded 7 inches, and on rarer occasions it has varied from 8 to 13 inches per month, while dry spells of varying duration have occurred, in which the natural rainfall was wholly inadequate to meet the requirements of growing crops. The accompanying table gives a record of some of the dry periods which the farmers of this district have had to contend with since 1893.

Compare, if you will, the cloud water in the above table with the ditch water used by a western farmer. In raising alfalfa, for example, he puts on from 3 to 6 inches of water per month while the plants are growing. Three inches per month, including both ditch and irrigation water, is considered the least amount of water which will keep alfalfa in a vigorous condition. What is true of alfalfa also applies to most of the truck crops. These may not require so much water at any one time, but it should be more frequently applied. We are therefore very glad of the opportunity to cooperate with your society in an effort to find out to what extent irrigation water will increase the yield and improve the quality of your best paying crops.

On May 8, 1909, this same gentleman wrote as follows to the State Horticultural Society at Jacksonville, Fla.:

Compared with the arid region, the citrus districts of Florida have an abundant annual rainfall, but since much of this is wasted in runoff during heavy downpours the amount which the roots of trees can obtain is frequently below rather than above what is required. Then, too, long periods occur when little rain falls. The Weather Bureau records show that at Orlando, from November 1, 1906, to March 31, 1907, a period of five months, the rainfall was only a trifle more than half an inch. The quantity of water required by the citrus orchards of Riverside, Cal., including both irrigation and rain water, averages about 3 inches a month. For the past 9 years at Tampa, Fla., the average rainfall during October and November has been only 1½ inches per month, and for more than half the year it is considerably below 3 inches per month.

The preliminary investigations made by Mr. Williams, in your State, during the past winter have convinced him of the need of installing irrigation plants to supplement the natural rainfall and as an insurance against crop failures during dry periods. The lakes, rivers, and artesian basins of the peninsula furnish abundant water supplies at low cost, and the only questions that are deserving of careful consideration are the installation of the right kind of a pumping plant that will perform efficient service, the adoption of the best distribution system, when both economy and efficiency are the main factors, and the application of water in such a way and by the use of such implements as will best serve the objects sought.

This office has been studying such questions in the West for the past 10 years, and if any of the experience thus gained or the data collected will prove of service to your industry we shall endeavor to place both at your disposal.

In order that we may have before us some further information as to the technical side of the question under discussion, I submit some observations of eminent engineers on the subject of irrigation of orange groves and subirrigation in Florida, the paper on the irrigation of orange groves being a statement concerning the plant of Charles Drennen, of Orlando, Fla., prepared by Mr. M. B. Williams for the Florida State Horticultural Society:

STATEMENT CONCERNING PLANT OF CHARLES DRENNEN, ORLANDO, FLA., PREPARED BY MILO B. WILLIAMS FOR THE FLORIDA STATE HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY, MAY 17, 1910.

During the spring of 1909 a cooperative arrangement was entered into between Dr. Charles Drennen, of Orlando, Fla., and the Office of Experiment Stations, United States Department of Agriculture, for the installation of an experimental irrigation plant and distribution system

for the purpose of investigating the practical and economical methods of applying water to citrus groves in Florida.

Preliminary surveys were run and tests made during the spring months of 1909, the tests being conducted with the pumping plant Dr. Drennen had at that time. Water was conveyed through the orchard in open ditches and applied to the surface in furrows or in basins. This study led to the following general conclusions:

That the loss of water is excessive when run for a length of time in open supply ditches made in sandy soil.

That water can be distributed over the surface in small furrows, providing the furrows are given proper grades and from 25 to 30 gallons of water per minute be supplied to each furrow.

That the tendency of the dry soil is to present a resistance to the absorption of water when first applied, which aids greatly in the flooding of small-basin areas.

That the water when applied to the Florida high-land soil in furrows does not percolate sideways in the root zone of the citrus tree more than 2 or 3 feet from the point of application in a five-day period, but has a tendency to go downward rapidly and be wasted in the deep, porous white sand, making it necessary to have a close spacing of furrows and a large flow of water to each for a short length of time.

From the data secured it was decided to remodel the pumping plant already on the ground in such a way that it would be used in supplying a distribution system built similar to the concrete construction used so extensively in the irrigation of citrus groves by gravity flow in southern California.

The pumping plant as now installed consists of a 25-horsepower Hagen gasoline engine, connected by belt to a 5-inch Gould centrifugal pump of the one-stage type. The water is drawn from a large lake and lifted to an elevation of 34 feet where it is delivered into a concrete standpipe which is situated at a controlling elevation in the orchard. The suction consists of a 7-inch steel pipe, while the discharge is made up of two 5-inch pipe lines to utilize some of the pipe on hand, left from the old plant. The economical capacity of the pumping plant is 44,000 gallons per hour, and the distribution system is designed to handle this amount.

The general design of the distribution system consists of large water-tight conduits, laid below the cultivated surface and following the most prominent ridges, in order to reach all high points in the orchard. At points where it is desired to supply water to furrows or basins small standpipes or hydrants are placed in the underground conduit and the water brought to the surface through these devices. Each hydrant is equipped with a valve which controls the amount of water taken from the underground supply, while in the sides of the standpipes are small division gates which divide the total head into the individual furrows. By means of check valves built into the main lines of the conduits the water can be taken, in part or in whole, to any portion of the orchard.

The construction of the distribution system was begun during the spring of 1910. The first conduit to be tested out was built of concrete, according to the standard specification used in southern California, which calls for a "dry-mixture" pipe, or a concrete pipe made from a comparatively dry mixture of sand and Portland cement, wetted only to a consistency that will permit immediate removal of the molds, and cured carefully afterwards by applying water in the form of spray until the cement is set. Each section of pipe is coated on its inside surface with a mixture of neat cement and the standard design of tongue-and-groove joint, as used in southern California construction, molded on each length. Three thousand feet of the above design of pipe was made and laid in the Drennen orchard.

In testing this amount of pipe under the Drennen grove conditions the following difficulties have been encountered: First, that the same design of joint as used in the California field, where the water flows through the lines by gravity and under low-pressure heads, is not suitable for the pressure heads necessary to conduct water in the Drennen grove, and, second, that a dry-mixture pipe, although carefully painted on its inside surface, is more or less porous and shows an undesirable amount of moisture upon its outside surface under the higher pressure heads.

With these data on hand, together with the results of comparative tests which this office has obtained from experiments with "wet-mixture" concrete pipe, vitrified sewer pipe, and dry-mixture pipe during the past winter months, it has been decided to delay the construction of the Drennen system and make arrangements to complete it in part with "wet-mixture" pipe and in part with vitrified sewer pipe, which will give a comparison of the three kinds under the same conditions.

Molds for the wet-mixture pipe are now being built, which will turn out pipe 8 inches in diameter in sections 5 feet in length, with a tongue-and-groove joint. A separate mold is also being made that will make a reenforcing concrete collar, to be placed about each joint, to overcome the difficulties encountered in the California joint.

The Drennen plant is being installed with the following experimental objects in view: To learn the possibilities of surface application of water in the irrigation of citrus groves in Florida; to study the effects, value, and disadvantages of irrigation; to determine the cost of pumping and applying water in irrigation by the surface methods; to gain data as to the quantity of water necessary for the insurance of citrus groves against drought; and to open a field for cheap pipe construction that will meet Florida requirements.

The plant when completed, therefore, will be so constructed that the different methods of surface application may be experimented with on different plats of the orchard and a study made of the feasibility of each method. An effort will be made to determine the proper size, depth, length, grade, and spacing of the furrows to use in obtaining an even distribution of moisture through the root zone and give the least waste of water. The proper amount of water to apply per irrigation and the length of time between applications, with respect to the amount of rainfall, cultivation, and soil moisture, will be investigated in the hope of obtaining data that will be of value to those who are developing water resources or designing irrigation plants. The system will be equipped with measuring devices, whereby a continuous record will be kept of the amount of water used, together with the time of application. A standard rain gauge is placed in the orchard, so that the exact record of precipitation and its distribution as to time can be had and the total amount of water any one plat of the orchard receives during a day, a month, or a growing season can be calculated.

The other paper to which I call your attention deals with the interesting subject of subirrigation and is as follows:

SUBIRRIGATION.

The term "subirrigation" is used to indicate the supplying of moisture to vegetation from an underground system. This method of application is very attractive, but difficult and expensive to apply successfully only under certain favorable natural conditions.

Where subirrigation has succeeded the following natural conditions exist: A surface soil which possesses high capillary power and will permit of rapid lateral percolation, an impervious understratum, and a uniform surface topography which will permit an even distribution.

In a few localities of the United States it has been found that after running water through earthen supply ditches for a time the land was kept moist from the seepage of the ditches and that surface application became unnecessary. This land is being subirrigated by the water sinking to and traveling along an impervious stratum, thereby being distributed beneath the surface, where it can be brought up slowly to the plant roots by capillarity.

In two or three localities subirrigation has been applied successfully by means of distributing the water through underground pipes, but this method has not reached favor for any growth except shallow-rooting plants.

There exists a patent subirrigation system, using continuous machine-made cement pipe for distribution, which injects the water into the soil through tubes placed in the top of the pipe line, over each tube being placed a portion of cement pipe, convex side up, to prevent earth and roots entering the tubes and stopping up the tile. This system is still in the experimental stage.

Subirrigation has reached its most successful state in the truck regions of Florida and California, and the following discussion is given on the Florida system as data on this subject:

System: The system consists of a water supply delivered to the highest portion of the field to be irrigated, from where a main feed pipe is run connecting with a distribution lateral system, which in turn terminates at a drainage ditch or tile.

Main feed pipe: From the most elevated portion of the field the water supply is delivered into a main feed pipe, which is run according to the lay of the land to feed the laterals, the lateral system determining the position of the main feed pipe. The best construction consists of a 4 or 5 inch cement pipe or vitrified clay sewer pipe, with water-tight cemented joints. This pipe line should be placed parallel to the surface profile, so that each lateral will be fed at the desired depth, generally 18 to 20 inches below the cultivated surface. In the main feed-pipe line at each lateral connection, if the water is to be delivered two ways, a standpipe is inserted in concrete, for the diversion and control of water in the connecting laterals. If laterals are to run only one way from the main feed pipe, it is more economical to place in the main feed pipe a T and put the standpipe in the first joint of the lateral tile. It is necessary also to place the standpipe in the first tile joint of the lateral along that portion of the main when a pressure is to be exerted greater than that equal to a head the height of a standpipe.

Lateral system: The lateral system consists of a series of parallel pipe lines made of common cement or clay drain tile 3 inches inside diameter and 12 inches in length. At points in each lateral where it is desirous to check the water a cement stop box is located for use in operation.

A correct spacing, location, and laying of the laterals is most important to the success of a subirrigation system when natural conditions permit the use of this method. The spacing is determined principally by the texture and powers of the soil to convey water within itself. In Florida sandy soils the spacing is 18 to 24 feet. In heavy soils this distance would be much less. The ruling facts of location are the grade of the tile and the topography of the land, the grade of the tile depending upon the texture of the soil. To facilitate quick drainage of the field it is desirous to give the laterals as much grade as possible and yet get an even distribution of irrigation water without water logging the soil at the lower end of the laterals and immediate to the stop boxes. Grades ranging from 1 to 3 inches to the 100 feet are used. To aid in a uniform distribution and to prevent the earth becoming too wet about the cement stop boxes, the best systems have cemented joints for three or four tile lengths just above the stop boxes, and in this way prevent the usual flow from these few joints. The balance of the lateral tile joints are clothed with a shovelful of cinders, charcoal, or some porous material like fiber waste. The object of this protection is to prevent sand getting into the tile and also to permit quick irrigation or quick drainage through the joints.

Standpipes: A standpipe consists of a 12-inch vitrified pipe set with the bell end up in the main feed pipe at each lateral head. The lower end of the standpipe is set in a concrete base in which the tile lines are embedded, also as they enter and leave the standpipes. The office of the standpipe is to act as a manhole into which the irrigator can reach and with a system of wooden plugs control the distribution of the water among the different laterals.

Stop boxes: A stop box consists of a cement box set in the lateral tile line having one open end at the surface of the ground. In the stop box is a weir division wall containing two holes, one 3-inch hole in line with the lateral tile and another 2-inch hole just above the 3-inch for the water to pass through when the lower one is plugged. If the shutting of the lower hole does not afford stoppage enough, the system of plugs may be used in the upper one; the weir division wall divides the box into two chambers, the longer chamber being of size to permit the plugs to be put in or removed with ease. This wall is made low at the top, so that both holes may be plugged and allow the water to weir over, which puts several inches of pressure on the tile lines above to quicken the filling of the soil with water.

Plugs: Wooden plugs are used to control the flow of irrigation throughout the tile system. Generally, each hole in the weir wall or pipe connection will be fitted up with a system of plugs, consisting of a large hollow plug which fits the opening and a smaller solid plug fitting into the hole in the larger plug. By operating this system of plugs different sized streams may be obtained.

This system of plugs, as used in Florida subirrigation, could be improved upon, in the writer's opinion, by introducing sliding gates into the stop boxes and standpipes. The wooden plugs often become water soaked and difficulty follows in removing them or fitting up.

Operation: The operation of a subirrigation system is comparatively easy when the construction has been planned properly and is done carefully. Water is turned into the main feed pipe and streams allowed to go into the lateral according to the amount needed for the existing conditions which each irrigator must learn by experience. Subirrigation is slow, the rapidity depending mostly upon the power of the soil; therefore each lateral must be supplied according to the rate that the soil will take the moisture without oversaturating that along the tile line before it can travel and meet between the individual laterals. The tendency in the operation in a great many of the subirrigated fields, especially when flowing wells are used as a source of water supply, is to overirrigate by allowing the water to run through the tile continu-

ously until water is discharged into the drainage system. This tends to put an excess of moisture into the soil, and in draining out not only gives a loss of water, but leaches the sandy soils of soluble fertilizer.

Adaptability: The principal factors which enter into the adaptability of a subirrigation system are topography, soil texture, understratum, and crops to be grown.

Topography: A comparatively flat area with a gentle slope in one direction is the best lay for a subirrigation system, although it is possible that the system can be used successfully, when other features do not interfere, on somewhat undulating land where great care can be taken in tiling the surface. It is absolutely necessary that the lateral tile have close-grade limits, and therefore should be run generally on a grade contour acting as intercepting drains to the slope, whether this contour runs on a straight line or on a curve. The main feed pipe may be run up and down slopes within certain pressure limits, depending upon the construction used. In general, the laterals should parallel the greater uniformity of grade and leave the greater irregularity of grade to parallel the main feed-pipe line.

Soil texture: The texture of the soil is a very important factor to the success or failure of subirrigation. Even in the sandy peninsula of Florida we find soils too heavy and claylike to permit the use of subirrigation on an economical basis. Soil to subirrigate well must submit to quick lateral percolation and have high capillary powers. The most successful systems in Florida are embedded in almost pure sand. As water in a subirrigation system is placed below the surface to begin with, it is necessary that the soil in which the plant roots lay be capable of drawing the moisture up to the root zone, which is true of soils where subirrigation succeeds.

Under strata: Where subirrigation has reached success in Florida there exists an underlying impervious stratum which tends to hold the moisture in place for the use of capillarity. This stratum may be hardpan, clay, rock, or the water table. In other words, there must be a bottom to support the water while it makes its slow transit laterally and upward through the soil, otherwise there would be a tendency toward a heavy loss by seepage before lateral distribution and capillary action could take place.

Feasibility: The generally high first cost of a subirrigation system makes it quite necessary to figure upon the value of existing factors. Practically all of the subirrigated land in Florida needs drainage before it can be farmed, therefore a large per cent of the expense for the tile system can be placed against the drainage end of the question. The subirrigated sections are the truck sections, also where the value of crops taken off each year is very large and will pay interest on a heavy reclamation investment. The class of growth to be put on the soil must be of root length sufficient to enter the shallow-laid tile, to prevent many difficulties in maintenance. Celery, lettuce, cabbage, potatoes, and nearly all other truck crops are grown by subirrigation in Florida.

Cost: Outside of the water supply the Florida subirrigation systems cost $85 to $125 per acre.

The material and labor come at approximately the following rates at Sanford, Fla.: 3-inch tile, $20 to $21 per 1,000 feet; 4-inch vitrified sewer pipe, $85 per 1,000 feet; 12-inch sewer pipe for standpipe, $1 each; cement stop boxes, 65 cents each; 2-inch iron pipes for lateral connection, 10 cents each; wooden plugs, 35 cents each; labor, common, $1.25 to $1.50 per day.

Supplemental irrigation is not a new thing. It has been practiced in Europe since the twelfth or thirteenth centuries, and the water meadows of England are so old that they would seem always to have been watered as at present. It seems odd, but nevertheless it is true that large areas in Arkansas that are now irrigated to great advantage had first to be drained of water that had stood upon them for years. Those lands up to a few years ago were worthless, wet, soggy prairie. They were drained, wells were sunk, and they are now being irrigated with water from the wells and producing more rice to the acre than any other lands in the world.

There are, of course, many difficulties to be encountered by the farmer who attempts this work, and for that reason, as well as for other good reasons, the Government ought to enlarge the scope of its investigations in order to assist him with information and advice. That this increased appropriation is needed in the humid regions can not be denied.

That it is needed in the arid country I can not doubt, and as evidence of it I will submit the following letters and resolutions from the State of Idaho:

BOISE, IDAHO, *February 7, 1911.*

Representative CRAIG,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith a resolution passed by the Idaho Agronomy Association at its annual meeting at Gooding, Idaho, January 30 and 31.

I feel that the irrigation investigations of the United States Department of Agriculture in our State are of such great benefit to the new settlers and that it is so important that the results of these investigations be made available to them that I can not too strongly urge upon you to use your best efforts to the end that ample appropriations may be secured for the continuance and further extension of this valuable work, which is of such vital importance to the new settlers.

Respectfully, yours, ELIAS NELSON,
President Idaho Agronomy Association.

—

Whereas thousands of new settlers are endeavoring to establish homes on the irrigated lands of Idaho; and

Whereas the majority of these settlers are unacquainted with the requirements of successful farming on the irrigated lands; and

Whereas it is necessary, in order that successful homes and farms be established, that extensive investigations as to the use of water for the various crops and soils be made and the results of the investigations be made available to the farmers of Idaho: Be it

Resolved, That the Agronomy Association of Idaho urge upon the Congress of the United States to increase as much as practicable the funds to be appropriated for irrigation investigations in the State of Idaho.

STATE OF IDAHO,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Boise, February 2, 1911.

Hon. Mr. CRAIG, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing a copy of a joint memorial that passed both houses of our legislature early this week.

The majority of our new settlers are unfamiliar with irrigation practices. If some little assistance and instruction can be given them on the start they will be successful, otherwise many failures will result.

I therefore trust that your honorable body may appropriate liberally to this cause, which means so much to the entire West.

Yours, very truly, FRED NIHART, *Representative.*

—

House joint memorial No. 4.—By Fred Nihart.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, would respectfully represent and make known that the development of irrigation has been very rapid in the West, there having been millions of acres added to our irrigation area during the past few years;

That the settlement on these new lands has been almost wholly by people from the East who have practically no knowledge of irrigation; that irrigation farming is an intricate science which requires considerable study; that the interests of the millions of farmers in the irrigated portion of the West, and of the West wholly, demand that these settlers learn irrigation farming in the shortest possible time.

Wherefore your memorialists urgently petition that the Government of the United States provide more liberally for education on the subject of irrigation through the irrigation branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, and that at some place centrally located in the irrigation belt a permanent institute be established at which instruction in the subject of irrigation and allied subjects be made a specialty, and that said subject be taught to all those who desire instruction therein.

I therefore sincerely hope the House will grant the increase provided for in my amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. MADISON. How much time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I very earnestly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAIG] will carry. Our people out in the western portion of this country need this increased appropriation. It is an actual need, not an imaginary one. This question of irrigation is always a vital one; and the work that is being done by this bureau, under Dr. Fortier, is a very effective one, and is rendering great good to the people out in our section of this country. Now, I desire to call your attention to this point, that practically every dollar—or a great many dollars, at least—which you appropriate for this purpose are duplicated by the different States in the West. One of the most valuable features of the work of this bureau is its cooperative work. Why, the State of California appropriated $60,000, with the understanding that the Government would appropriate $60,000 for the same work, and together they have done magnificent work in California. My friend HAWLEY, who sits here to my left, represents a State which is considering the question.

The State of Idaho appropriated some $6,000 with the understanding that the Government would use the same amount, and Idaho and the Government have been cooperating and getting magnificent results. The State of Texas is contemplating the same thing; also the State of Colorado; and my own State has under consideration an appropriation of money with the understanding that the same amount that it puts into the work the Government will put in also. Now, all of these States can not be accommodated unless this House will give the necessary money for the cooperative agreement, and in doing so you are doubling your dollars when you appropriate them for the purpose of assisting this bureau; and I earnestly hope that the amendment which is offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAIG] will carry. [Applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. I quite agree with all that has been said by the gentleman from Alabama and my colleague from Kansas as to the importance of the work that is being done by this office and as to the efficiency of that work. I believe, however, that the committee has sufficiently recognized its importance by bringing in here a recommendation that an appropriation be made which is in the aggregate $12,820 greater than the appropriation for the same work for the current year. That is an increase of nearly 20 per cent in the appropriation, and it will provide for a very large amount of new work. It is exactly the sum that was recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture in the estimates submitted to the committee, and it has not been my experience that the Department of Agriculture fails to ask for the money which it thinks it can satisfactorily and profitably use. I trust, therefore, that the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAIG].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADISON) there were—ayes 22, noes 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Drainage investigations: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands and to prepare plans for the removal of surplus waters by drainage and for the preparation and illustration of reports and bulletins on drainage, including rent and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all necessary expenses, $80,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 16, page 72, after the word "expenses," strike out "eighty" and insert "two hundred and fifty," so that it will read "$250,000."

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to increase the amount carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for drainage investigations from $80,000 to $250,000.

The Department of Agriculture, during the last four years, has expended for drainage investigation $290,588.40. These investigations covered an area of almost 10,000,000 acres. About one-half of the lands investigated were subject to overflow by floods; about two and a half millions were lands continually wet and swampy; about one-half million were lands requiring new outlets or the improvement of water courses. A little more than 350,000 acres of irrigated lands needing drainage were investigated. Experiments in farm drainage were limited to about 5,500 acres.

CHARACTER OF INVESTIGATIONS.

The character of the work carried on by the department consisted of drainage examinations and surveys made in the interest of agriculture, at the request of farmers' organizations and drainage districts, or of other persons or associations having special drainage difficulties and requiring information of a reliable character. The drainage districts have been required to contribute a part of the expense. Preliminary and advisory work alone are done.

The department has been able, on account of the limited appropriation available, to make the investigations and furnish assistance in only a few of the many cases, comparatively, in which its services have been invoked.

In addition to these investigations and surveys, the department's engineers have given advice to commissioners of local drainage districts, and have aided and directed them in commencing and conducting their work in accordance with approved methods. This work is not included in the areas above set forth.

Investigations relative to drainage have been made of muck lands of various kinds with a view to determining the depth to which the water may be lowered, the conservation of moisture in dry seasons, and the amount of water necessary to be removed from a saturated muck.

Experiments in the drainage of irrigated lands have been made in cooperation with farmers in California, Utah, Wyoming, Washington, Texas, and New Mexico. Special examinations have also been made of salt marshes along the Atlantic coast. Farmers' organizations are furnished with bulletins containing information, as are local drainage districts, and those actively interested in the organization and development of drainage districts under local laws.

No feature of the work done by the Department of Agriculture has been more fruitful of benefit. The extension of irrigated areas in the West and in the South make necessary and desirable the rapid extension of this service. Since 1904 hundreds of thousands of acres of lands in the State of Arkansas have been irrigated for the culture of rice. This has added a new industry, exceedingly profitable, to that section; but it has brought to agriculture there new problems, not the least among which is the drainage of the irrigated lands. It is quite as important to be able to get rid of the water from rice lands at the right time as it is to be able to supply it when needed.

The department has recognized the importance of investigations in the drainage of rice lands. It has made a few experiments, very satisfactory in their results. It is hampered and embarrassed by a lack of sufficient funds with which to prosecute this very important line of research.

SWAMP AND OVERFLOWED LANDS.

The vast area of swamp and overflowed lands in the Union, and situated especially within the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, South Carolina, North Carolina, Florida, and Maryland, can, in the main, be reclaimed to cultivation by systematic and comprehensive drainage plans which can only be devised so as to inspire the confidence of all interested through the investigations and reports of the Department of Agriculture and its engineers. It is difficult to state, within a narrow limit, the importance of this subject. These several States are all making rapid progress, under local laws, in the reclamation of this character of land. It is not designed that the Government of the United States shall relieve the localities affected of the responsibility of conducting this work and of meeting the expense which it occasions. But it is desired for many reasons that the Federal Government shall make the investigations and plan the drainage systems on a broad and comprehensive scale, so that the work of one local district will not interfere with the work of another, and so that the systems adopted in one State for the drainage of its wet lands will not impose needless or unfair burdens on adjoining States. It can not be denied that the services of the department in this regard have already resulted in great good. The assistance rendered local drainage districts in various parts of the Union in formulating plans and in starting and prosecuting the work has been of great practical benefit.

In this subject the people of the great Mississippi Valley are profoundly and directly interested. Within the lazy embrace of its swamps and lagoons are locked millions of acres of immeasurable fertility and productivity. The reclamation of this vast area is a work of such importance and gives promise of such great results as to occasion a meeting of the governors of five States in the city of Memphis recently. They gave their unqualified indorsement to a resolution asking that this Congress make more liberal appropriations for drainage investigations. A convention held in the city of Memphis recently, attended by citizens from Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, and other States, enthusiastically indorsed the work done by the Department of Agriculture, and asked greater liberality in appropriations to the end that this service may be speedily extended.

Its adoption will result in practical benefit. You of the West, who enjoy the results of the wonderful system of irrigation which has reclaimed millions of acres of desert and semi-arid land, should sympathize with this movement to reclaim the swamp land in other sections; for it is certainly true that the movement, viewed from the standpoint of area to be affected and of results to be accomplished, is not less important than that of irrigation, which has accomplished so much for the West. [Applause.]

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute, which I ask the Clerk to report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all the paragraph beginning on line 10, page 72, after the words "Drainage investigations," down to and including the word "dollars," on line 17 of page 72, and insert in lieu thereof the following, so that it will read:

"To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to locate, survey, investigate, and report upon the drainage of swamp and other wet lands in the United States, with a view of determining what of such lands are susceptible of drainage, and at what cost per acre, the value and effect of drainage on such lands with respect to the public health and agricultural production, together with reports on existing legislation of the different States on the subject of drainage and operations thereunder, foreign drainage policies and their results, and the relation of the Federal Government to local and State authorities and legislation on drainage; and to prepare plans for the removal of surplus waters by drainage; and for the preparation, printing, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins on drainage, including rent and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere and all necessary expenses, $250,000."

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, for several years I have been deeply interested in the subject of drainage. I have given it considerable study and attention since I have been in Congress. I do not believe there is any subject which deserves greater consideration by Congress than legislation looking to the drainage of the swamp lands of the country.

In Senate Document No. 443, Sixtieth Congress, first session, on the subject of "Swamp Lands of the United States," we are told that there are in the United States 79,005,023 acres of wet land, and in addition to that there are 150,000,000 acres of what is now known and occupied as farm lands, which is too wet for the most profitable cultivation and whose production would be increased 20 per cent by proper drainage. These figures are enormous, and to one who has not given the matter considerable study I may add that they are surprising.

Showing how the 79,005,023 acres of unreclaimed swamp and overflowed lands are distributed, I wish to read the following, taken from the Senate document that I have just referred to:

The following is an estimate of the number of acres of swamp and overflowed lands in the several States which may be reclaimed for agriculture, exclusive of the coast lands, which are overflowed by tidewater. The acreage given is that obtained from the most recent in-

formation secured by correspondence with officials of the counties in the States represented.

	Acres.
Alabama	1,479,200
Arkansas	5,911,300
California	3,420,000
Connecticut	30,000
Delaware	127,200
Florida	19,800,000
Georgia	2,700,000
Illinois	925,000
Indiana	625,000
Iowa	930,500
Kansas	359,380
Kentucky	444,600
Louisiana	10,196,605
Maryland	192,000
Maine	156,520
Massachusetts	59,500
Michigan	2,947,439
Minnesota	5,832,308
Mississippi	5,760,200
Missouri	2,439,600
Nebraska	512,100
New Hampshire	12,700
New Jersey	326,400
New York	529,100
North Carolina	2,748,160
North Dakota	200,000
Ohio	155,047
Oklahoma	31,500
Oregon	254,000
Pennsylvania	50,000
Rhode Island	8,064
South Carolina	3,122,120
South Dakota	611,480
Tennessee	639,600
Texas	2,240,000
Vermont	23,000
Virginia	800,000
Washington	20,500
West Virginia	23,900
Wisconsin	2,360,000

The lands above enumerated are not all permanently unfit for cultivation in their natural state, but part of them are swamp or are subject to such frequent overflows from streams as to be entirely unproductive, while a part are only periodically rendered unfit for cultivation by reason of their wet condition. The lands named in the foregoing list are properly those which may be wholly reclaimed from either a permanently or periodically swamp or overflowed condition.

It will be observed that Georgia has 2,700,000 acres of swamp and overflowed lands that are susceptible of improvement and reclamation, a great portion of which are in the district that I have the honor to represent. Most of this land is very fertile and would be unusually productive and profitable if it were drained and put in condition that it could be cultivated. In its present condition, swampy and wet, it is practically worthless. In many cases it is a nuisance, because, without question, it depreciates the value of the adjoining and surrounding land of a better character and is conducive of malaria. Figuring that this land is worth $1 per acre, which is a reasonable valuation for it in its present wet condition, remembering that it is producing nothing of the world's wealth, with a comparatively small expenditure per acre this vast amount of land, if properly drained, would be worth at least $20 per acre, which would mean $54,000,000 in valuation, as against $2,700,000, showing an increase of $51,300,000, to say nothing of the agricultural production every year that would result to the State of Georgia. What I have said with regard to Georgia's swamp lands applies with equal force to the wet lands in all of the other States of the Union, and I imagine that the increase in value would be in about the same proportion.

The Government is committed to the project of irrigating the arid lands of the West. I do not propose to discuss the wisdom of the legislation through which the Government has become committed to the irrigation of the arid lands, but I do think that there is ample precedent for the Government to undertake to drain the swamp and wet lands of the country in that it is already committed to the same principle in the irrigation of arid lands. I am of the opinion that there is even a stronger argument in favor of legislation whereby the swamp and overflowed lands of the country may be drained than there is in favor of irrigating the arid lands. It is not a question, however, as to whether we shall have drainage to the exclusion of irrigation, or vice versa. The fact is, however, that the arid lands are being irrigated on a large scale through the help of the National Government, while the swamp lands are receiving but little attention. If it is just and right to irrigate the arid lands, it is equally right and just that the Government contribute toward the drainage of the lowlands.

The amendment that I have offered provides for a general survey and investigation of the swamp and wet lands of the United States to determine what of such lands can be drained, and at what cost per acre, the value and effect of such drainage with respect to public health and agricultural production, all of which will be accomplished if my amendment is adopted. It provides further that reports on the existing legislation of the different States be looked into and reported upon, as well as foreign drainage policies and their results. It will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare plans for the drainage of these lowlands, and to have printed the results of his investigations, in order that the general public may have the benefit thereof.

Since I have been in Congress I have gotten through the Department of Agriculture a preliminary drainage examination of Liberty, Bryan, and McIntosh Counties, and a survey of Effingham County is soon to be made, in Georgia. In taking the matter up with a view of distributing to the people residing in those counties copies of the surveys, I found that there is no provision under which the reports of these drainage surveys can be printed for distribution. I have had a great number of requests from citizens in the district that I represent for copies of the surveys of the counties that I have just named, and in each case where copies have been furnished they have been typewritten copies, entailing an immense amount of work and great delay. If we are to provide for this important work of drainage investigation, we should do it in a way that will be effective.

I regret to admit that of the 23 States which have enacted general drainage laws, which are considered operative and sufficient to accomplish the purpose for which they were made, Georgia is not included. I hope that the next Georgia Legislature will see the wisdom of enacting a drainage law for that State along the line of the one enacted by North Carolina.

In 12 of the States that have drainage laws large areas of wet lands have been reclaimed under their provisions, while in the other 11 the laws have not been in force for a sufficient length of time for the completion of extensive drainage work, but I am advised that large projects have been inaugurated and are in process of construction in several of the States last referred to.

In Senate Document No. 443, which I referred to awhile ago, we are told that—

It is estimated that the following areas in the States named have been drained and reclaimed under the provisions of the State drainage laws:

	Acres.
Illinois	3,496,000
Indiana	3,358,000
Ohio	3,400,000
Michigan	1,600,000
Minnesota	1,500,000
Iowa	915,000
California	700,000
Missouri	350,000
Wisconsin	200,000
Nebraska	100,000
North Dakota	150,000
Louisiana	120,000
Total	15,889,000

The States of Arkansas, Mississippi, Kansas, Texas, and Washington have drainage laws similar to the above States, and have under consideration the execution of projects of considerable magnitude. The States of Utah, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Montana have laws, the efficiency of which has not been fully tested. All other States of the Union, except Alabama, Georgia, Nevada, Wyoming, and West Virginia, have drainage laws, some of which were enacted at an early date, but are not now regarded adequate for use in cooperative agricultural drainage.

The benefits that will result from drainage are manyfold. I wish to refer briefly to the effect, as discussed in the Senate document already referred to, that it will have in benefiting agriculture and in improving the health of the country.

The benefits that would accrue to agriculture from thoroughly draining the lands classed as swamp and overflowed will be, first, the addition of 79,005,023 acres which are now waste to the productive area of the country. This land will differ greatly in value when reclaimed, since it is found in widely different climatic conditions and does not possess equal natural fertility, nor will it be possible to cultivate all of it with equal profit.

The effect of draining swamp and overflowed lands upon the public health is shown by a decrease of malarial diseases and of mortality due to them. Such diseases prevailed to an alarming extent in the greater portions of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa prior to the construction of extended drainage systems in those States. The census of 1870 gives the number of deaths from malaria for the preceding year as 52.5 per 1,000 of the total, while the census of 1890 gives the deaths due to malaria at 8.6 per 1,000. During that time large areas of land in those States were drained, with the result that lands which were formerly swamp and unfit for cultivation were converted into productive

farms. It is safe to conclude that these changes in malarial conditions was due largely to draining.

In support of this conclusion the following comparison of malarial conditions in States where the swamps and wet lands were not drained during the same period is given: From the census of 1870 it appears that the deaths from malaria in the lowlands of the Mississippi River from Cairo to the Gulf during the preceding year were 89.8 per 1,000 of the total. In the census of 1890 we find that for the same territory the deaths from this disease were 88.8 per 1,000, showing practically no change in this regard. It is also noted that during the two decades named no material amount of drainage was done in that section. For the southeast coast of South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida the deaths from malaria in 1870 were 66.2 per 1,000, and in the same territory in 1890 they were 61.7 per 1,000. These figures show that malarial conditions did not materially change in these sections during the two decades. It is also observed that little agricultural drainage was executed there during the same time.

Drainage operations in some districts which were once malarial show that such work has had a remarkably beneficial effect upon the health of the people within their boundaries. We are told that the white people of James Island, opposite the city of Charleston, S. C., were formerly obliged to leave the island during the summer months on account of the prevalence of malaria. Since the general introduction of drainage upon the farm lands of that section no difficulties of this kind have been experienced, and white people now remain upon the island during the entire season without suffering from malaria. Some exceptional malarious localities in Charleston County, S. C., have been made completely sanitary within the last five years by means of drainage ditches, constructed under the authority of the sanitary and drainage commission of that county. A particularly unwholesome locality about 7 miles from the city has been made by drainage so thoroughly sanitary that a large manufacturing plant now occupies the ground that was formerly considered dangerous for white men to live upon. Should these operations be extended to the 2,000,000 or more acres of land of the coast region in that State, and to the swamp lands of the country generally, it is safe to predict that the sanitary condition would be improved in the same ratio as in the drained lands of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa previously referred to.

Chatham County, Ga., at its own expense, has been draining the lands of that county, until to-day it has a splendid system of drainage. The result has been that the public health has been wonderfully improved, the death rate materially reduced, and thousands of acres of fertile land have been reclaimed and made fit to be cultivated. This has been made possible through the help and push the great city of Savannah has given the movement in order that the health of its citizens may not be endangered. Through such measures in properly looking after her sanitary condition Savannah is one of the cleanest, most healthy, beautiful, and progressive cities in the whole country, while Chatham's farm lands are of the best, and "malaria" is a word seldom heard in that section, and I hope will be entirely forgotten when Chatham's great drainage scheme has been completed.

With such a splendid object lesson as to the effect of drainage in Chatham County, I am at a loss to understand why the Georgia Legislature does not proceed to enact proper drainage legislation and proceed upon a comprehensive and effective plan with this important work, in order that national aid might be invoked. I can not understand, either, why Congress does not give more encouragement to this great work, which, if carried out in all of the States, would reclaim millions of acres of fertile land and would improve the public health of every State in the Union and would tend to materially reduce the death rate from malaria and kindred causes from one end of the country to the other, to say nothing of the billions of dollars that would be added to the Nation's wealth in increased values and through agricultural productions upon lands that are now practically waste, worthless, and unproductive.

Here is an opportunity for real conservation of health and resources through reclamation that is full of hope and benefit to our country. The arid lands of the West are not endangering the health of the surrounding sections, but the swamp lands are. If either is to wait for their respective improvements, it is less dangerous and less injurious to let the arid lands wait. Our country is big enough and strong enough, however, to carry on both the irrigation and drainage work, and if those representing States needing drainage will speak out and make a fight fo this important work, it would not take long to commit the Government to a policy to aid in drainage reclamation. All parts and sections of the country are interested in this drainage movement.

These vast areas scattered throughout the country, and many right at the doors of our great cities, offer an opportunity for relieving the overcrowding of cities. Their nearness to centers of population is assurance that when made habitable they will in a measure tend to turn the pendulum of the population from the city back to the farm. In many sections of our country requiring reclamation by drainage nearly all the lands naturally cultivable in localities where moisture is supplied by rainfall are already occupied.

The demand for land is increasing every year by the natural increase of native born and by the addition of about 1,000,000 foreigners annually, who must also be provided with homes. What are we to do? We are not making more land, but the population is constantly growing more and more, and the demand for land is growing greater and greater as the years go by.

Our people must have homes. The future greatness and happiness of this country is dependent upon happy homes, and, if you please, upon farm productions, in order that our people may be clothed and fed.

The Government is aiding in making homes in the arid plains of the West, and the desert is being peopled with home makers, building an empire in a region long vacant and voiceless. "National drainage" is just as important as "national irrigation," and can be accomplished and maintained at a less cost with greater benefits to the general public, because the swamp areas are menaces to human prosperity, health, and life. Land reclaimed by irrigation is expensive to maintain, because it is necessary to keep it watered by artificial means, while land reclaimed by drainage would not be subject to that expense, as it would be watered by natural rainfall.

It is short-sighted statesmanship to delay longer in this important matter, for we have reached that period of our progress when a serious study of the conditions of these uninhabited regions of swamp land is imperative and when a broad policy of "drainage reclamation" on the part of the Government is demanded by all citizens who have the general welfare of the Nation at heart.

Some will say, "The Government can not go into the drainage business for the benefit of private landowners." No; but it can loan money upon easy installments, at a low rate of interest, to landowners for the general good, as it is now doing in the great irrigation work, especially as it will improve the general health as well as add to the general valuation in increased values of land and agricultural production. Drainage is of vast importance, but it is too great an undertaking to be attempted by individual landowners, just as irrigation in the West is too large an undertaking to be attempted by individual landowners.

Through governmental aid irrigation has been made possible and successful, and through the same means, if justice is done by this great movement, drainage will be made possible and successful.

I hope my amendment will be agreed to, and if it is I believe it will be a long step toward the reclamation of the swamp lands and I hope will commit the Government in the near future to the policy of reclamation by drainage as it is now committed to a policy of reclamation by irrigation.

EXHIBIT A.

[U. S. Department of Agriculture. Office of Experiment Stations. Drainage investigations. Report of a preliminary drainage examination of Bryan County, Ga., to the Chief of Drainage Investigations, by J. V. Phillips. Field examination made January–February, 1910.]

In letter from the office, dated January 14, 1910, I was instructed to visit Bryan County, Ga., and make a general report upon the drainage conditions of the entire county.

This investigation was made at the request of Mr. CHARLES G. EDWARDS, M. C., first congressional district of Georgia, and information was obtained from the following-named men, who are more or less interested in the draining of the different sections of the county: J. R. Shuman, W. C. Downs, Zac. Gay, E. C. Bell, L. L. Downs, J. W. English, C. H. Downs, B. Myrick, A. G. Cox, Jasper Wise, Z. Shuman, T. M. Morgan, Wm. Ahern, J. C. Burnsed, Z. Cowart, J. H. Keleher, and G. H. Lanier, all of Ellabell, R. F. D.; Hampton Wise, Preston Wise, J. W. Stuart, and S. D. Harn, of Clyde, Ga.; J. H. Blitch, Blitchton, Ga.; Hosteen Roberts, of Olney, Ga.; W. F. Slater, G. C. Slater, J. C. Cowart, and Quincy Edwards, of Eldora, Ga. (Some of these mentioned I did not see, yet they are more or less interested and bulletins should be sent them.)

Bryan County, as will be seen from the accompanying map, is a long, narrow county, situated just west of Chatham County, in which lies Savannah, Georgia's chief seaport. Bullock County lies to its north, the Ogeechee River forms its eastern boundary line, the Atlantic Ocean bounds it on the south, and the Canoochee and Midway Rivers form most of its western boundary line.

It is traversed by three competing lines of railroads. The Seaboard Air Line crosses the northern section of the county, while the Seaboard Air Line and the Atlantic Coast Line cross the south central section of the county. Also the Savannah and Statesboro Railroad affords transportation for the extreme northeastern section of the county.

The county has many swamps over the entire area, all of which afford independent outlets for their respective sections, or would do so if they were improved. I visited practically every section or locality in the county and studied the conditions existing in each, both by ques-

tioning the more prominent landowners and by personally riding over different sections of these creeks, which are merely flat swamps in many cases.

In several cases I found that some of the largest landowners were very much interested in the draining of their lands, and that they wished to go into the work. Not being able to see them all in this particular section at that time, I made an engagement with them and returned later, when I could see more of them.

Some of the more prominent outlets in the county are: Cana Branch, Mill Creek, Black Creek, Savage Creek, Cross Swamp, and Mill Creek No. 2, all of which are shown on the map.

I found the landowners along the Cana Branch district more eager to expend money for its improvement than elsewhere in my entire examination. Those who were ignorant of the benefits to be derived from a plan of drainage along this branch soon grasped what it meant and showed their willingness to go into the work. Although this branch is several miles in length, there is a good fall to it, and the landowners from its head to 5 or 6 miles below desire to improve that section. As the lands bordering along the branch are low, flat woodlands, at wet times the excessive water held in the swamp along the branch soaks into this higher land, thus injuring it very much. By digging a suitable canal along the branch an area of about 2 to 3 miles in width can be thoroughly drained. The body of the swamp itself varies from a few hundred feet to a quarter of a mile in width.

Mill Creek No. 1, Black Creek, Savage Creek, and Cross Swamp each have about the same watershed as Cana Branch. Each also has its swamp with its more or less open run, its black mud lands along same varying in width from an eighth to a half mile. The soil is about 2 to 3 feet deep, with a sand generally beneath this; however, a light brown or red clay is found in places. The area to either side of the swamp is flat, low lying, and badly in need of drainage. This area varies from a light sandy loam to a sandy soil, yet there is very little of these lands that are too sandy for profitable cultivation after drainage.

Note the place marked on the map with cross in the northeastern section of the county. This is the home of Mr. Quincy Edwards. He owns about a thousand acres or more of good mud land and sandy loam. There is a chain of ponds or depressions on this land leading to Black Creek, a distance of some 3 miles. The area on either side that would be benefited by draining these ponds is about a mile or more in width, flat and very fertile, being a dark, sandy loam. The ponds themselves contain gum and cypress and have a black mud soil, with a clay subsoil. Mr. Edwards is very much interested in the draining of this area and is willing to do even more than his share as soon as the department has more thoroughly examined the district and given him a general plan to follow. I think the other landowners also will be made to see the benefits to be derived from such a course in the near future.

As mentioned above, the county is well covered with swamps, each of the larger swamps having its numerous tributaries and chains of ponds or depressions leading back into the higher lands. The Ogeechee River, on the eastern boundary of the county, and the Cannochee, on the western boundary line, afford ample outlet for these several swamps, yet in their present condition, with their poor "runs" and thick undergrowth, these swamps and tributaries are worthless as outlets during wet times, wholly or partially rendering the flat woodlands lying in their watershed area unfit for cultivation.

Regarding practical drainage, there has been none undertaken in this county since the days of slavery. Practically all of it at that time was for the culture of rice. With few exceptions this was practiced along the rivers in the tidal belt. To-day these old drains and embankments have all been entirely neglected and allowed to go to ruin. In Mauldin Swamp, just southeast of Cana Branch, there is an old cleared field containing about 100 acres. This field was cleared and thoroughly drained by slave labor years ago, and it is said that 50 bushels of corn and rice were grown per acre, while a bale of cotton was made on the same area. The swamp has a very rich black mud soil about 3 to 4 feet in depth. Black gum is the prevailing timber, and there is several feet fall per mile. The swamp varies in width from one-fourth to one-half mile, with a good sandy loam woods land on either side in the watershed. Some of the same landowners in Cana Branch watershed own lands in this watershed, and it is only a question of time until this will be brought under cultivation also.

The farming conditions are about the same as are usually found in such localities that have much swamp land. The people are living on the higher places, which, though by far the poorer lands, are mostly free from excessive water. Some of the farmers are a shiftless set of people, depending to a great extent upon either the timber or the turpentine interests for most of their subsistence, and paying little attention to their crops. Fifteen to forty bushels of corn can be made per acre, from one-half to a bale of cotton, about 300 gallons Georgia cane sirup, and about 300 to 400 bushels sweet potatoes, and good hay crops. Though few at present have given much attention to the science of better farming, I see signs of it rapidly coming, for, with a change in the convict system for the State, each county is building good roads. Bryan County now has many miles of well-graded roadbed, while they are extending the same over the entire county. They realize how backward they have been regarding this important feature in agriculture, as also their status as farmers and in general the poor farming conditions. There is now being projected a railroad from without the county, which, if the charter is followed, will go through Pembroke, Ga., down to Clyde, Bryan's county seat; thence to Ways Station. Thus will the people have the very best transportation facilities through the farming section. That section of the county south of Ways Station, though very rich for the most part, is held to the extent of about 90 per cent by wealthy northern men and by clubs for hunting purposes solely. Little farming is practiced in this section, save on a very small scale by a few negroes. Although I pushed my examination down as far as Keller Post Office, I found very little encouragement in my work. I found that the tide usually comes up the Ogeechee River into the Canoochee River, about 3 miles south of Clyde, the county seat.

Having a semitropical climate, a good rich sandy loam soil over the most of the county, being near a good trucking market, and having a fair transportation, by instituting drainage in this county I think the county can be benefited beyond their most sanguine dream, for 80 per cent of the lowlands may, at a very small cost, be brought under very profitable cultivation. And after having discussed the subject with a great many of the landowners I feel that all are more or less interested in this work, though in only two cases do I think their interest great enough to lead them to take up drainage at any near date.

The two places being greatly interested are the Cana Branch district and the district where the cross is made, in the northeastern part of the county. In each of these places a main canal down the swamp will be all that is necessary.

In closing I will say that I found the people to be very intelligent, and that, with some encouragement in the way of circulars or bulletins, they can be easily induced to improve their condition along the line under discussion.

I am inclosing views showing some characteristic parts of the county.

Very respectfully submitted.

J. V. PHILLIPS.

EXHIBIT B.

[U. S. Department of Agriculture. Office of Experiment Stations. Drainage investigations. Report of a preliminary drainage examination of Liberty County, Ga., to the Chief of Drainage Investigations, by F. G. Eason. Field examination made Jan. 21 to Feb. 2, 1910.]

Under instructions from the Chief of Drainage Investigations, dated January 14, 1910, I began an investigation of Liberty County, Ga. This county is in the first congressional district of Georgia, of which Hon. C. G. EDWARDS is the Representative. There is no drainage organization of any kind in the county. Those most interested in drainage and from whom information was obtained are N. McQueen, of Ludowici; E. P. Miller, of Walthourville; A. F. Winn, of Dorchester; and W. M. Stevens, of Dunham.

The examination was conducted by visiting the different points in the county by train and team. Those who are interested in drainage were interviewed and their opinions gotten on the subject. They were also asked to describe the conditions in their several localities. Their opinions were afterwards verified by personal inspection. As a part of this county had already been visited and described by me (see my report on McIntosh County, December, 1909), it was not necessary to visit it a second time, and it will not be described in detail in this report. I wish to draw attention to the similarity of Liberty and McIntosh Counties. They are adjoining coast counties of Georgia and resemble each other very closely in natural conditions and the attitude of people.

Liberty is one of the largest counties of Georgia, having an area of 976 square miles and a population of 13,000 people, two-thirds of this number being negroes. The county seat is Hinesville, and it has no railroad connection. The main watershed runs through the central part of the county in an east and west direction, the water on the south flowing into the Altamaha River and on the north into the Canoochee River.

The main drainage channel for the southern part of the county is the Altamaha River, and its main tributaries are Beards Creek, Jones Creek, and Doctor Creek. For the northern part, it is the Canoochee River, and the main tributaries are the Little Canoochee River and Taylors Creek. For the eastern part, it is the Atlantic Ocean, and its main tributaries are South Newport River, North Newport River, and Midway River.

The soil of the county is of two different kinds. The coast and northern sections are sandy, with a light clay subsoil, and central and southern part is a very fertile alluvial clay, deposited from the Altamaha River and known as the "flat clay lands."

The county has good natural drainage as a whole, but there are several localities which can and need to be greatly improved. In the coast section, a great deal of it is needed. The proposition here is a comparatively easy one, as the whole section is a network of tidewater rivers and creeks, giving many drainage outlets. Before the Civil War this section had a complete and thorough system of drainage, and fine crops were raised. It was the richest section of Georgia then, but the large owners have either left or allowed the places to run down, until to-day all that remains of a once fine system are a few overgrown ditch banks. It is a section of bygone days. The drainage here would be a matter of individual activity, as nearly all of the places are on some creek.

The northern part of the county is high, sandy, rolling land, and the drainage is very good into the creeks and rivers through the branches and swamps. It could be improved in some instances by opening up these swamps.

The central and southwestern part of the county is the section which I desire to call especial attention to, as the drainage here is very poor and it is annually overflowed. This is the section which I have already referred to as the "flat clay lands," but it is really the alluvial plain of the Altamaha River. All of this section can be reclaimed by building some short levees along the river and by digging canals through the swamps to the tidewater rivers of the coast. It is necessary for McIntosh and Liberty Counties to work together in this matter.

The farming conditions of the coast section are very poor. What I have written about this section of McIntosh County applies to Liberty County as well. As said before, it used to be very rich, and the people take great delight in telling you so, but when you ask them why they do not improve their lands and bring them under cultivation again, they merely shrug their shoulders. This country near Dorchester used to have five men worth over a million dollars each, and they all made it off of farming. There are a few small farms in this locality which are crudely worked. A great deal of the land here is owned by negroes, and they can never be counted on for anything progressive. Nothing is recommended for this section now, but there is a possibility that they will wake up and improve their lands some day.

On account of the overflow conditions and lack of drainage in the "flat clay lands," no farming is done here. The section north of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad is the best farming section of the county. I do not mean that it is the best land, but conditions are best suited for it. It is high and well drained and the farmers raise very good crops by the use of much fertilizer. The chief crops are corn, cotton, potatoes, and cane.

The transportation facilities throughout the county are not very good. There are three railroads. The Atlantic Coast Line traverses the central part, the Seaboard Air Line the eastern part, and the Georgia Coast & Piedmont the western part. The entire northern part of the county is without a railroad. The roads are in fair condition. A few small boats ply up and down the large rivers and connect with the coast.

As to the attitude of the landowners, I will again have to divide the county into sections. The coast people have already been described, so nothing further need be said here about them. The people of the northern section are wide-awake, progressive farmers, but are not much interested in drainage. The owners of the "flat clay lands" fully realize the possibilities of the land and are willing to form a drainage district. I found but one of them who was not in favor of the propo-

sition, and I understand from his neighbors that he always opposes anything new or beneficial. I worked this section of the county more thoroughly than any other, and find the people very enthusiastic over the project.

The kind and system of drainage thought to be necessary has been explained in the McIntosh County report. The system will have to be extended up the western part of the county, between the Altamaha River and the Georgia Coast & Piedmont Railroad, nearly to Beards Creek.

The kind of survey has also been described. The work in the western part of Liberty County can be done without a camp, as farmhouses are numerous.

The idea I suggested of making this into a trucking section seems to be growing in favor every day. They feel that if it could be started they would get more for their land. The present market value of most of these lands is from $2 to $3 per acre, and the present value of good truck lands in the South is too well known to state here.

—

EXHIBIT C.

[U. S. Department of Agriculture. Office of Experiment Stations. Drainage investigations. Report of a preliminary drainage examination of the county of McIntosh, Ga., to the Chief of Drainage Investigations, by F. G. Eason, assistant drainage engineer. Field examination made Dec. 9–17, 1909.]

Early in December, 1909, I was detailed by the Chief of Drainage Investigations to make an examination of drainage conditions in McIntosh County, Ga. This matter was brought about by the influential men of the county, with the aid of Congressman CHARLES G. EDWARDS, of Savannah. There is no drainage organization of any kind in the county at this time; neither is there any drainage law in the State of Georgia, but I have gotten them very much interested in the subject, and I understand steps are being taken to form an organization and also to pass drainage laws in the State at the next session of the legislature. I explained to them that this was a matter of vital importance and referred them to the drainage laws of North Carolina.

Some of the largest landowners and most influential citizens from whom information was obtained are: E. M. Thorpe, of C. C. Davis & Co., at Townsend, Ga.; N. McQueen, banker, of Ludowici, Ga.; R. A. Strain, merchant, of Darien, Ga.; R. H. Knox, of Hilton & Dodge Lumber Co., at Savannah, Ga.; and Fred McFarland, representative, of Darien, Ga. The above men are those most interested in drainage, and some of them very kindly took me over the county. Any of them will be glad to furnish the office information at any time. No map of this county could be procured, so a State map had to be used.

The examination was conducted by getting all the information I could from the residents and later riding over the country verifying it. This was done on horseback, buggy, and train.

McIntosh County is one of the coast counties of Georgia, and consequently is very similar in physical conditions to the other coast counties; that is, low and flat with numerous swamps. It is a small county, containing 308,000 acres and about 9,000 people, the majority being negroes. The part needing improvements the most and to which most attention was paid is the northwestern section of the county. This locality is annually overflowed by freshets from the Altamaha River, which is the western boundary of the county. This water comes out at a point in the northern part of Liberty County through Beards Creek, and several other small places down the river in Liberty and McIntosh Counties, overflowing about 200,000 acres. There is on both sides of the river a swamp from 1 to 2 miles wide, called the River Swamp. This swamp is also overflowed, but it would not be practical to try to protect it, as a very high levee would have to be built along the entire river bank at a very great cost. The eastern boundary of this swamp is a narrow ridge of sand hills, known as the River Sandhills, varying in width from 100 to 500 feet. These are very high and form a natural levee paralleling the river. There are several gaps in this ridge through which the water flows, and, as said above, also through Beards Creek. One of the gaps is about 6 miles north of Barrington and is about 600 feet wide. Another is right on the line between Liberty and McIntosh Counties and is about 500 feet wide. There are several other small ones near the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad from 50 to 200 feet wide. All of the water comes through these small openings. During a freshet, the water from the river backs up Beards Creek and overflows the lowlands, being augmented on the way down by water from these gaps. A portion of this overflow water goes back into the Altamaha River below Barrington (see map), but the greater part of it flows down these flat clay lands paralleling the river for a distance, and then spreads out over the entire country (Tibet to Eulonia), finally emptying into the Atlantic Ocean through the South Newport and Sapelo Rivers. The land north of Tibet and east of Ludowici is high and sandy, and never overflows. The lands in the vicinity of Darien are also high and do not overflow, so that the water is confined to an area bounded by the River Sandhills on the west and the high sand hills near Ludowici on the north, and the high land of the coast on the south. This whole section is not overflowed, because the land is slightly rolling, and the low parts only being covered to a depth of from 1 to 8 feet. This overflow water can be cut off by building a low levee about 3 or 4 feet high along the south bank of Beards Creek for about 1½ miles, and by stopping up the openings in the sand hills. This will require a levee 10 or 12 feet high for about 1,500 feet. This can be done for about 10 cents per yard, making the total cost very small, when considering the large number of acres that will be reclaimed.

This section of the country that would be reclaimed is also the one most needing drainage. As said above, the whole county is cut up by small swamps, but there are only two which can be used as main drainage channels. These are Mortar and Jackey Camp Swamps. Mortar Swamp heads in Liberty County west of Tibet, near the River Sandhills, flowing in an easterly direction, and passing about 2 miles north of Townsend, 500 feet north of Darien Junction, and finally uniting with Bulltown Swamp to form the South Newport River. This swamp is not wide, up to Darien Junction it being from 100 to 600 feet wide and below widening out to half a mile. While the general direction is straight, the swamp itself is rather crooked. The other rain drainage channel would run from this one through Jackey Camp Swamp. This swamp starts near Townsend and flows in a southeast direction, forming the Sapelo River at Eulonia. None of these swamps have a run of any size, and the whole being choked up by brush and fallen trees makes them inadequate to carry off the water, and in consequence there is water in them nearly all the time. Entering into these swamps are numerous other small swamps, through which laterals could be run, or laterals could be run as often as desired through the flat clay lands, making a complete system of drainage for the section. The canal through Mortar Swamp would be approximately 20 miles long and the Jackey Camp Canal about 5 miles long. This system would give thorough drainage channels for these lands. Another canal can possibly be run into the South Newport River through Bulltown Swamp, but it is not recommended at the present time.

Not much attention was given to the coast lands, because they are higher and can easily be drained through the numerous swamps into the Altamaha River and tidewaters of the coast. No large project could be formed here, it being more a question for the individual landowners to solve.

The soil is one of extreme fertility and capable of raising almost any crop. The topsoil consists of a mixture of sand and light, gray clay, the latter predominating. This is underlain by a subsoil 18 to 20 inches below the surface. This consists of thick, yellow clay, which will allow water to pass through very slowly. From this clay the Ludowici roofing tile is made. The mass when mixed makes a very rich soil and one that is easily worked. The swamp soil consists of a mixture of black loam and clay, with a little sand, the whole being of light color. This is underlaid by a thick clay. The swamp growth gives every indication of fertility, being mostly cypress, gum, ash, hickory, and a little maple.

These lands are not farmed now to any extent on account of the overflow conditions and lack of drainage. Only the high knolls which are not covered by water are farmed, and good crops are raised on them. Personal notice of small gardens has shown that these lands are well adapted to growing early garden truck.

The amount of drainage has been roughly given above, but it is thought that a very complete system would have to be laid out on account of the compact condition of the soil.

At the present time, while the natural conditions tend toward agriculture, it can not be called a farming country. The only farming done in the county is a little rice planting on the coast and a small amount of corn and sweet potatoes scattered over the country. Along the main road from Darien to Eulonia I did not see 10 acres of cultivated land, and hardly more from Darien to Barrington. The chief industries are working turpentine, lumber business, and cattle raising. The chief crops are sweet potatoes, rice, corn, sugar cane, cotton, and a little garden truck.

The transportation facilities throughout the county are very good. There are two railroads in the county, the main line of the Seaboard Air Line traversing the western section and the Georgia Coast & Piedmont the central part. The main line of the Atlantic Coast Line runs through Liberty County, near the McIntosh County line. The public roads in the county are, as a general rule, good hard roads, but there are some heavy sandy roads. Connections can also be made by water up the rivers, and daily from Darien to Brunswick, Ga. It is quite evident that this could be made a great trucking section and the products gotten to market easily and quickly.

The attitude of the landowners, on the whole, I would say, is very favorable. A great deal of the land is owned in large tracts by private persons and lumber companies, and they were very enthusiastic on the subject. Most of the land has had all the large timber cut off and only a small, second growth now exists, which is worked for turpentine. This industry will, in a few years, play out, and then these companies will have large tracts on their hands, absolutely worthless to them. If anything can be done to better these lands and put them in condition to offer for sale it can be seen what it would mean to them. The present market value of most of these lands is from $1 to $3 per acre, and some has been bought recently for less. Judging from similar conditions and from small, drained rice-field lands on the coast, I should say they would easily sell for from $12 to $20 per acre when drained. If the trucking industry I spoke of could be started here, there is no telling how high the lands would go.

The survey will have to be made from a camp on account of the scarcity of farmhouses throughout the district. It will have to be quite an extensive one on account of the large acreage. All of the main swamps indicated above would have to be run out and the canals located. The main roads should be run out and the watershed determined. Numerous cross sections would have to be run. There is not much brush in any place, except a little in the swamps, so not many axmen would have to be employed.

The three railroads (Atlantic Coast Line, Seaboard Air Line, and Georgia Coast & Piedmont) are all affected by the high waters and the companies should be very much interested in the subject. They would, I believe, help financially toward a survey.

No drainage (except rice fields) has been practiced at all in Georgia, except some work done in Chatham County by the convict forces.

Interviews were given to both of the Savannah papers and are included in the report.

In conclusion, it is recommended that a survey be made, as the people seem ready and willing to carry out any feasible plan provided they are shown how.

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT.

DARIEN, GA., *January 13, 1910.*

Mr. C. G. ELLIOTT,
Chief of Drainage Investigations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 7th instant received and noted.

For the past several days I have been in the clay lands interviewing the people as to their attitude toward the drainage proposition. The majority of this land, as said before, is owned by large landowners. I have interviewed personally owners, aggregating 75,000 acres, and find every one of them very much in favor of the proposition and willing to go their share on draining the land, if the Government proves the proposition feasible. I have not yet been able to see many of the small landowners, but I believe there will be a little opposition from them, as is usually the case. The names and opinions of all I have seen have been taken for future reference.

As to mutual cooperation, I have my doubts. There are always some few that will oppose, and I believe it will be the case in this instance. However, a drainage law will, no doubt, be passed at the next session of the legislature, in June.

I have not as yet been able to ascertain the number of owners that will be affected, but will report on this later.

As to the fertility of this land, from general questioning, I have arrived at the following figures, which I believe are very conservative: Cotton, 1 bale to acre; corn, 50 bushels to acre; sweet potatoes, 300 bushels to acre.

The land is also well adapted to the growing of sugar cane and early garden truck.

As to the use to be made of it after drainage, most of the large owners will sell and colonize theirs, while the small ones will farm.

I will investigate a little further the small landowners, but their opinion will not have much weight, as they are in the minority, and all the large ones are in favor of it.

A few more days will finish this up and then I shall await your orders as to what will be done down here.

I still make Darien my headquarter and work from this point.

Awaiting your reply, and thanking you for past favors, I am,

Very sincerely, yours, F. G. EASON,
Assistant Drainage Engineer.

—

[U. S. Department of Agriculture. Office of Experiment Stations. Drainage investigations. Report of a preliminary drainage examination of the coast section of McIntosh County, Ga., to the Chief of Drainage Investigations, by F. G. Eason, assistant drainage engineer. Field examination made Jan. 3–6, 1910.]

Under instructions from the Chief of Drainage Investigations, dated December 30, 1909, I was directed to make a preliminary drainage survey of the coast lands of McIntosh County, Ga. Very little time or work was given to this section of the country, as it was seen at the outset that nothing was needed. This section, which is now in a very chaotic state, used to be one of the richest in Georgia, but has gradually been on the decline, brought about chiefly by the lumber and turpentine business superseding agriculture, and this business is rapidly dying out. The price of labor has also tended to diminish farming.

McIntosh County is in the first congressional district of Georgia, of which C. G. EDWARDS, of Savannah, is the Congressman. There is no drainage organization of any kind, nor are there any individuals interested in drainage in a financial way in this section.

Several of the largest farms on the coast were visited and were reached by buggy and train. The farms were then inspected personally.

This section is located on the Atlantic Ocean, about 50 miles south of Savannah and 20 miles north of Brunswick. Darien is the only town in this section of any size, it having about 1,000 people. Most of the investigations were conducted from this place. The country is for the most part high, sandy land, with a gradual slope toward the ocean. It is cut up by many tidewater creeks and swamps which greatly facilitate drainage.

There is no main drainage channel in this section, unless it may be called the ocean. There are three rivers. The Altamaha, which is the largest, flows from the upper part of the State. The Sapelo and South Newport Rivers can hardly be called more than tidewater creeks.

The soil is mostly sandy in the vicinity of Darien, with loam or clay in some places. Farther northward, the soil changes to more of a light clay.

What farms there are here are mostly well drained, for they have natural drainage, but in some instances this has been helped by the construction of small surface ditches emptying into tidewater.

The farming conditions in this section of the country are very crude and poor, and agriculture is practiced only to a small extent. There are three or four farms near Darien and some small ones in the northeastern section of the county near the South Newport River. They seem to raise fair crops on them. They plant mostly corn, sweet potatoes, and sugar cane.

The transportation facilities are very fair. They are connected with Darien by very good roads, one railroad—the Georgia, Coast & Piedmont—which runs along this section of the coast, and by private boats through the inland creeks to Darien.

The attitude of the landowners is very lukewarm in the extreme. For some reason, unaccountable to me, these people have a distaste to farming, and will not do it if they can get anything else to do. There are only a few white men in this section, and most of them have nice homes, which were at one time the centers of plantations. For reasons given above these places have in most cases gone down to almost nothing.

There is very little drainage needed in this section, as most of the farms are well drained, but there is some swamp land in this locality that could be drained and put in condition to cultivate, but the landowners seem loath to take up the proposition, so nothing is recommended in this section at the present time.

A portion of this section which is in the "flat clay lands" will be included in the district to be formed there.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I hope the gentleman will withhold the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. Let us see if we can reach an understanding. I will reserve the point of order to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Can I have about two and one-half minutes of that time?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Can I have the other half minute?

Mr. SCOTT. I think we can arrange that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have a few minutes in reference to this matter.

Mr. SCOTT. I think we can arrange to accede to the request the gentleman from Mississippi makes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GAINES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 31596, the agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES ON RED LAKE RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 32222) authorizing homestead entries on certain lands formerly a part of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House agree to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

DISPOSITION OF WATERS UNDER RECLAMATION ACT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 6953) authorizing contracts for the disposition of waters of projects under the reclamation act, and for other purposes, with House amendments disagreed to.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its amendments, and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. REEDER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER NEAR ATCHISON, KANS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 10594) to authorize S. J. Guerrier, of Atchison, Kans., to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of Atchison, Kans.

The bill was read in full.

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

A similar bill, H. R. 32266, was ordered to lie upon the table.

BRIDGES ACROSS CHARLES RIVER, MASS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 26150) to authorize the cities of Boston and Cambridge, Mass., to construct drawless bridges across the Charles River between the cities of Cambridge and Boston, Mass., with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. MANN, Mr. WASHBURN, and Mr. ADAMSON.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness in his family.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. JAMIESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print some remarks in the RECORD in relation to the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to print remarks on the agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8358. An act providing for the releasing of the claim of the United States Government to arpent lot No. 87, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 8736. An act providing for the releasing of the claim of the United States Government to arpent lot No. 44, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 9268. An act releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land being a fractional block bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 9269. An act releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306 in the old city of Pensacola; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 10690. An act providing for aids to navigation along the Livingstone Channel, Detroit River, Mich.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10596. An act to authorize the Rainy River Improvement Co. to construct a dam across the outlet of Namakan Lake at Kettle Falls, in St. Louis County, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10274. An act to authorize construction of the Broadway Bridge across the Willamette River at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 10171. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the reorganization of the consular service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 9437. An act to provide American register for the steam yacht *Diana;* to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 9270. An act for the relief of Frank W. Hutchins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 7650. An act for the relief of Thomas N. Boyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 7638. An act for the relief of Bellevadorah Steele; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2207. An act to provide for the erection of a public building at Aurora, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 1031. An act for the relief of Jaji Bin Ydris; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 974. An act for the relief of Albert S. Henderer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 10691. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

H. R. 18342. An act for the relief of E. C. Young;

H. R. 23361. An act authorizing the Hot Springs Lodge, No. 62, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons, under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Arkansas, to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the organization on lots Nos. 1 and 2, in block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.;

H. R. 21646. An act for the relief of William Doherty;

H. R. 31172. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 31859. An act to authorize the Chucawalla Development Co. to build a dam across the Colorado River at or near the mouth of Pyramid Canyon, Ariz.; also a diversion intake dam at or near Black Point, Ariz., and Blythe, Cal.;

H. R. 30149. An act to transfer the military reservation known as Fort Trumbull, situated at New London, Conn., from the War Department to the Treasury Department, for the use of the Revenue-Cutter Service;

H. R. 18857. An act for the relief of Laura A. Wagner; and

H. R. 29300. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell a certain 40-acre tract of land to the Masonic order in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3315. An act amending an act entitled "An act to amend an act to provide the times and places for holding terms of the *United States* court in the States of Idaho and Wyoming," approved June 1, 1898.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 11, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for pay of the Military Academy (H. Doc. No. 1370); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Attorney General submitting an estimate of appropriation for Indian depredation claims (H. Doc. No. 1371); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation for the authorization of a new building for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and Labor (H. Doc. No. 1372); to the committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims (H. Doc. No. 1373); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of waterway from Lockport, Ill., to the mouth of the Illinois River (H. Doc. No. 1374); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting schedules of claims allowed by accounting officers (H. Doc. No. 1368); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting deficiency estimates for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911 (H. Doc. No. 1367); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the governor of New Mexico, transmitting a certified copy of the constitution adopted by the people of New Mexico at an election on January 21, 1911 (H. Doc. No. 1369); to the Committee on the Territories and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 869) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station for the hatching and propagation of shad upon or near the seacoast in the State of Georgia, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2117), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1251) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Kentucky, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2118), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1378) to establish a marine *biological* station on the Gulf coast of the State of Florida, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2119), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4785) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Nevada, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2120), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2130) for the establishment of a fish hatchery at Paris, Tex., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2121), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3661) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Utah, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2122), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5196) to establish a fish-cultural station in the county of Hickman in the State of Tennessee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2123), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7102) to establish a fish-cultural and biological station in the Territory of Hawaii, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2124), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10621) to establish a fish-culture station at or near Sykeston, in the State of North Dakota, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report

(No. 2125), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11306) to establish a fish-culture station in Idaho, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2126), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12433) to establish a fish hatchery in Butler County, Kans., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2127), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13408) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Missouri, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2128), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14504) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of New York, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2129), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17410) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of North Carolina, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2130), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19065) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Alabama, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2131), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20040) to establish a fish-cultural station in the Territory of Arizona, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2132), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21838) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2133), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23017) to establish and maintain a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in La Plata County, Colo., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2134), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 26461) to establish a fish-cultural station near Chicago, in the State of Illinois, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2135), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 28623) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Wyoming, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2136), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31432) to establish a fish-cultural station near Walterboro, Colleton County, in the State of South Carolina, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2137), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referrred the bill of the House (H. R. 32266) to authorize S. G. Guerrier, of Atchison, Kans., to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of Atchison Kans., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2141), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 32440) authorizing the Moline, East Moline & Watertown Railway Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the south branch of the Mississippi River from a point in the village of Watertown, Rock Island County, Ill., to the island known as Campbells Island, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2142), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6583) for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2138), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 31774) to carry into effect the findings of the military board of officers in the case of George Ivers, administrator, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2140), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the House bill H. R. 4931, reported in lieu thereof a resolution (H. Res. No. 958) referring to the Court of Claims the papers in the case of Santa Anna Wallace, accompanied by a report (No. 2143), which said resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LAW, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13939) for the relief of the heirs of Hannah F. Traynier, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 2139), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9670) granting a pension to J. L. McDowell, alias Leander Dickey; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 32691) granting an increase of pension to Sherwood C. Bowers; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 32700) to provide for the sale of the surface of the segregated coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 32701) providing for the equipment of Army transports with life launches; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELIHER: A bill (H. R. 32702) amending an act providing for the purchase of a site and erection of an immigration station at Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Resolution (H. Res. 959) to pay Harry D. Williams for special and extra services rendered; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 960) for the appointment of two special messengers for the majority and minority caucus rooms, respectively; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PARSONS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 284) providing for the termination of the treaty between the United States of America and Russia concluded at St. Petersburg December 18, 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, praying that a grant of the land and buildings of the Fort Walla Walla Military Reservation be made to Whitman College; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, asking for Territorial legislature for Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, asking Congress to appropriate money for a Federal building at Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, relative to the reclamation act; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, concerning the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 32703) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fortescue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 32704) granting an increase of pension to Martin Norton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32705) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Ream; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 32706) for the relief of Willie L. Cornwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COUDREY: A bill (H. R. 32707) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Hepps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 32708) granting an increase of pension to John Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 32709) granting a pension to Eleanor M. Freer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 32710) granting a pension to Catherine Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 32711) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Hansen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 32712) granting an increase of pension to Edmond Bonneau; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 32713) to correct the military record of Abraham H. Onstott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 32714) granting a pension to Charlena J. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: A bill (H. R. 32715) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 32716) granting a pension to Carlton M. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 32717) for the relief of J. C. Risher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 32718) granting a pension to Charles H. Chester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 32719) for the relief of A. M. Williams, jr., administrator of Edward Cleve; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 32720) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of George T. Silvers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local Union No. 1377, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring building of battleships in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Steam Fitters' Local, No. 395, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the building of the battleship *New York* in Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Local No. 1377, Carpenters and Joiners, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Washington Camp No. 201, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Shamokin, Pa., for H. R. 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of business firms of Liberty Center, Ohio, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, on election of Senators by direct vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition signed by citizens of Leavenworth, Kans., asking that Congress insist on having the proposed new battleship *New York* built in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of the Ohio National Guard Association, favoring the bill providing for Federal pay for the State Militia; to the Committee on the Militia.

Also memorial of house of representatives of Ohio, for an amendment to elect Senators by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Wayne Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Wooster, Ohio, for Senate bill 423 and House bill 27068, children's bureau; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of Ohio National Guard Association, for Federal pay for Organized Militia; to the Committee on the Militia.

By Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky: Petition of the ninth congressional district of Kentucky, against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce and Manufacturers' Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of David Crockett Council and Vale Council, No. 15, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for H. R. 15403; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of International Association of Machinists, of Washington, D. C., for the eight-hour working day and for the construction of battleship *New York* in the New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Resolutions adopted by the New York Mercantile Exchange, indorsing the proposed Canadian reciprocity treaty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Los Angeles County Osteopathic Society, protesting against the establishment of a health bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petition of Macedonia Quarterly Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Corinth, Ill., for House bill 23641, the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Washington Camp No. 18, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Miami, Fla., for H. R. 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. COUDREY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mrs. Sarah A. Hepps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Union of Hamilton, Ohio, for repeal of the oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Dayton, Ohio, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of R. J. Knowlton and 16 other citizens of Gratiot County, Mich., for a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Charlevoix County, Mich., for the Miller-Curtis bills (H. R. 23641 and S. 7528); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the National Wholesale Dry Goods Association of New York, for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: Petition of Board of Councilmen, Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturers' Club, and the Americus Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Brewers' Exchange, New York Produce Exchange, and Chamber of Commerce, of New York State, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of New York, urging building of battleship *New York* in Government yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, of Milwaukee, Wis., against abolition of the United States pension agencies; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Papers to accompany bill for relief of John Battlefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 25734) for relief of Bennett D. Cline; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of R. M. Atkinson, G. S. Banks & Son, and others, against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOELKER: Petition of International Association of Machinists, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for repeal of oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Dry Goods Association, for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange, Chamber of Commerce, Manufacturers' Club, and the Merchants' Association, of New York, commending the proposed reciprocal agreement with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petitions of Local No. 683, Burlington, and Iramford Council, No. 6, of Putney, in the State of Vermont, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Marseilles (Ill.) Wrapping Paper Co. and J. D. Tower & Sons, against the adoption of the proposed reciprocal tariff legislation with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. D. Pease, of Malta, Ill., against parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the National Wholesale Dry Goods Association, for a nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Buffalo and Chamber of Commerce of New York, in the State of New York, favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Metropolitan Tobacco Co., of New York City, favoring the Esch phosphorus match bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, for an amendment to the oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Merchants' Association of New York City, for reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Wholesale Dry Goods Association, of New York, for a tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Ferdinand Hansen, for Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Dr. S. Edw. Fretz, of Denver, Lancaster County, Pa., against the enactment of H. R. 25241, known as the Foster antinarcotic bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Central Labor Union, of Lancaster, Pa., urging the construction of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of printers of North Dakota, for the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, for liberal extension of the parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Federation of Labor, against repeal of law relative to printing money of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, for building battleship *New York* in Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Book and Thimble Club, of Williston, N. Dak., favoring investigation of causes of tuberculosis, typhoid fever, and other diseases originating in dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens living along rural post-office routes, for increase of salaries for carriers, as per Hanna bill, H. R. 26791; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of the first congressional district of Oregon, favoring a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of Carpenters' Union, Local No. 1082, of San Francisco, Cal., urging that the battleship *New York* be built in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of members of Some Club, favoring reciprocity with Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Branch 73, Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, Bellaire, Ohio, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Ohio General Assembly, for election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Shadyside Council, No. 239, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for House bill 15413, to restrict immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of citizens of Springfield and Muscatine, Iowa, protesting against the fortification of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KORBLY: Petition of Post 93, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring inclusion of enlisted men in House bill 18899; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of General Assembly of Indiana, favoring Senate bill 5677, to promote efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Seventy-third Indiana Regiment and One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, for dollar-a-day pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of American Institute of Homeopathy, against the Mann, Owen, and Creager national health bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of board of trustees of Indiana State Prison, against House bill 12000; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of I. A. Hubbard, A. L. Miller, and others, against Senate bill 407; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Alvin P. Hovey Post, No. 559, Department of Indiana, Grand Army of the Republic, for dollar-a-day pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of Councils Nos. 6, 7, 3, 10, 67, and Indiana State Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of J. P. Peters Council, No. 42; F. M. Bristo Council, No. 5; E. C. Wenget Council, No. 17; C. S. Baker Council, No. 15; John W. Ebel Council, No. 56; and James Robinson Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, against tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Travelers' Protective Association, A. A. Barnes, Havens & Geddes Co., H. C. Atkins, and others, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association and the Indian Historical Society, favoring preservation of the language of Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Robert H. Thompson, for retention of the eight-hour clause in naval appropriation bill and building of battleship *New York* in the New York Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: Petition of Baltimore Federation of Labor, against Senate bill 10646; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of Washington Camps No. 72 and No. 6, of Baltimore, Md., Patriotic Order Sons of America; Independent Council, No. 98, and Star Spangled Banner Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Baltimore, Md.; Wells & McComas Council, No. 16, and Star of the East Council, No. 29, Daughters of America, of Baltimore, Md., urging the enactment of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Christian Endeavor Union of Maryland, for the passage of the Burkett-Sims bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of L. Greif & Bro., of Baltimore, Md., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Dr. Eliza J. Russell and other citizens of Baltimore, Md., in behalf of Mary J. Adams for increase of pension; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Baltimore District Council of Carpenters, relating to item in agricultural appropriation bill relating to construction of cattle quarantine building at Curtis Bay, Md.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of Washington Camps Nos. 696 and 602, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Armstrong and Jefferson Counties, Pa., urging passage of House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of William Lytle and 25 other citizens of Gladwin, Mich., for a general parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Jordan Barr and 25 others, of Pinconning, Mich., protesting against passage of Senate bill 404 and House joint resolution 17; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. V. Hinkly and Myron Gillett, of Onaway, Mich., against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Carlton M. Dodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of business men of the first Nebraska congressional district, for Senate bill 3776, the Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of business men of Eagle, Alvo, Beatrice, and Johnson, Nebr., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: Petition of citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, for construction of battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard and for the eight-hour clause; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John C. Dunehew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. MITCHELL PALMER: Memorials of Local Council No. 90, of Spring City, Pa., and Local Council No. 921, of Port Matilda, Pa., Junior Order United American Mechanics, for illiteracy test of immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 228, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners; Washington Camp No. 601, Patriotic Order Sons of America; Newton (Pa.) Council, Morning Star Council, No. 29, Star Council, No. 68, and Penn Council, No. 106, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: Petition signed by K. Howard and others, for the building of the battleship *New York* in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Petition of Hon. Fletcher W. Lawton, Hon. Henry K. Littlefield, and Hon. Henry C. Wilcox, members of the house of representatives of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, against the free-fish schedule in House bill 32216; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas Congdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Petition of citizens of the first congressional district of Texas, against enactment into law by Congress of parcels-post recommendation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of citizens of New York, for construction of battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Stafford (N. Y.) Grange, No. 418, Patrons of Husbandry, against Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local No. 24, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, for enactment of more restrictive immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of John R. Black and 8 others, of Ogemaw County; Joseph Yelle and 40 others, of Marquette County; Thomas Hill and 9 others, of St. Clair County; William Smith and 34 others, of St. Clair County; Jesse Van Riper and 26 others, of Wayne and Monroe Counties; Frank Peters and 15 others, of Wayne and Monroe Counties; Rudolph Templeton and 11 others, of Sanilac County; W. B. Frost and 39 others, of Ingham County; L. McArdle and 39 others, of Iosco County; L. McArdle and 33 others, of Iosco County; and W. M. Osborne and 6 others, of Ogemaw County, all in the *State of Michigan*, for a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany bill for relief of A. M. Williams; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Ohio: Petition of Standing Rock Council, No. 276, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for enactment of the illiteracy-test immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Connecticut State Grange, favoring extension of parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Washington Camps Nos. 385, of Beech Creek; 222, of Newberry; 612, of Unityville; 578, of South Williamsport; 158, of Hughesville; 574 of Williamsport; and 299, of Montoursville, Pa., Patriotic Order Sons of America, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petitions of Mercer County Central Labor Union and Local Union No. 62, American Federation of Musicians, Trenton, N. J., for construction of battleships in Government navy yards; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Washington Camps Nos. 50, of Titusville, and 54, of Baptistown, Patriotic Order Sons of America, for House bill 15413; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *February 11, 1911.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, whom alike the living and the dead praise, we thank Thee for this day of reverent memory and of tender recollection. We thank Thee, who art the giver of every good gift and of every perfect boon, for the lives and services of those whom our lips shall this day name. It is hard to yield up those who have labored by our side and have shared our councils. As they stand again before us in memory and again live in our hearts, teach our tongues fit words to utter our sense of loss and to voice our unchanged devotion. Sanctify to us, we implore Thee, the services of this day, and make us worthy of the fellowship of those who in newness of life dwell with Thee in Thy heavenly kingdom. Join our hearts with theirs, and unite our spirits with the faithful and true, there and here, in one light of faith, one beauty of holiness, one repose on Thee.

And unto Thee, our Father, who has loved us and hast given us eternal comfort and good hope through grace, will we ascribe praise now and forevermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 2469. An act for the relief of Alfred Childers;

S. 10348. An act to convey to the city of Fort Smith, Ark., a portion of the national cemetery reservation in said city;

S. 10594. An act to authorize S. G. Guerrier, of Atchison, Kans., to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near the city of Atchison, Kans.; and

S. 10595. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 10326. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10327. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10453. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 10454. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 30135. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 30886. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 31161. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

H. R. 32222. An act authorizing homestead entries on certain lands formerly a part of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota; and

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution for the relief of Thomas Hoyne.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 6953) authorizing contracts for the disposition of waters of projects under the reclamation act,