

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I stated at a time when the Senator was not present that we incorporated word for word, without so much as the change of a comma, the provisions of the Lever bill for agricultural extension work. The difference between the two bills is this: The Page bill, or Senate bill No. 3, appropriates \$3,000,000 for extension work. The Lever bill appropriates \$3,480,000. I do not object to the addition of the \$480,000. So I thought it wise, to save any trouble or question, that we should adopt the Lever bill, or the Smith-Lever bill, without the change of a single comma.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Are we to understand, then, that the Lever bill covers simply agricultural work, and that the substitute offered by the Senator covers not only agricultural work, but vocational work?

Mr. PAGE. The Lever bill does not contain a single word or line in regard to industrial education. It provides for conveying knowledge from the experiment stations to the adult farmer on the farm. The Page bill, or Senate bill No. 3, provides for agricultural work in secondary schools and in district agricultural high schools.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Is the amendment which the Senator offers an amendment which covers in express terms not only the provisions of the Lever bill, but also all the provisions of the old Page bill?

Mr. PAGE. Not all of it, because it was amended at the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, so as to exclude the \$1,000,000 appropriation for branch-station work.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to correct the statement of the Senator from Vermont. That was done, not at the suggestion but as a result of the criticism of the Senator from Georgia. I think perhaps that is a distinction that I should draw.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I want to say that I went to the Senator's home, and I sat at his feet like Saul at the feet of Gamaliel, and I listened to the wisdom that came from his lips, and this measure was drafted exactly to meet his desires. After it was drafted I took it to him, and said: "Senator, is it all right?" He replied: "Yes; so far as I can see."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think the Senator ought to modify that statement. I said, "I have not had time to study it carefully." The Senator sent me three different bills after the conference. I have not been disposed to state just what happened, but I must. He has sent me three new substitutes—one No. 1, one No. 2, and one No. 3—and each of those three is different. They are long. It would have taken me two or three days with nothing else to do to carefully study and critically master each of the bills. Each of these new bills was nearly as long as the 26-page bill he has just withdrawn. The first of the three I examined more carefully than the others, and I said to the Senator that it seemed to me that that bill was freer from criticism than either of the other two. I told him that I was more impressed with it, and that so far as I had had time to investigate it, I thought it was all right.

That is about the substance of what I said. The Senator certainly does not mean that I committed myself, or affect in any way in his action, except as he had invited criticism of the bill, and I tried to give it just as I gave it on the floor of the Senate. In the discussion we had at my house the criticism I made of the bill was very similar to the criticism I have made of it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, the Senator's argument to-day was addressed to the original bill with all its defects. I want to say that after I had presented the bill to the Senator, he said to me: "Senator, the first provision that you have suggested seems to me practically to eliminate my objections to the bill."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not think I ever said that.

Mr. PAGE. I withdraw the statement if I misunderstood the Senator. That is as I understood him.

#### CONNECTICUT RIVER DAM.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia obtained the floor.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I rose to give notice that on Monday, January 27, following the routine morning business, I would ask the Senate to take up and consider the bill (S. 8033) to authorize the Connecticut River Co. to relocate and construct a dam across the Connecticut River, above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut. I understand, however, that it is desired to finish the agricultural extension bill on Monday, and at the request of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Georgia I will change the date of the notice to Tuesday, January 28.

#### AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to give notice that on Monday, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to take up again House bill 22871, providing for agricultural extension work, and shall urge the continued consideration of the measure until we dispose of it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I did not hear the request of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was no request, but a notice that on Monday morning, immediately after the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to take up again the agricultural extension measure and continue to consider it until we dispose of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 27, 1913, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 24, 1913.

The House met at 11 a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, we draw near to Thee in the spirit of prayer and devotion, that we may feel the pulsations of Thy loving heart and be reassured in our quest for a life of godliness, the surety of individual and national progress. Inspire us, we beseech Thee, with high ideals, and give us the desire and the strength as individuals and as a people to attain. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

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

#### IMMIGRATION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state, before the House begins the morning business, that in regard to the conference report on the Immigration bill, submitted by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] yesterday for printing in the RECORD, everything was done by the clerks at the desk that it was their duty to do. It was published as a document, which shows conclusively that the conference report reached the Printing Office, and it was no fault of the clerical force of the House that it is not in the RECORD.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, right in line with that statement, would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent to take up the conference report this morning?

The SPEAKER. Anything on earth is permissible by unanimous consent.

Mr. BURNETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, while we are upon that subject, to take up the conference report on the immigration bill. I can make a statement of the few changes that were made by the conferees.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will my colleague yield for a minute?

Mr. BURNETT. I will.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Kentucky was on his feet to ask for recognition to correct the Journal.

Mr. BURNETT. I simply called it up now because we were upon that subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that after the Speaker's table is cleared the conference report on the immigration bill be taken up.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that he does not make that request until later.

Mr. BURNETT. Very well; I will wait.

#### OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 19115) making appropriations for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 19115, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if the bill has been printed with Senate amendments so that the House can have access to it?

Mr. SIMS. It has not, because the bill has remained on the Speaker's table by my request.

Mr. MANN. Then I think I will object.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I requested that this bill remain on the table in order that I might make some investigation of the Senate amendments. Mr. Speaker, I find that practically all of the House provisions of the bill were stricken out by amendment in the Senate and a great number of new items were added by amendments, and therefore the conference on the bill will require much time because there are such a great number of items to be considered. It is now getting toward the latter part of the session, and it will be practically impossible for the conferees to consider this bill unless it goes to conference immediately. That is the reason why I am hoping that the gentleman from Illinois will withhold his objection, because if it goes to the Committee on War Claims and that committee reports with recommendation to disagree to the Senate amendments and asks for a conference, it will simply go upon the Private Calendar to be called up only on the day when business on the Private Calendar can be considered under the rules, which may and probably will make it impossible for it to go to conference at the present session.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many Senate amendments. The bill has not been printed to show what those Senate amendments are. It would be a difficult matter to ascertain what they are by an examination of the record of the proceedings in the Senate. If objected to, the bill will be referred to the Committee on War Claims and printed with the Senate amendments numbered. Then the bill will be reported back and the same request can be made after we have had an opportunity of examining the Senate amendments, and therefore I will object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on War Claims.

#### CONTRACT FOR TRANSFERRING FOREIGN MAIL.

Mr. TUTTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of House resolution 778, directing the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to investigate certain mail contracts, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 778 and that the same be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the resolution?

Mr. TUTTLE. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution providing for the investigation of certain mail contracts which have been let by the Post Office Department. The Committee on Rules, I understand, is so congested with work that it may not receive consideration promptly, and as this affects certain contracts which are to go into effect on the 1st of July, it is thought that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads could give it the attention which it deserves at this time.

Mr. MANN. I doubt whether the Committee on Rules has as much work as the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. May we not have the resolution reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk will read as follows:

#### House resolution 778.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads be, and the same is hereby, directed to institute and carry forward an investigation into the letting of contracts for transferring the foreign mail from incoming steamships in New York Bay to the steamship and railway piers, and especially into the making of a contract between the Government of the United States through the Post Office Department and Howard Carroll, of New York, on or about the 19th day of November, 1912, for four years beginning July 1, 1913, for an annual compensation of about \$77,900.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would inquire of the gentleman from New Jersey if this investigation requires an appropriation or will require an appropriation?

Mr. TUTTLE. It will not. It has developed that a certain contract has been let without competition, to the amount of about \$300,000, to cover an average of four years from next July.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say that I did not hear the resolution read. I would like to know who is to make the investigation.

Mr. TUTTLE. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. And there will be no expense attached to it?

Mr. TUTTLE. No.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. No counsel employed?

Mr. TUTTLE. No.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The committee is going to make the investigation itself?

Mr. TUTTLE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, while I think this resolution, of course, should go to the Committee on Rules, yet, under the circumstances, I believe it is right that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads should be permitted to make the investigation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question. Does not the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department have the right under the rule to make the investigation at this time?

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe it has. There is a resolution which provides that it may; but that committee is conducting some extensive investigations at the present time, and we felt that attention could be more properly given to this by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, understand this proposition?

Mr. TUTTLE. He does. It was done after consultation with him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### PENSIONS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Speaker to the bill (H. R. 27874) 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 of such soldiers and sailors, a pension bill, to call it up and ask that the House as a Committee of the Whole House take the bill up for consideration, as this is pension day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman what the condition of business is.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business, which is the regular order, is the bill H. R. 23669, the reclamation town-site bill, on which the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the Chair that to-day two weeks ago the Pension Committee was absolutely cut out and had no chance to do business, and we were to be allowed to come first to-day. We are calling our cases up in regular order.

The SPEAKER. We have not yet reached the stage of the proceedings where either the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] or the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] would have the right of way. The unfinished business is to vote on the bill H. R. 23669, on which the previous question was ordered last Wednesday evening, unless it should be knocked out of joint by a conference report. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

#### IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the immigration bill may be taken up and now acted on.

Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BURNETT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice I will call it up in the morning the first thing after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Alabama, in view of the notice he has just now announced, to withhold the consideration of the conference report until Monday. I would like him to modify the notice that he has just now given. The gentleman is acquainted with the fact that some gentlemen in the House are necessarily detained from attendance here, and to-morrow being Saturday they may not arrive in town. Now, under those circumstances, I think the gentleman from Alabama ought to withhold the consideration of this conference report until Monday.

The SPEAKER. That rests entirely in the discretion of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is the reason I am making the request.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Without further order the conference report will be printed in to-day's proceedings in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just directed the reporters to notify the Public Printer to have it printed in the RECORD in the morning. What does the gentleman from Alabama say?

Mr. BURNETT. I will not.  
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker—  
 The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?  
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If the report is printed in to-morrow's Record, will not then the consideration of the conference report be necessarily postponed until Monday? I put that as a parliamentary inquiry.  
 The SPEAKER. It will not; no.

RECLAMATION TOWN SITES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second amendment to the bill H. R. 23669.  
 Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be submitted en bloc.  
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all these amendments be submitted in gross. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.  
 The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.  
 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.  
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.  
 The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.  
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] demands a division.  
 The House divided; and there were—ayes 31, noes 21.  
 Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.  
 Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] demands the yeas and nays, and both things are accomplished at one time. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Evidently there is no quorum present.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 107, nays 152, answered "present" 14, not voting 110, as follows:

YEAS—107.

Ainey	Farr	Konop	Pou
Allen	Foss	Kopp	Powers
Anderson	French	Lafferty	Prince
Anthony	Fuller	La Follette	Prouty
Austin	Gallagher	Langham	Rees
Bartholdt	Godwin, N. C.	Lawrence	Roberts, Mass.
Bates	Good	Lenroot	Roberts, Nev.
Buchanan	Green, Iowa	Lindbergh	Rosenberg
Burke, S. Dak.	Greene, Mass.	Lithicum	Rucker, Colo.
Burke, Wis.	Griest	Lobeck	Scott
Butler	Hamilton, Mich.	McCreary	Simmons
Calder	Hartman	McKenzie	Sloan
Campbell	Hawley	McKinney	Smith, Saml. W.
Cannon	Hayden	Madden	Stephens, Cal.
Cary	Hayes	Martin, S. Dak.	Sterling
Copley	Helgesen	Miller	Sweet
Crumpacker	Henry, Conn.	Mondell	Switzer
Curry	Higgins	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Colo.
Dalzell	Hinds	Morgan, Okla.	Thistlewood
Davidson	Howell	Morse, Wis.	Towner
De Forest	Howland	Murdock	Volstead
Dodds	Humphrey, Wash.	Neeley	Warburton
Donohoe	Jackson	Nelson	Willis
Draper	Kennedy	Norris	Wood, N. J.
Dyer	Kent	Nye	Young, Kans.
Esch	Kinkaide, Nebr.	Patton, Pa.	Young, Mich.
Evans	Knowland	Pickett	

NAYS—152.

Adair	Collier	Fowler	James
Aiken, S. C.	Cooper	Gardner, Mass.	Johnson, S. C.
Akin, N. Y.	Cox	Garner	Jones
Alexander	Cravens	Garrett	Kendall
Ashbrook	Cullop	Gill	Kinkaid, N. J.
Barnhart	Curley	Gillett	Korbly
Bartlett	Davenport	Glass	Lafean
Bathrick	Davis, W. Va.	Goldfogle	Lee, Ga.
Beall, Tex.	Dent	Goodwin, Ark.	Lee, Pa.
Bell, Ga.	Denver	Gould	Lever
Blackmon	Dickinson	Graham	Lewis
Boehne	Dickson, Miss.	Gray	Littlepage
Booher	Dies	Gregg, Pa.	Lloyd
Borland	Difenderfer	Gregg, Tex.	McCoy
Broussard	Doughton	Gudger	McDermott
Brown	Driscoll, D. A.	Hamill	McGillcuddy
Bulkley	Dupré	Hamilton, W. Va.	Macon
Burgess	Edwards	Hamlin	Maguire, Nebr.
Burnett	Ellerbe	Hardy	Mays
Byrnes, S. C.	Estopinal	Harrison, Miss.	Moon, Tenn.
Byrns, Tenn.	Faison	Hart	Moore, Tex.
Callaway	Fergusson	Helm	Morgan, La.
Candler	Ferris	Helm	Morrison
Cantrill	Fitzgerald	Hensley	Moss, Ind.
Claypool	Flood, Va.	Holland	Padgett
Clayton	Floyd, Ark.	Houston	Page
Cline	Foster	Jacoway	Pepper

Post	Russell	Sparkman	Tribble
Raker	Saunders	Stedman	Turnbull
Ransdell, La.	Sharp	Stephens, Miss.	Tuttle
Rauch	Sherley	Stephens, Tex.	Underhill
Redfield	Sherwood	Stone	Watkins
Reilly	Sims	Taggart	Webb
Roddenbery	Sisson	Talcott, N. Y.	Whitacre
Rothermel	Slayden	Taylor, Ala.	White
Rouse	Small	Thayer	Wilson, Pa.
Rubey	Smith, N. Y.	Thomas	Witherspoon
Rucker, Mo.	Smith, Tex.	Townsend	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—14.

Adamson	Hobson	McGuire, Okla.	Richardson
Browning	Humphreys, Miss.	Mann	Riordan
Driscoll, M. E.	Langley	Murray	
Dwight	McCall	Parran	

NOT VOTING—110.

Ames	Francis	Littleton	Sabath
Andrus	Gardner, N. J.	Longworth	Scully
Ansberry	George	Loud	Sells
Ayres	Goeke	McKellar	Shackelford
Barchfeld	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Sheppard
Berger	Guernsey	McLaughlin	Slemp
Bradley	Hammond	McMorran	Smith, J. M. C.
Brantley	Hardwick	Maher	Smith, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Harris	Martin, Colo.	Speer
Burleson	Harrison, N. Y.	Matthews	Stack
Carlin	Haugen	Merritt	Stanley
Carter	Hay	Moon, Pa.	Steenerson
Clark, Fla.	Heald	Mott	Stephens, Nebr.
Conry	Henry, Tex.	Needham	Stevens, Minn.
Covington	Hill	Oldfield	Sulloway
Crago	Howard	Olmsted	Talbott, Md.
Currier	Hughes, Ga.	O'Shaunessy	Taylor, Ohio
Danforth	Hughes, W. Va.	Palmer	Tilson
Daugherty	Hull	Patten, N. Y.	Underwood
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Ky.	Payne	Vare
Dixon, Ind.	Kahn	Peters	Vreeland
Doremus	Kindred	Plumley	Weeks
Fairchild	Kitchin	Porter	Wilder
Fields	Konig	Pray	Wilson, Ill.
Finley	Lamb	Pujo	Wilson, N. Y.
Focht	Legare	Rainey	Woods, Iowa
Fordney	Levy	Randell, Tex.	
Fornes	Lindsay	Reyburn	

And so the bill was rejected.  
 The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
 For the session:  
 Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.  
 Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. MANN.  
 Mr. FORNES with Mr. BRADLEY.  
 Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PARRAN.  
 Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. DWIGHT.  
 Mr. PALMER with Mr. HILL.  
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.  
 Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS.

Until further notice:  
 Mr. HARDWICK with Mr. SULLOWAY.  
 Mr. HULL with Mr. NEEDHAM.  
 Mr. PUJO with Mr. MCMORRAN.  
 Mr. GEORGE with Mr. SMITH of California.  
 Mr. RAINEY with Mr. MCCALL.  
 Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. FORDNEY.  
 Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.  
 Mr. HARRISON of New York with Mr. PAYNE.  
 Mr. CARTER with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. BARCHFELD.  
 Mr. AYRES with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. CRAGO.  
 Mr. BURLESON with Mr. DANFORTH.  
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.  
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.  
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. FOCHT.  
 Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.  
 Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CURRIER.  
 Mr. DIXON of Indiana with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.  
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. GUERNSEY.  
 Mr. FRANCIS with Mr. HAUGEN.  
 Mr. GOEKE with Mr. HEALD.  
 Mr. HAMMOND with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.  
 Mr. HAY with Mr. LOUD.  
 Mr. HENRY of Texas with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 Mr. MURRAY with Mr. HARRIS.  
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. MCLAUGHLIN.  
 Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. MATTHEWS.  
 Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky with Mr. MERRITT.  
 Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. KAHN.  
 Mr. KINDRED with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. KONIG with Mr. MOTT.  
 Mr. LAMB with Mr. OLMSTED.  
 Mr. MCKELLAR with Mr. PLUMLEY.  
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. PORTER.  
 Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. PRAY.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. SELLS.  
 Mr. PETERS with Mr. J. M. C. SMITH.  
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. SPEER.  
 Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio.  
 Mr. STANLEY with Mr. TILSON.  
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. VARE.  
 Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. VREELAND.  
 Mr. MARTIN of Colorado with Mr. WEEKS.  
 Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. WILDER.  
 Mr. STACK with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.  
 Mr. LEGARE with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.  
 Mr. RANDELL of Texas with Mr. AMES.  
 Until February 1:

Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. LONGWORTH.  
 Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I am paired with my colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. CARTER, and I desire to change my vote and vote "present."

The name of Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma was called, and he voted "Present."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I am paired with the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The name of Mr. MANN was called and he voted "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### FILIBUSTERING.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] saw proper to conduct a filibuster and delay the approval of the Journal for three hours and a half on yesterday. In discussing his reasons for conducting that filibuster he said that he wanted to teach this side of the House, and especially the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], how to conduct a filibuster, and in the same statement said that I had on the previous day undertaken to filibuster in this House. There is not the slightest foundation in fact, nor is there the slightest indication in the RECORD, to justify the gentleman from Illinois in that statement. As a matter of fact, the RECORD shows in the proceedings of Wednesday that the "gentleman from Texas" specifically stated to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that he was not conducting a filibuster. I call attention, Mr. Speaker, to the proceedings on page 1901, in which this colloquy occurred:

Mr. MANN. This is not the only bill that can be filibustered on, I will say to the assistant whip.

Mr. GARNER. I am not filibustering. I think it is full time that we took out. I have heard the gentleman from Illinois say that many times at this hour in the day.

I call attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that often when that clock has shown it was 10 minutes of 6 o'clock I have heard the gentleman from Illinois rise in his place and suggest to the gentlemen who were in charge of legislation on this side of the House that the committee had better rise. I have at the same time seen these gentlemen cast their eyes over the empty seats in this Hall and realize that they were helpless to keep the gentleman from Illinois from making a point of no quorum, and agree to his dictation. Moreover, I refer to the RECORD to show that I inquired of the Speaker as to what the parliamentary status of the legislation we had just voted on would be in case the previous question was ordered. On page 1903 of the RECORD this colloquy occurred:

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. As the previous question has been ordered, and a separate vote is demanded on each amendment adopted by the committee, when will the vote be taken on each amendment?

The SPEAKER. Next Wednesday morning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the Speaker himself and to this House that when I asked that question I had a right to conclude that on next Wednesday morning this identical question would come up in this House for consideration. I had certainly gone to the highest authority that I know of in this House on parliamentary law, especially since he occupies the chair now—the Speaker himself—to determine what the parliamentary status of this legislation was. I have no quarrel with the Speaker for his ruling. It may be correct, but I do deem it my duty to call the attention of this House to the fact that whenever you adopt this rule that the Speaker laid down as permanent you give to the Calendar Wednesday of this House not only one day, but possibly three days in each week.

For instance, Calendar Wednesday business has taken up two hours of to-day's work. To illustrate, suppose we had called for the yeas and nays on each one of these amendments. These amendments would have taken not all of to-day only, but tomorrow, or at least 12 hours, for there are twenty and odd amendments. So, I say that I have no quarrel with the Speaker for this ruling, because it may be technically correct, but I believe I should call the attention of the House to the effect of this rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] did me an injustice, he did himself an injustice, and he did the membership of this House an injustice when he created the impression yesterday not only in remarks made on the floor of the House, but in remarks to his colleagues, that I was the cause of this filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, if I was the cause of bringing on a filibuster that took three hours and a half to approve the Journal, I did wrong. But I invoke the RECORD here and place in the mouth of the gentleman from Illinois the statement that he "did not blame the gentleman from Texas for making the point of no quorum and asking that the House adjourn" on Wednesday evening last. If the gentleman did not blame me, then certainly I could have done no wrong. The gentleman must blame me for some wrong or else he himself is not justified in bringing on a filibuster, because I moved that the House adjourn on Wednesday evening.

The truth of the matter is that the gentleman from Illinois has been so accustomed to dictating to this side of the House that he has got to the point where, if you cross his wishes, he will see that no business in this House is accomplished. [Applause.] The gentleman from Illinois is an efficient legislator; he is an accommodating gentleman; but in the detail of his work and in the multiplicity of it he has got to the point where he overlooks the larger things in legislation, and the result is that he is making himself ridiculous, as he did yesterday in undertaking to organize a filibuster here for no purpose. [Applause.] I think the gentleman himself made a spectacle by undertaking to give as an excuse for conducting the filibuster the fact that I on the day previous had said that I wanted the parliamentary status of this bill preserved until next Wednesday, it then being 6 o'clock in the afternoon, and asked that we adjourn.

We got a roll call to-day. That is all I asked for on Wednesday. We got it to-day, and we have defeated the bill. Did I not have the right on Wednesday at 6 o'clock to ask that this legislation remain until I could get an opportunity to record my vote, knowing that there was not a quorum here?

Mr. Speaker, I care nothing about the amendments. I never try to play in this House other than in the open, but the gentleman from Illinois appears rather to conduct his game under concealed hands.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARNER. I must confess that the method of the gentleman from Illinois is most effective, but I prefer to play mine as I have done, and I think the American people prefer that kind. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. GARNER. No.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there will be two more Calendar Wednesdays at this session of Congress besides the Wednesday which will be required to count the electoral vote. On last Calendar Wednesday a bill was pending before the House which had been agreed to by the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and reported back to the House with about 20 amendments. If a separate vote were demanded on each amendment and a yeas-and-nays vote were taken on each amendment, it would have consumed the entire two days on Calendar Wednesdays yet remaining at this session of Congress and would have prevented any other bill being called up

for consideration. The next bill which will be called up for consideration on Calendar Wednesday will be a bill called up by the Committee on the Library. I understand that the Lincoln memorial bill will be that bill. So that it was quite possible, if the bill that was under consideration last Wednesday went over until next Wednesday and a separate vote was had by yeas and nays on each of the amendments, that the Lincoln memorial bill could not be reached at this session of Congress. I was notified by gentlemen all over the House that that was the intention of certain gentlemen in the House. When the bill was reported from the committee back to the House, this is a portion of the proceedings:

Mr. GARNER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that we can not pass the bill to-night, because there are a number of us on this side who propose to have a ye-and-nay vote on this bill to its final passage.

I take it there is but one construction of that language, and that is a ye-and-nay vote on each of the 20 amendments. Further, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] said:

I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that I understand his anxiety and the anxiety of the other gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] with reference to this particular bill being gotten out of the way. I speak for myself. I am not in accord with that movement, and there are a number of others over here who are in the same attitude, and I think it is perfectly legitimate to ask, at least for the present, that all the rights of Members with respect to this bill may be preserved from the parliamentary standpoint in order that we may take advantage of it to fight a bill that is to come up later.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

If I misunderstood the gentleman, if he did not mean that he expected to demand a roll call on each of those amendments, to consume two days, and thereby prevent the Lincoln memorial bill coming up, I am willing to apologize to the gentleman. I would not have used such language unless I had intended what it meant. I thought then that I was justified, and I think now that I was justified, in demanding all the rights of a Member on the floor, in order to demonstrate to the House that the majority side of the House can never afford to filibuster against the consideration of a proposition which ought legitimately to come before the House. [Applause.] I was willing then, as I would be willing now, to filibuster against any other measure if it was intended on the other side to filibuster in order to prevent this Government at this late hour from giving a proper expression of its love, affection, and veneration for Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. BORLAND objected.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. CANNON. Who objected, Mr. Speaker? Did the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] object?

Mr. SHERLEY. I did not object, but I want to find out how long this is to proceed. We have two of the big supply bills waiting for consideration; and without desiring to be discourteous to anybody, it occurs to me that the public business is at present of the first importance.

Mr. GARNER. It is only 10 minutes. I hope no one will object.

Mr. CANNON. I only desire to know who objected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know.

Mr. MANN. We are entitled to know who objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to serve notice that I will object to any similar request hereafter.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who objected, and I reserve the right now to object, simply to state that this request will be the last one that will go unobjected to, to the delay of the public business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the high privates in the rear rank who followed the lead of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in the filibuster yesterday. I have rarely resorted to filibustering during my service. I have no apology to offer. I indorse what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said.

Now, I want to say just a word about the Lincoln memorial. There is a difference of opinion in the House. Some of us believe that the memorial ought to be erected in Washington. Others believe that there ought to be a highway, to be called the Lincoln highway, built from Washington to Gettysburg. I am on that commission, and as a member of it did not get my

way entirely. I would have located the memorial out in the Soldiers' Home, but the Arts Commission and an almost unanimous House and Senate commission chose the other site.

I am willing that it should be discussed. I desire that it should be considered, and when it is considered I will be content with what the majority of the House may say touching the proposed legislation.

Much has been said in the newspapers. I have not gone to the newspapers. It is said that many Members are holding frequent councils, either in the Capitol or the Office Building, organizing, and that great pressure is being brought to bear throughout the country. I will not criticize that. It is the right of the American citizen to promote as best he can that which he is in favor of, whether a Member of Congress, or automobile owners, or others are behind him—many men of many minds.

Now, a word as to the Lincoln Monument. There were four great characters in that great contest for the preservation of the Union—Abraham Lincoln, Gen. Grant, Gen. Lee, and Jefferson Davis. It is all behind us. Arlington, the home of Lee, is now the burial place for Union soldiers and Confederate soldiers—a monument that will stand forever across the Potomac in the State of Virginia. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I stand here a Representative from Illinois. I had a personal acquaintance with Abraham Lincoln when I was a young man and came on to the sphere of action. I loved Abraham Lincoln personally. I loved his magnificent service in the preservation of the Union—the great, wise, strong, charitable, patriotic man. Speaking respectfully, to my mind it is the prostitution of that great man's name when you speak of using it as an argument for the promotion and construction of goods roads. [Applause.]

I am willing to assist, and have the Federal Treasury assist properly, toward their construction as post roads, or in aid of their construction. With the Washington Monument standing there, as it will stand through the ages, is there a man within the sound of my voice, is there a man in Congress, is there a man North or South, that would purchase the construction of a road from here to Gettysburg or from here to Richmond, the price thereof being the pulling down of the Washington Monument? [Applause.] Not one; not one. Talk about utility, there are certain great characters that will dwell in the history of the country. First, and barely first, Washington; second, Lincoln; third, Grant; fourth, Lee, a great man, a great general who did his duty from his patriotic standpoint; fifth, Jefferson Davis, a great man performing a great service for a proposed new republic as he saw his duty.

A hundred years from now the ordinary reader will recall this period, and there will be in the mouths of the school children the names of Washington, Lincoln, Grant, Lee, and Jefferson Davis. But you will have to search the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the encyclopedias to find out about the balance of us, who have been Speakers, ex-Speakers, Members of Congress in the House and Senate. Take Mr. CANNON, for instance. I have been Speaker for eight years. They will say, "It does appear that there was a man from Illinois by the name of CANNON, but I don't know much about him. There was another man by the name of Cannon in Congress from Utah, and it was said that he had seven wives." [Laughter and applause.]

And, gentlemen, I trust that the Washington Monument and the Lee home at Arlington, holding the hallowed dust of the Union and Confederate dead, in the fullness of time will be connected with the site of the proposed Lincoln Monument by a bridge across to that great burial place.

I have no quarrel with anybody, but as I pass out of this Congress I hope that a memorial will be provided for the memory of this, the second greatest man, if not the first, that ever lived upon this continent, that ever lived in the history of the race. [Applause.]

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill H. R. 27874, a pension bill on the Private Calendar. And I move that the House go into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. POU rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. POU. I rise to present a conference report on the bill H. R. 24121 for printing in the Record under the rule.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have a correction made in the Record and the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] calls up a pension bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, what became of the conference report submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW]?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to state the situation, and his statement of it will answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman from Alabama calls up a pension bill, this being pension day. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] makes a preferential motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] submits for printing under the rule a conference report, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] desires to correct the RECORD. The Chair will take up these matters in the following order: First, the gentleman from Massachusetts, then the gentleman from North Carolina, and then the motion of the gentleman from Florida.

#### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution approving the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial; to the Committee on the Library.

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for use at the meeting of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine to be held at Dallas, Tex., in May, 1913; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 111. An act to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in Washabaugh County, in the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 184. An act for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 2058. An act for the relief of William Wentworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3315. An act to prohibit corporations from making contributions in connection with political elections and to limit the amount of such contributions by individuals or persons; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

S. 4524. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Middlesboro, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 4584. An act to promote the efficiency of the Naval Militia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 5076. An act to promote instruction in forestry in States and Territories which contain national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 6100. An act appropriating \$100,000 for the use of the Interstate Commerce Commission in addition to the sum or sums already appropriated for their use; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 7080. An act for the relief of Charles Meyers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 7297. An act for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Mineral Point, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 7298. An act for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Rhinelander, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 7502. An act for the erection of a public building at Ridgway, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 7522. An act for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at the city of Greenville, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 7855. An act to authorize the Northern Pacific Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River in section 36, township 134 north, range 79 west, in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 8178. 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.

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting to the Fifth Regiment Maryland National Guard the use of the corridors of the court-

house of the District of Columbia upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the marshal of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8768. An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 18787. An act relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon a public work of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and of all persons employed in constructing, maintaining, and improving a river or harbor of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. CRAVENS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. J. Res. 369. A joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to give certain old Government documents to the Old Newbury Historical Society, of Newburyport, Mass.;

H. R. 27062. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 8768. An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, this being pension day, I desire to ask if this motion to go into the Committee of the Whole should prevail—

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will complete his question.

Mr. RUSSELL. If this motion to go into Committee of the Whole should prevail, will there be any other opportunity to call up and consider pension bills on the Private Calendar until the second Friday in February, which is the 14th day of February?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. If the motion prevails, it will dispense with private business for the day and pension bills will not be in order until the next day set for them. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NORRIS and Mr. ADAIR) there were—ayes 80, nays 86.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirteen members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the motion was rejected.

#### PENSIONS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire again to call attention to the bill (H. R. 27874) 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 of such soldiers and sailors, and

I move that the House resolve into the Committee of the Whole House to consider this and other bills on the Private Calendar. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, with Mr. SHERLEY in the chair.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill H. R. 27874.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MANN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. What has become of the bill S. 7160, calendar No. 275?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama suggested the calling up of a case from the Committee on Pensions. The call rests with a case from the Committee on Invalid Pensions. It is within the power of the committee to determine otherwise, if it sees fit. In the absence of such determination, the Clerk will report the bill referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to take up the bill the number of which I gave. This is the course we have always pursued.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to take up the bill H. R. 27874.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 27874) 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 of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Without objection, it is so ordered. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 27874) 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 of such soldiers and sailors.

*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 Joshua B. Hartzog, late of Battery E, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William Bennett, late of Capt. Hart's independent company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Florida war with Seminole Indians, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Slack, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah H. David, widow of Jacob David, late of Company A (Capt. William Torry), First Regiment New York Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William J. Allmand, late of Company I, Thirty-second Regiment Michigan 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 Olaus Anderson, late of Company E, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Thomas F. Moore, late of Company A, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of George W. Lyons, late of Capt. N. P. Willard's company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, Florida 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 John E. Jones, late of the Hospital Corps, United States Army, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of John A. White, late of the steamship Hornet, United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of John E. Zoucks, late of Capt. G. U. Ellis's company, Florida Volunteers, Florida 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 Sarah A. Gray, widow of George W. Gray, late of Company D, First Regiment Arkansas Mounted Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Russell F. Oliver, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Bishop Karshner, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Michael F. Gaygan, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Weems, widow of Joseph Weems, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with

Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fannie J. Raiford, widow of Philip H. Raiford, late Lieutenant colonel, Battalion Alabama Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Ann Thompson, widow of William R. Thompson, late of Troop I, Third Regiment United States Dragoons, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Katherine O. Hactor, widow of John M. Hactor, late post quartermaster sergeant, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Robert P. Prescott, late of Capts. Jernigan and Rutland's independent company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Florida war with Seminole Indians, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah J. Sikes, late of Capt. Brady's company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, Florida war with Seminole Indians, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rosalla Spohr, widow of Mathias Spohr, late of Capt. Sommers's company, Louisiana Volunteers, Florida war with Seminole Indians, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia C. Pickard, widow of John S. Pickard, late of Company K, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 4880. Joshua B. Hartzog.	H. R. 21600. Russell F. Oliver.
H. R. 6816. William Bennett.	H. R. 21639. Bishop Karshner.
H. R. 10797. William F. Slack.	H. R. 23313. Michael P. Gaygan.
H. R. 12440. Sarah H. David.	H. R. 24311. Elizabeth Weems.
H. R. 13749. William J. Allmand.	H. R. 24474. Fannie J. Raiford.
H. R. 14317. Olaus Anderson.	H. R. 25367. Mary Ann Thompson.
H. R. 14371. Thomas F. Moore.	H. R. 25415. Katherine O. Hactor.
H. R. 15438. George W. Lyons.	H. R. 26095. Robert P. Prescott.
H. R. 16489. John E. Jones.	H. R. 26179. Josiah J. Sikes.
H. R. 16638. John A. White.	H. R. 26589. Rosalla Spohr.
H. R. 19436. John E. Zoucks.	H. R. 26627. Cynthia C. Pickard.
H. R. 19454. Sarah A. Gray.	

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The amendment will be accepted by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 3, by adding, after line 9, the following:

"The name of Charles Myer, late of Company E, First Regiment Georgia 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."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Committee on Pensions authorizes this amendment, and all I desire to do is to put in evidence the report they made upon it at the last session of this Congress.

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

The report is as follows:

H. R. 20999. Charles Myer, of Macon, Ga., is pensioned under the general law at the rate of \$6 per month on account of malarial poisoning incurred as an artificer in Company E, First Regiment Georgia Volunteer Infantry, in which he served from May 2 to November 18, 1898, during the War with Spain.

The pension was allowed December 11, 1903, commencing February 21, 1899.

A claim for increase, filed December 18, 1911, was rejected January 26, 1912, on the ground that the degree of disability shown from the pensioned cause did not warrant an increased rating; that no disability was shown from stomach trouble independent of that covered by the rate allowed for malarial poisoning, and alleged loss of sight was not accepted as a result of the pensioned disability.

In support of the claim for increase, A. Moody Burt, M. D., testified December 14, 1911, that the pensioner had been under his professional care a considerable part of the time during the past four or five years, and that—

"At first the said Myer was suffering from an obscure, obstinate, chronic intestinal indigestion; that for the past year optic neuritis has supervened and has finally developed complete blindness of both eyes, and the said Myer is totally blind, and is now totally incapacitated for any ordinary avocation of life."

The medical examination on which the adverse action was taken was made by the board of surgeons at Macon, Ga., January 3, 1912. The board reported: Age, 45 years; height, 5 feet 6½ inches; and weight, 146 pounds. They said:

"General appearance healthy; tongue clean; skin clear; heart negative; lungs negative; urine negative; conjunctiva slightly injected; pupils react slowly to light; can not discern objects; can tell light from darkness; no disease of rectum; liver, spleen, abdominal organs negative. Don't know cause of loss of vision; board not in position to make ophthalmoscopic examination. No evidence of vicious habits or excessive use of intoxicants. Claimant is so disabled from blindness as to be incapacitated for performing any manual labor and is entitled to \$30 a month."

In an affidavit accompanying the bill the petitioner states that he is wholly disabled by malarial poisoning and resulting total blindness; that he is without property of any kind and is solely dependent upon his pension and the charity of acquaintances.

The gentleman who introduced the bill states from his own personal knowledge that the pensioner is blind, has no property other than his pension of \$6 per month, is an object of charity, and is being supported by a benevolent order and by friends.

The evidence, your committee thinks, shows an increased degree of disability from the pensioned cause and results, and they respectfully recommend the allowance of pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROUSE 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 with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 20193. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to pay a cash reward for suggestions submitted by civilian employees of the Navy Department for improvement or economy in manufacturing processes or plant.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution approving the plan, design, and location for a Lincoln memorial;

S. 111. An act to authorize the sale and disposition of the surplus and unallotted lands in Washabaugh County, in the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriations to carry the same into effect;

S. 184. An act for the erection of a public building at Lancaster, Ky.;

S. 2058. An act for the relief of William Wentworth;

S. 3315. An act to prohibit corporations from making contributions in connection with political elections and to limit the amount of such contributions by individuals or persons;

S. 4524. An act to increase the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Middlesboro, Ky.;

S. 4584. An act to promote the efficiency of the Naval Militia, and for other purposes;

S. 5076. An act to promote instructions in forestry in States and Territories which contain national forests;

S. 6100. An act appropriating \$100,000 for the use of the Interstate Commerce Commission in addition to the sum or sums already appropriated for their use;

S. 7089. An act for the relief of Charles Meyers;

S. 7297. An act for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Mineral Point, Wis.;

S. 7298. An act for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Rhineland, Wis.;

S. 7502. An act for the erection of a public building at Ridgway, Pa.;

S. 7522. An act for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at the city of Greenville, Ala.;

S. 7855. An act to authorize the Northern Pacific Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River in section 36, township 134 north, range 79 west, in the State of North Dakota;

S. 8178. 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. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for use at the meeting of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine to be held at Dallas, Tex., in May, 1913; and

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting to the Fifth Regiment Maryland National Guard the use of the corridors of the courthouse of the District of Columbia upon such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the marshal of the District of Columbia.

#### PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

#### WILLIAM P. CLARK.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 2666) granting an increase of pension to William P. Clark. The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2666) granting an increase of pension to William P. Clark.

*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 P. Clark, late second lieutenant Thirty-seventh Company Philippine Scouts, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The bill was read for amendment,

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 8035) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill for amendment, as follows:

An act (S. 8035) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Caroline M. Anthony, late nurse Medical Department, United States Volunteers, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Arthur F. Shepherd, late of Company H, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Walter L. Donahue, late of Company I, Thirty-third Regiment Michigan 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 Calvin R. Lockhart, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert J. Wallace, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas M. F. Delancy, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin 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 Joseph Hurd, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine 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 John D. Sullivan, late of Company F, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Engineers, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$46 per month.

The name of Mary E. Maher, widow of John A. Maher, late of Company D, First Regiment District of Columbia 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 minor children of the said John A. Maher until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of George W. James, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment United States 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 G. Thirby, late of Company M, Thirty-fourth Regiment Michigan 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 Lansing B. Nichols, late of Company C, First Regiment South Dakota 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 Jacob Korby, late of Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of John J. Ledford, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Deborah H. Riggs, widow of Ashley C. Riggs, late of Capt. James M. Morgan's company, Iowa Mounted Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elmer E. Rose, late of Companies I and H, Twenty-third Regiment United States 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 Cyrenius Mulkey, late of Capt. Bailey's Company A, Second Regiment Oregon 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 Patrick J. Whelan, late of Company E, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Burton, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim W. Baughman, late of Capt. Nathan Olney's Company B, Oregon 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 James J. Blevans, late of Company B, 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 Henry H. Woodward, late of Capt. Chapman's Company I, Second Regiment Oregon Mounted Volunteers, Rogue River 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 Bertie L. Wade, late of Company L, Twenty-second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charlotte R. Wynne, widow of James W. Wynne, late of Capt. Blackmore's company, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Otto Weber, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carl W. Carlson, late of Company B, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 1915. Caroline M. Anthony.	S. 6898. John J. Ledford.
S. 2465. Arthur F. Shepherd.	S. 6921. Deborah H. Riggs.
S. 3615. Walter L. Donahue.	S. 6998. Elmer E. Rose.
S. 3726. Calvin R. Lockhart.	S. 7021. Cyrenius Mulkey.
S. 3920. Albert J. Wallace.	S. 7032. Patrick J. Whelan.
S. 4691. Thomas M. F. Delaney.	S. 7036. John F. Burton.
S. 6091. Joseph Hurd.	S. 7065. Ephraim W. Baughman.
S. 6101. John D. Sullivan.	S. 7135. James J. Blevans.
S. 6107. Mary E. Maher.	S. 7281. Henry H. Woodward.
S. 6193. George W. James.	S. 7305. Bertie L. Wood.
S. 6276. George G. Thirlby.	S. 7328. Charlotte R. Wynne.
S. 6764. Lansing B. Nichols.	S. 7368. Otto Weber.
S. 6883. Jacob Korby.	S. 7466. Carl W. Carlson.

The following committee amendments were severally considered and severally agreed to:

On page 2, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.  
On page 2, strike out lines 15, 16, 17, and 18.  
On page 3, strike out lines 22, 23, and 24.  
On page 4, strike out lines 17, 18, 19, and 20.  
On page 5, strike out lines 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and, on page 6, strike out lines 1 and 2.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 28379) 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 of such soldiers and sailors.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The bill was read in full for amendment, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 28379) 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 of such soldiers and sailors.

*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 Elizabeth A. Whittaker, widow of William T. Whittaker, late of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of one minor child of the soldier until such child attains the age of 16 years.

The name of Cornelia A. Mobley, widow of William L. Mobley, late of Capt. Martin's and G. W. Smith's companies, Florida Volunteers, Florida Seminole Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James L. Herod, late of Company A, Second Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Soucek, late of band, Fourth Regiment United States 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 John H. Woodruff, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of Peter A. Fitzpatrick, late of Troop A, Eighth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Edward M. Yochem, late of Troop K, Eleventh Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carrie E. Gibson, widow of David Gibson, late of Company H, Fifth United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, and \$2 per month additional on account of one minor child of the soldier until it reaches the age of 16 years.

The name of James H. Swallum, alias James H. Shields, late of Troop H, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The name of Jesse Crawford, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Emily Ford, widow of William Ford, late of Capt. Tracy's company, Georgia Volunteers, and Capt. Bird's company, Florida Volunteers, Florida war with Seminole Indians, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Lois Wriston, widow of John P. Wriston, late of Company A, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Albert McMichaels, late of Troop K, First Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Aminda Space, dependent mother of William H. Space, late of Battery K, First Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Hartman, late of Company H, Third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The name of Thomas Smith, late of Company B, First Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The name of Chris Sletteland, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Louisa Margaret Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph B. Brown, late colonel and surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Karl C. Wettstein, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of John G. Vantrump, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Welteroth, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of Ellen Wecker, widow of Charles Wecker, late of Troop D, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Moore, late of Troop B, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$10 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Wood, widow of Buzzilla Wood, late of Capt. Stewart's company, First Regiment Florida Mounted Volunteers, Florida Seminole Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John E. Karns, late of Company B, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Edward M. Deegan, late of Company G, Two hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$6 per month.

The name of Henry H. Lord, late of Hospital Corps, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The bill was ordered to be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Pensions:

H. R. 4630. Elizabeth A. Whitaker.	H. R. 20363. Aminda Space.
H. R. 6266. Cornelia A. Mobley.	H. R. 20425. Thomas Hartman.
H. R. 11492. James L. Herod.	H. R. 20731. Thomas Smith.
H. R. 11546. John Soucek.	H. R. 21930. Chris Sletteland.
H. R. 12434. John H. Woodruff.	H. R. 22631. Louisa Margaret Brown.
H. R. 13259. Peter A. Fitzpatrick.	H. R. 23847. Karl C. Wettstein.
H. R. 13816. Edward M. Yochem.	H. R. 24810. John G. Vantrump.
H. R. 14840. Carrie E. Gibson.	H. R. 25218. Charles L. Welteroth.
H. R. 15790. James H. Swallum, alias James H. Shields.	H. R. 25450. Ellen Wecker.
H. H. 16535. Jesse Crawford.	H. R. 25537. Henry Moore.
H. R. 18311. Emily Ford.	H. R. 26096. Sarah J. Wood.
H. R. 19446. Mary Lois Wriston.	H. R. 26287. John E. Karns.
H. R. 19488. Albert McMichaels.	H. R. 26505. Edward M. Deegan.
	H. R. 27799. Henry H. Lord.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield all the time I have left to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has no time to yield. If the gentleman from Wisconsin desires, he can be heard on some later bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call up the bill (S. 7160) 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 CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill was read as follows for amendment:

An act (S. 7160) 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.

*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 Susannah Roberts, widow of Evan Roberts, late of Company E, Fourteenth 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 John Hedge, late of Company I, Fortieth 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 Albert Whitehead, late of Company B, 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 Henry Ackerman, late of Company F, One hundred and fourth 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 Edward S. Clithero, late of Company D, One hundred and sixteenth 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 Almond Partridge, late of Company B, Sixty-fourth 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 Gustavus A. Kindblade, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Iowa 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 Martin Parker, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kansas 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 Benjamin F. Adams, alias Franklin B. Adams, late of Company H, 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 Augustus A. Nauman, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Iowa 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 Mary Byrne, widow of John Byrne, late major and lieutenant colonel One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment New York 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 Mary C. Smith, widow of George A. Smith, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of E. Leora Norris, widow of David H. Norris, late of Company E, Eleventh 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 Augustus C. D. Wilson, late of Company A, 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 Alice O. Lord, widow of Frederick C. Lord, late captain Company L, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Third Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Julius T. Morse, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts 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 Henrietta V. Hawley, widow of Willis C. Hawley, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles E. Sherman, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island 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 Jennie M. Smalley, widow of Edward F. Smalley, late of Company A, Sixth 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 Samuel N. West, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth 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 James V. D. Ten Eyck, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment New Jersey 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 Nellie L. Davis, widow of Jared M. Davis, late of Company E, 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 Jerome S. Pinney, late of Company G, Battalion, 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 James E. C. Sawyer, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$18 per month.

The name of Julius E. Henderson, late of Company B, Sixtieth 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 L. Baird, late second lieutenant Company L, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The following amendments were read, severally considered, and agreed to:

Page 1, strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive. (This is the case of Susannah Roberts (S. 449).)

Page 2, strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive. (This is the case of Almond Partridge (S. 2978).)

Page 2, line 23, strike out the word "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "forty." (This is the case of Gustavus A. Kindblade (S. 3786).)

Page 3, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive. (This is the case of Martin Parker (S. 4063).)

Page 3, strike out lines 5 to 8, inclusive. (This is the case of B. F. Adams (S. 4072).)

Page 3, line 16, strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty." (This is the case of Mary Byrne, widow of John Byrne, late major and lieutenant colonel, One hundred and fifty-fifth New York Volunteer Infantry (S. 4187).)

Page 4, strike out lines 7 to 11, inclusive. (This is the case of Alice O. Lord (S. 5509).)

Page 4, line 14, strike out the word "forty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty-six." (This is the case of Julius T. Morse (S. 5590).)

Page 5, line 9, strike out the word "forty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty-six." (This is a bill for the relief of James V. D. Ten Eyck (S. 6660).)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill as amended be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 449. Susannah Roberts.	S. 4556. E. Leora Norris.
S. 1531. John Hedges.	S. 5411. Augustus C. D. Wilson.
S. 1777. Albert Whitehead.	S. 5509. Alice O. Lord.
S. 2614. Henry Ackerman.	S. 5590. Julius T. Morse.
S. 2640. Julius E. Henderson.	S. 5647. Henrietta V. Hawley.
S. 2739. Edward S. Clithero.	S. 6038. Charles E. Sherman.
S. 2978. Almond Partridge.	S. 6290. Jennie M. Smalley.
S. 3786. Gustavus A. Kindblade.	S. 6324. Samuel N. West.
S. 4063. Martin Parker.	S. 6660. James V. D. Ten Eyck.
S. 4082. Augustus A. Nauman.	S. 6947. Nellie L. Davis.
S. 4072. Benjamin F. Adams (alias Franklin B. Adams).	S. 6985. Jerome S. Pinney.
S. 4187. Mary Byrne.	S. 7066. James E. C. Sawyer.
S. 4491. Mary C. Smith.	S. 6861. William L. Baird.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 8034) 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 CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The bill was read for amendment as follows:

An act (S. 8034) 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.

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 Ellen B. Kittredge, widow of Perry Kittredge, late hospital steward, Third 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 Thomas W. Dickey, late scout, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary E. McDermott, widow of John E. McDermott, late captain Company G, One hundred and eighth 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 Henry Frink, late of Company I, Eighteenth 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 Christian C. Bradymeyer, late of Company E, 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 George M. Pierce, late of Company I, Second 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 Joseph C. Trickey, late of Company B, 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 James M. Kinnaman, late of Company G, Twelfth 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 Addie Roof, widow of Daniel P. Roof, late of Twenty-first Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Leeman Underhill, late of Company D, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Morgan, late of Company E, Tenth 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 Alphonso L. Stasy, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Massachusetts 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 Jeremiah Lushbough, late of Company I, One hundred and 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 James B. Sales, late of Company C, 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 Mary E. Rikard, widow of James M. Rikard, late of Company B, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Illinois 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 Minnie V. Rikard, helpless and dependent child of said James M. Rikard, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Rikard the name of the said Minnie V. Rikard 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 E. Rikard.

The name of Margaret H. Benjamin, widow of Edson A. Benjamin, late of the U. S. S. Ohio, 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 Benjamin F. Ferris, late of Company K, Fifty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Hiram Ferrier, late of Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Henry B. Leach, late of Company I, Sixty-sixth 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 John Bell, late of Company I, 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 Elizabeth Lile, widow of Lewis Lile, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Kansas 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 M. Conner, late of Companies F and M, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The names of Lola B. Hendershott and Louise Hendershott, helpless and dependent children of Henry B. Hendershott, late captain, Second Regiment United States Artillery, and major, United States Army, retired, and pay each of said children a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Daniel H. Grove, late of Company H, Sixty-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 Charlotte R. Coe, widow of Edward D. Coe, late second lieutenant Company B, First Regiment Alabama 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 Caroline M. Packard, widow of William H. Packard, late of Company G, First Regiment, and Company E, Eleventh Regiment, Rhode Island 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 C. Smith, late of Company A, One hundred and fifth 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 George R. Griffith, late second lieutenant Company B, Two hundred and eleventh 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 Rolly Wright, late of Battery A, First Regiment West Virginia 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 Charles J. Higgins, late of Company C, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, 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 Joseph Letzkus, late of Company G, 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 Israel H. Phillips, late of Company C, Ninety-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 E. Woodward, late captain Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut 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 Josephine A. Davis, former widow of James H. Sackett, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Osmer C. Coleman, 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 Hugh McLaughlin, late of Company F, 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 Joseph Striker, late of Company E, Eighty-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 Mary Glancey, widow of James Glancey, late of Company D, Ninth 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 Joby A. Howland, late of Company F, Fifty-first 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 King, late of Company A, 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 Mary S. Hull, widow of John P. Hull, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois 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 Sarah E. Haskins, widow of John A. Haskins, late of Company D, 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 Ira Waldo, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Iowa 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 Ellis C. Howe, late of Company D, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania 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 M. Dixon and Joanna L. Dixon, helpless and dependent children of Barton S. Dixon, late captain Company F, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay them each a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Solomon Wilburn, late of Company H, Thirty-second 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 O. Sutherland, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, Battalion United States Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie H. Ross, widow of D. Laning Ross, late of U. S. S. Perl, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Dixon, late of Company A, Fiftieth 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 Arnold Bloom, late of Company K, 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 John D. Perkins, late of Company B, Second Regiment, and Company F, 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 William Harrison, 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 Sarah E. Johnson, widow of Absalom Y. Johnson, late Lieutenant colonel Twenty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and colonel Seventh Regiment 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 Willis Dobson, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment, and Company A, Fifty-second 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 Zachariah T. Fortner, late of Company G, Fifty-third 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 Jesse A. Moore, late of Company H, 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 James Moynahan, late second Lieutenant Company B, and first Lieutenant Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment Michigan 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 Dustin Berrow, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Sharpshooters, and Company G, Fourth 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 Sarah J. Viall, widow of Horace T. Viall, jr., late of Company B, Second Regiment Rhode Island 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 Luther Justice, late of Company L, Twentieth 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 Mary A. Crocker, widow of George A. Crocker, late captain Company A, Sixth 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 Winfield S. McGowan, late of Company B, Eighth 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 Martha J. Stephenson, widow of Ferdinand D. Stephenson, late captain Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment, and colonel One hundred and fifty-second Regiment, Illinois 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 George E. Smith, late of Company B, First Regiment Rhode Island 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 Roscoe B. Smith, late of Company I, 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 Mate Fulkerson, widow of Alexander C. Fulkerson, late of Company A, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Fred D. Bryan, late of Company C, Thirtieth 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 Ada M. Wade, widow of Charles O. Wade, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Companies I and L, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charlotte M. Snowball, widow of Edwin R. Snowball, late of Company C, Second Regiment California 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 Franklin M. Snowball, helpless and dependent child of said Edwin R. Snowball, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine.

The name of Albert White, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment United States 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 W. Lane, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa 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 Lydia M. Jacobs, widow of William H. Jacobs, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Albert Burgess, late of Company C, 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 Rosa L. Couch, widow of Simon A. Couch, late first Lieutenant Company D, Thirteenth 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 John Cook, alias Joseph Moore, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire 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 Amanda Barrett, former widow of Austin M. Kay, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Ninety-first Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alvah S. Howes, late of Company H, Sixtieth 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 George C. Rider, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Eighteenth Regiment New York 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 Charles C. Littlefield, late of Company D, Forty-sixth 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 Martha Dye, widow of John H. Dye, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company M, Eighth Regiment, Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie Hitchcock, widow of James W. Hitchcock, late captain Company K, Thirty-seventh 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 Sarah McLaury, widow of George S. McLaury, late of Company I, One hundred forty-fourth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Frederick, late of Company F, 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 Joseph D. Iler, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-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.

The name of Rodney S. Vaughan, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Ninety-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 Isaac A. Sharp, late of Company G, 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 Turner S. Bailey, late of Company A, Third Regiment Iowa 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 Alpheus K. Rodgers, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-second 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 Christina Higgins, widow of Asa T. Higgins, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth 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 Josiah B. Hall, late of Company B, Fifty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts 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 Ellen Tyson, former widow of Almon E. Gardner, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Hoover, late of Company G, Fifth 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 Abby E. Carpenter, widow of Charles A. Carpenter, late first Lieutenant Company H, 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 Sarah Gross, widow of Henry S. Gross, late assistant surgeon, Twenty-sixth 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 Nelson Taylor, late of Company K, One hundred and second 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 Carrie Crockett, widow of Hugh T. Crockett, late of Company A, Forty-sixth 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 Lucy H. Collins, widow of Oscar Collins, late of Company L, Third Regiment Ohio 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 Royal H. Stevens, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and first lieutenant Company B, First Regiment Michigan 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 Araminta G. Sargent, widow of George G. Sargent, late of Company C, Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio 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 Sidney P. Jones, late of Company B, Twelfth 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 Ann T. Smith, widow of William W. Smith, late captain Company G, Twenty-fourth 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 Ellen E. Clark, widow of John Clark, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and former widow of Joseph Kirk, late of Company B, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah B. Paden, widow of Thomas F. Paden, late of Company A, Third Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Edmund P. Banning, late second lieutenant of Marines, U. S. S. Powhatan, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Winchester E. Moore, late acting third assistant engineer, 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 Mary P. Pierce, widow of Edwin S. Pierce, late lieutenant colonel, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John B. Ladeau, late of Company D, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher P. Brown, late of Company D, Second Regiment Vermont 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 Allen Price, late of Company F, Tenth 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 Delphine R. Burritt, widow of Loren Burritt, late major, Eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The following committee amendments were read, severally considered, and agreed to:

Page 2, strike out lines 1 to 3, inclusive. (This is the bill (S. 300) of Thomas W. Dickey.)

Page 3, strike out lines 5 to 7, inclusive. (This is a bill (S. 2379) for the relief of Addie Roof.)

Page 8, line 19, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24." (This is the bill (S. 5657) of Andrew King.)

Page 12, line 5, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$24." (This is the bill (S. 6968) of James Luther Justice.)

Page 12, line 19, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20." (This is the bill (S. 7025) of Martha J. Stephenson.)

Page 13, strike out lines 3 to 6, inclusive. (This is the bill (S. 7084) for the relief of Mate Fulkerson.)

Page 14, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive. (This is the bill (S. 7173) of Lydia M. Jacobs.)

Page 14, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive. (This is the bill (S. 7214) of John Cook.)

Page 16, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive. (This is a bill (S. 7363) for the relief of Sarah McLaury.)

Page 20, line 20, strike out "\$40" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30." (This is the bill (S. 7805) of Delphine R. Burritt.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill as amended be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following Senate bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

S. 33. Ellen B. Kittredge.	S. 5136. John E. Woodward.
S. 300. Thomas W. Dickey.	S. 5171. Josephine A. Davis.
S. 437. Mary E. McDermott.	S. 5329. Osmer C. Coleman.
S. 921. Henry Frink.	S. 5339. Hugh McLaughlin.
S. 1115. Christian C. Bradymeyer.	S. 5514. Joseph Striker.
S. 1223. George M. Pierce.	S. 5528. Mary Glancey.
S. 2106. Joseph C. Trickey.	S. 5562. Joby A. Howland.
S. 2293. James M. Kinnaman.	S. 5657. Andrew King.
S. 2379. Addie Roof.	S. 5852. Mary S. Hull.
S. 2490. Leeman Underhill.	S. 6012. Sarah E. Haskins.
S. 2563. Charles W. Morgan.	S. 6169. Ira Waldo.
S. 2634. Alphonso L. Stasy.	S. 6270. Ellis C. Howe.
S. 2948. Jeramiah Lushbough.	S. 6452. Thomas M. Dixon and Jo-
S. 3178. James B. Sales.	anna L. Dixon.
S. 3304. Mary E. Rikard.	S. 6606. Solomon Wilburn.
S. 3370. Margaret H. Benjamin.	S. 6651. William O. Sutherland.
S. 3490. Benjamin F. Ferris.	S. 6664. Annie H. Ross.
S. 3522. Hiram Ferrier.	S. 6739. John Dixon.
S. 3573. Henry B. Leach.	S. 6750. Arnold Bloom.
S. 3597. John Bell.	S. 6759. John D. Perkins.
S. 3665. Elizabeth Life.	S. 6787. William Harrison.
S. 3664. George M. Conner.	S. 6791. Sarah E. Johnson.
S. 3673. Lola B. Hendershott and	S. 6873. Willis Dobson.
Louise Hendershott.	S. 6878. Zachariah T. Fortner.
S. 3748. Daniel H. Grove.	S. 6931. Jesse A. Moore.
S. 3993. Charlotte R. Coe.	S. 6938. James Moynahan.
S. 4123. Caroline M. Packard.	S. 6955. Dustin Berry.
S. 4255. Benjamin C. Smith.	S. 6966. Sarah J. Viall.
S. 4656. George R. Griffith.	S. 6968. James Luther Justice.
S. 4802. Rolly Wright.	S. 6973. Mary A. Crocker.
S. 4819. Charles J. Higgins.	S. 7000. Winfield S. McGowan.
S. 4989. Joseph Letzkus.	S. 7025. Martha J. Stephenson.
S. 5033. Israel H. Phillips.	S. 7047. George E. Smith.

S. 7076. Roscoe B. Smith.	S. 7547. Alpheus K. Rodgers.
S. 7084. Mate Fulkerson.	S. 7550. Christina Higgins.
S. 7100. Fred D. Bryan.	S. 7557. Josiah B. Hall.
S. 7108. Ada M. Wade.	S. 7569. Ellen Tyson.
S. 7136. Charlotte M. Snowball.	S. 7581. William Hoover.
S. 7137. Albert White.	S. 7587. Abby E. Carpenter.
S. 7164. William W. Lane.	S. 7588. Sarah Gross.
S. 7173. Lydia M. Jacobs.	S. 7595. Nelson Taylor.
S. 7190. Albert Burgess.	S. 7596. Carrie Crockett.
S. 7200. Rosa L. Couch.	S. 7615. Lucy H. Collins.
S. 7214. John Cook, alias Joseph	S. 7624. Royal H. Stevens.
Moore.	S. 7628. Araminta G. Sargent.
S. 7215. Amanda Barrett.	S. 7661. Sidney P. Jones.
S. 7216. Alvah S. Howes.	S. 7664. Ann T. Smith.
S. 7219. George C. Rider.	S. 7677. Ellen E. Clark.
S. 7224. Charles C. Littlefield.	S. 7701. Sarah B. Paden.
S. 7276. Martha Dye.	S. 7717. Edmund P. Banning.
S. 7282. Carrie Hitchcock.	S. 7719. Winchester E. Moore.
S. 7363. Sarah McLaury.	S. 7730. Mary P. Pierce.
S. 7376. William H. Frederick.	S. 7775. John B. Ladeau.
S. 7460. Joseph D. Iler.	S. 7781. Christopher P. Brown.
S. 7510. Rodney S. Vaughan.	S. 7791. Allen Price.
S. 7526. Isaac A. Sharp.	S. 7805. Delphine R. Burritt.
S. 7529. Turner S. Balley.	

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I call up Private Calendar 313, it being House bill 28282.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 28282) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Before the reading of the bill, Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed to do so, I would like to make a brief statement of its contents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. This bill, Mr. Chairman, has received most careful consideration at the hands of your Committee on Invalid Pensions. We have endeavored to present a bill that would be unobjectionable to the Members of this House, and yet that is a matter that is almost impossible to do. Still we have done our level best. Our committee since the session began in December has been somewhat crippled. There are two or three vacancies on our committee, and there have been several absentees since the last election. Our subcommittees are somewhat crippled by reason of there being sometimes only one member of a subcommittee present to work with us, and it is barely possible that under such circumstances some objectionable bills may have crept through. I have noticed that some subcommittees that have been fully represented at all times have presented bills here that were without objection, and if there are cases in this bill that are objectionable I think it is on account of there being an inefficient force on the subcommittee.

I desire to explain that in this bill there are 468 claimants, 332 being soldiers, 120 being widows, 14 being children, and 2 mothers. The bill carries a total appropriation of \$148,206. This is a total increase of \$48,048 per year on the part of the 332 soldiers; an increase of \$14,928 per year on the part of the 120 widows, of \$2,016 per year on the part of the 14 children, and of \$288 on the part of the 2 mothers, thus making about \$68,000 increase altogether. The average amount allowed per year under this bill is but \$361 to a person. Of course, some are receiving a larger amount per year and some less.

This, in brief, is our explanation of the present bill.

We hope that it will be the last one that we shall present at this session. If it is not the last one that we shall present at this session, it will probably be the last one that we shall call up for passage.

Mr. MANN. That is, the gentleman means House bills?

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] be allowed to address the House on this subject for 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. It does not require unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] is entitled to an hour, and the Chair understands he yields 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], who is recognized for that time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as has already been stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE], this is probably the last bill that will be reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions during the life of this Congress. There may be a few bills reported for desperate cases.

This bill was prepared under a resolution that each Member who had his evidence prepared should be allowed three bills.

Now I have in my district 4,000 living soldiers. I have to-day bedridden soldiers to the number of 50, and you can see from that statement what proportion of adequate relief we have in this bill when you consider the whole body of over 500,000 surviving soldiers.

I have some statistics here, part of which have been stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I think it is due the House to know how many pension bills have been introduced in this Congress. There has been introduced in this Congress 15,151 private pension bills.

Now, it is the presumption that every Member on this floor who introduces a bill thinks that bill has some merit. Of that number we reported and passed 3,090 bills. That is only 1 out of 5 introduced.

I stated on the floor of this House when the so-called dollar-a-day pension bill was under discussion that if that bill should pass the House it would largely dispense with private pensions. That was true; but, as you will remember, during the four days' consideration of that bill on this floor amendments were added to the bill which increased the aggregate between eleven and twelve million dollars. Then the bill went over to the Senate. There another and an entirely different bill was substituted. That was a pauper pension bill largely, and not a bill based upon service or upon sacrifice like the House bill.

The conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate had a contest lasting over four months, in order that our conferees, representing this House, could secure a bill partly based upon service and upon sacrifice, and we had to submit to a new classification in order to get any bill at all. Under this law a soldier who is totally disabled, who was wounded in battle, if he has not reached the age of 70 years, can only get a maximum of \$19 per month, whereas a soldier who is 75 years old, under this law, whether he was in the service for only 90 days, will get \$21, and if he was in 2 years, \$30 per month, without regard to his service or disability.

Let me illustrate why these private bills are necessary. I went into the Army at the age of 26 years, when I was at full maturity. The boys who went into the Army at 16 and 18 and who served through the war are older men than I am to-day. If I had gone into the Army at 16 or 18 years of age and had gone through the same service in that war, I would probably have been in the cemetery by this time or a physical wreck, utterly incapacitated for manual labor.

So that this law which passed in May last does not take care adequately of those who are disabled and who have not reached the age of 70 years. That is the reason why these private bills are necessary now. I have a table here showing the increases in this bill, referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin. The increases in this bill, should it become a law, will be \$5,472 a month, or \$65,704 a year, should all the beneficiaries live that long. That is the total increase for the 467 cases involved in this bill, but the death rate will reduce the aggregate to less than \$40,000. So you will concede that the increases are very moderate and in many cases not as liberal as they should be.

Now, my friends, a good many men on this floor, and more outside, do not appreciate or understand the magnitude of this great war. Do you know that more men lost their lives in one great battle—the Battle of Gettysburg—than in the entire American Revolution and in the two years' war with Mexico and the War with Spain, all combined, covering a period of 10 years?

In the War of the American Revolution, lasting 7 years, there were 56 battles fought, or 8 battles a year. In the Civil War there were over 2,000 battles fought, and 400 battles in which more men lost their lives than in the bloodiest battle of the War of the Revolution—the Battle of the Brandywine. In the whole War of the American Revolution 1,735 men were killed in battle. In the War with Mexico, where 105,000 soldiers were recruited in 2 years, 1,049 men lost their lives. In the War with Spain, including the terrible slaughter at San Juan Hill, according to the official report, 247 men lost their lives in battle. In the Battle of Gettysburg there were 3,070 killed on the battle field or died on the battle field from wounds.

Now, you can figure up your 1,735 in the War of the American Revolution, 1,049 in the War with Mexico, and 247 in the War with Spain, and you will find that 41 more men were killed in that one Battle of Gettysburg than in all these three great wars.

Let me call your attention to another fact. There were more men killed on the Union side in that war than all the wars of England—the greatest imperial Empire and the most warlike of any nation around the world—for 350 years, including the 43 wars of conquest under Queen Victoria. I have not the statistics of the loss on the Confederate side, for they are not so available.

Now, it does not seem to me to be beyond patriotic duty to bring in a bill here for these deserving and destitute old soldiers staggering to a nearby grave and only carrying an aggregate increase of \$65,000 a year.

Let me make another statement that may seem startling. Considering the size of the armies, considering the battle fatalities of these armies, the American people have provided more pensions, more benefits, more bounties to the soldiers of the American Revolution than we have up to this date for the soldiers of the Civil War. And now I will prove it.

Take Virginia—only one of the thirteen original Colonies—for illustration: In a speech made by Representative Smith, of South Carolina, in January, 1828, quoted in Thomas H. Benton's *Abridgment of the Debates of Congress*, is a statement of the amount of lands, the amount of bounty, and the amount of money given to the soldiers of Georgia and South Carolina by these Commonwealths for the services of their volunteer soldiers in the War of the Revolution. Congressman Smith, of South Carolina, said:

The truth is that the officers of your Revolutionary army had been more liberally provided for than any other class of men in this or any other country. In addition to their pay during their time of actual service they were promised half pay for life after they should retire from the Army, which was commuted for five years' full pay—which was a mighty stretch for a Government at the dawn of its struggle for freedom—and were promised and received large tracts of valuable lands. Each officer, from a major general down to an ensign, had his lands, and that placed upon the most fertile spots. In addition to this, the Southern States gave their officers large tracts of the finest land in the world. Virginia gave largely and liberally in lands to her officers. South Carolina did the same. North Carolina gave to each brigadier general 12,000 acres; to a colonel 7,200; to a captain 3,500; and to Gen. Greene that State gave 25,000 acres that were said at one time to be worth \$500,000. To that meritorious officer Georgia gave \$22,500 in money, and South Carolina gave him \$45,000 in money. These were free-will offerings after the war was ended, which those States were prompted to make to exalted merit for distinguished services, and surely they would redeem the Carolinas and Georgia from the crying sin of ingratitude.

In 1828 the Congress of the United States passed a law retiring all soldiers of the War of the Revolution and all officers on full pay for life (on the maximum pay of a captain) who served for two years in the continental line. Four years later, in 1832, the Congress of the United States passed a law retiring for life on full pay (limited to the full pay of a captain) all the minute men, all the militia, and all the militia officers who served on and off for two years. In 1833, a year later, Congress modified and liberalized that law. The second section of the act of 1832 required the reduction of all invalid and other pensions and a total relinquishment thereof before receiving its benefits; but Congress, on the 19th of February, 1833, removed this restriction; so that, since that time, the soldiers of that war received two pensions, where their service has been of sufficient duration to admit them to pensions under the act of 1832. Congress also made the law retroactive two years, to date back to 1830.

Here is something very substantial that Virginia did for her soldiers. In chapter 21 of the act of October, 1779, it is provided that—

Officers who shall serve in the Virginia line on the continental establishment \* \* \* to the end of the present war, and noncommissioned officers, soldiers, sailors, etc., shall \* \* \* receive land \* \* \* following:

	Acres.
Every colonel.....	5,000
Every lieutenant colonel.....	4,500
Every major.....	4,000
Every captain.....	3,000
Every noncommissioned officer.....	400
Every soldier.....	200

And so forth.

In the act of October, 1780, chapter 3, it was provided—

And each recruit, and all our soldiers now in service, \* \* \* or who may enlist by the 1st of April next to serve during the war, and who shall serve to the end thereof, SHALL THEN RECEIVE A HEALTHY NEGRO between the ages of 10 and 30 years.

That is most startling news—more startling than Hannibal brought back from Africa.

Or he shall receive £60 (\$300) in gold or silver, at the option of the soldier, in lieu thereof, and moreover be entitled to 300 acres of land.

Here are a few cases where the United States paid Revolutionary War officers money under the half pay originally promised by Virginia:

Laban Bailey, sailing master.....	\$2,021.50
Charles S. Bonoch, lieutenant, Navy.....	5,066.00
John Bailey, captain.....	10,548.16
Robert Andrews, chaplain.....	7,284.88
James Barron, commodore.....	32,382.50
John Bailey, Barstow, Ky.....	10,480.68
Corbin Griffin, captain.....	10,970.10
John Cox, captain.....	13,715.22

And many others.

These payments were made good by the United States to redeem promises made by Virginia and were in addition to the full pay and pensions provided by Congress.

Again, officers of the Regular Army—not more than 5 per cent of whom have any chance to see any battle service—are now retired at 64 years of age on three-fourths pay for life, and those Regular officers who served in the Civil War, if for a day only, are paid the salary of one rank above their rank at retirement. They receive three-fourths pay which, after five years, ranges from \$1,400 for a second lieutenant to \$4,500 for a brigadier general.

And quite recently 10 per cent increase in pay was voted the officers and soldiers of the Regular Army, aggregating some \$10,000,000 annually of our hard-earned tax money. And this was followed by a 10 per cent increase in pay of the officers and sailors of the Navy, aggregating \$6,000,000 more per year. All this for the benefit of men always well paid, well housed, and well fed, who produce nothing, earn nothing, improve nothing, and who have suffered no hardships, compelling every wage-worker to carry a soldier upon his back in addition to the tremendous burden of onerous taxation on everything he wears, eats, or consumes.

Congress provides liberally for the Navy in time of peace. The official pamphlet entitled "The Making of a Man-of-War's Man," issued by the Navy Department, May, 1910, to induce young men to enlist in the Navy, shows that a man may enlist at 18 years of age, spend half his wages, lay up the remainder, and at the age of 48 have savings of \$27,486. I quote a paragraph from this official pamphlet:

FINANCIAL BENEFITS OF A LIFE IN THE NAVY.

Regarding financial benefits we will suppose, for example, that a man enlisting at the age of 18, reaches the rank of petty officer by the end of his first enlistment (four years more). Any man can do this if he is willing to work. If he saves half his pay during 30 years, from the age of 18 to 48, and he invests it in the Navy Savings Bank at 4 per cent interest and reenlists immediately on the expiration of each enlistment those 30 years, at the end of that time he will have in cash \$27,486, and may retire on three-fourths of his pay, which will be about \$105 a month, or \$1,260 a year. Thus he will have \$27,476 in cash, which he can invest at 4 per cent, which will bring him in over \$1,236 a year. Add this to his retirement pay and you will readily see that he would have \$2,496 per year income from the early age of 48 for the balance of his life.

And yet we have great metropolitan journals and magazines claiming to be in a moral and patriotic uplift who utter no word of protest against the six hundred millions a year spent on militarism. But when it is proposed to spend a few thousand dollars on the seared and sorrowed remnant of that great army of veterans of the Civil War these same journals and magazines do not hesitate to denounce the surviving veteran soldiers as grafters, seeking to bankrupt the Federal Treasury. Verily are we not, ethically speaking, on the toboggan slide?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. KENDALL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Other instances might be cited showing the vast amount of land rewarded other officers of the Revolution. I will cite only one case, which is perhaps a marked one. Lafayette was first given 11,520 acres of land; afterwards he was given a full township, 36 square miles of land, to be selected by himself, and also \$200,000 in gold.

All these vast rewards were in addition to the pension and full pay given to Revolutionary officers, according to their rank, by the Congress of the United States.

Again, 40 years after the Mexican War, we pensioned every soldier who served 60 days in that war, and those who enlisted north of Texas could not reach the Army in Mexico at that time in 60 days. So these soldiers of the Mexican War were pensioned because they were soldiers who enlisted in that war and not because of actual service at the front or any disability whatever.

I invite your careful scrutiny to this bill. No soldier is pensioned without service or without disability and unless he is in destitute circumstances. It is our patriotic duty to care for these grizzled, battle-scarred veterans.

We can not call back from 70 national cemeteries our valiant dead. They are forever beyond recall. But we can do something for the living, who in that terrible four years' war offered their lives in battle to preserve the Republic. Let us see to it that the last sad remnant of that Army, now passing rapidly away, shall have their last days on earth made comfortable and free from biting want. Let us give to the fast-fading remnant of the men who stood behind the guns, who did the hardest work of war, a small token of our sense of gratitude to cheer their worn-out, weary lives. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] desire to occupy any more of his time?

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Not now.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the remarks of the distinguished ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON] this morning he made reference to the location and type of memorial that the Government should erect to Abraham Lincoln.

I do not propose now to discuss what type of memorial would be most fitting for the Government to undertake, but I venture to suggest that if the policy of plan to be adopted is that of a great national highway reaching from one point of the country to another, rather than have it from Washington to Gettysburg, it would be more appropriate to construct it from Washington to Richmond, Va.—Richmond, as the seat of that virile young government that thrived for a season and perished forever, and Washington, as the seat of that Government which has survived and will survive forever [applause]; or, rather still, discard the seat of government altogether, for there is, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] stated, or should be, a higher purpose than the construction of this memorial as the occasion of emphasizing any great project. Appealing the esthetic taste and love of appropriations is a great Washington project. It is equally true that it should be for a still higher purpose than gratifying the ambitions and desires of many to make it chiefly a factor that goes to make the Capital of the Union the most beautiful and most attractive of all the cities of the world.

I should rather go to Illinois, whence came the immortal Lincoln to assume the Presidency of the Republic in the most crucial period of its existence, and there with enduring arches begin the consecration of the memorial, letting it stretch southward across the plains, from which thousands and tens of thousands of soldiers went forth from their homes, both to the Union and to the Confederate lines, and let it reach to Mississippi, there to connect the home of Abraham Lincoln and the home of Jefferson Davis, the two Presidents of the respective Governments in this great and trying period, both of whom died martyrs for their country's good, as country's good each thought it. Either of these, it seems to me, would be more fitting than the proposition to connect Washington, with its grandeur, with Gettysburg, nigh by, with its memory and record of fratricidal strife and fraternal destruction. The only sound reason that makes the plan to construct a highway to Gettysburg of equal importance with either of the plans that I have suggested—to construct it from Washington to Richmond or from Illinois to Mississippi—is that on one occasion Lincoln repaired to Gettysburg, and there, in a few words and in brief speech, gave deliverance to expression of patriotic thought that, for the time consumed in their utterance, are equaled in no age and in no language yet spoken by man. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we have digressed from the purpose for which we arose to address the House. On January 10, 1913, when the preceding omnibus pension bill was under consideration, I took occasion, without knowing Capt. King, without knowing Commissioner Davenport, to read into the Record a letter that Capt. King, past commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, had written, in which letter Capt. King called attention to the fact that the Commissioner of Pensions is now and for several years had been drawing a fair salary of \$5,000 a year as such commissioner, and was at the same time, and had been for more than 20 years, drawing a pension as a disabled soldier because of disease contracted during his service in the war. Capt. King also took occasion to say that the Commissioner of Pensions saw no active battle and sustained no injury in his service; that he procured himself to be placed upon the pension roll at a time when he was an employee in connection with and in service of the Pension Bureau. Other remarks were made touching this question. On that occasion, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY], took occasion, after I had concluded my remarks, to say:

I made it my business to telephone the Pension Commissioner, and he informed me that he endeavored on three occasions to enlist in the Union Army in his native section in New Hampshire, but was rejected because of his youthfulness. He was less than 18 years of age, and in order that he might serve his country, in order that he might assist in keeping this Union whole, he left home, a boy under 18 years of age, and worked his way westward to Wisconsin, and was finally accepted and enlisted in Wisconsin; that he served five months in the Civil War in Mississippi and in Tennessee, and that he participated in the Battle of Memphis, on August 5, 1864.

My colleague said further:

In the light of the testimony of the commissioner himself, who would not dare state an untruth as far as his record is concerned, because it could be easily discovered by an investigation of the records at the War Department, I believe it is not only unjust, but it is unwarranted, it is unfair, and it should be condemned.

I accept the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts as correct. I mean to say by that that the gentleman from

Massachusetts undoubtedly correctly and truthfully reported what the Commissioner of Pensions had said to him over the telephone.

If what the Commissioner of Pensions said to the gentleman from Massachusetts is true, then it undoubtedly follows that the statements were unwarranted, unfair, and should be condemned. Any remarks I now make in no way bring into question either the good faith, the accuracy, or the propriety of my colleague's statement just quoted. But I assert again that I assume that, fresh from the telephone, he quoted the commissioner correctly—that is, that Commissioner Davenport told him that he undertook to enlist in his native State three times, and because he was under 18 he was too young and could not; next, that he went westward and finally enlisted and served five months in the Army; next, that in addition to that service in the Army, after it had ended he was in such a condition as to be entitled to a pension; and, further, that during that service he was engaged in the battle at Memphis on the 5th of August, 1864. Mr. Chairman, I lay down the proposition that neither statement is true. I not only lay it down, but I propose in my time here to prove it by the record and incontrovertible fact. On that occasion my friend very properly, as he thought, said:

I can very readily conceive that some joker has been indulging in the very pleasing task of writing letters.

Let me read this letter, Mr. Chairman:

25 WEST MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE,  
Baltimore, Md., January 13, 1913.

Hon. JAMES M. CURLEY,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was interested, if not amused, at your defense of Commissioner Davenport, Friday last, in the House.

Mr. Davenport informed you over the telephone that he was less than 18 years of age when he enlisted (presumably in the summer of 1864), and the "fairy" tale that he had made three attempts to do so in New Hampshire and was obliged to make his way to far Wisconsin before he succeeded.

About a year ago four ex-Union soldiers were at lunch together—Davenport and the writer were of the number. The question of age came up, and it was disclosed that all of us were born in 1845. I was the youngest of the four, being some two or three months Davenport's junior (he likes to repeat this incident). Now, Davenport claims to have enlisted in the summer of 1864; 1845 from 1864 leaves 19 plus 6 months—nearly 20 years instead of less than 18. Has Mr. Davenport told you the truth? I was born June 24, 1845, and on the 15th day of August, 1862, was mustered into the service of the United States in Company H, Sixth Regiment Maryland Volunteers; served until the close of the war (2 years 10 months); wounded three times, used crutches for nearly 12 months after the war, and had the honor of commanding my company in the Wilderness campaign. Again, Mr. Davenport told you in that telephonic conversation that he served 5 months and was in the Battle of Memphis, August 5, 1864. As my entire service was in the Army of the Potomac, in the famous Sixth Corps (Keller's brigade), I am not very familiar with the battles fought in the Southwest. As I had never heard of the Battle of Memphis, August 5, 1864, I have looked through Strait's Alphabetical List of Battles, 1754 to 1900, and it fails to disclose any such engagement. This book is accepted as authentic in the Pension Bureau. Now, Mr. CURLEY, did Mr. Davenport tell you the truth? You can verify his statement by a call on the Adjutant General of the Army for his record and of the Battle of Memphis. If there was such a battle, it must have been disastrous to this gallant soldier, who was so anxious to "keep the Union whole," as 21 years thereafter, while holding a position in the Pension Bureau, had himself placed on the pension rolls at \$16 per month for "chronic diarrhea," and under the law that wasting disease must still be present or be dropped from the rolls. Does he look it?

I have on my desk a late photograph of the Commissioner of Pensions, and he does not look it. Capt. King goes on to say:

I have served several years on the Grand Army of the Republic national pension committee, have always urged the most liberal pensions for my comrades who deserved them, but have never favored those "chocolate" soldiers who never saw the front or felt the shock of battle. We read in Holy Writ that those who went into the vineyard at the eleventh hour received the same pay, but nowhere do we read in that sacred volume that they received more than those who bore the whole heat and burden of the day.

Now, Mr. CURLEY, it was not a "joker" who wrote to Mr. RODDENBERRY. I pride myself on having been a real soldier, and you are at liberty, and I court the inquiry, to call on The Adjutant General of the Army for my record, or to my dear old commander, Gen. J. Warren Keifer.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN R. KING.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague said that it would be easy to obtain from the War Department the military record of the Commissioner of Pensions, and that the Commissioner of Pensions would not dare misstate it. I read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 14, 1913.

THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,  
Care of War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Please cause to be forwarded to me the military record of James L. Davenport as a private in Company B, Fortieth Wisconsin Regiment, 1864-65.

Yours, truly,

S. A. RODDENBERRY.

This is the reply from The Adjutant General's Office:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 15, 1913.

Hon. S. A. RODDENBERRY,  
House of Representatives:

The records show that James L. Davenport was enrolled May 23, 1864, at Beloit, Wis., and was mustered into service June 7, 1864, as a

private of Company B, Fortieth Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, to serve 100 days, and that he was mustered out with the company as a private September 20, 1864, to date September 16, 1864.

GEO. ANDREWS, Adjutant General.

So the record of the department shows that the distinguished Commissioner of Pensions served less than three months and a half in this great war and that his arduous sacrifices and services nowhere approximated five months. I also addressed a communication to the Surgeon General of the Army, which was referred to The Adjutant General, under the same date, as to Mr. Davenport's confinement in hospital from disease or injury. The reply is:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
January 16, 1913.

Hon. S. A. RODDENBERRY,  
House of Representatives:

Involving attention to the letter addressed to him to-day by this office, from which it will be seen that nothing has been found in the hospital records to show that the said Davenport was wounded or received any injury while in service, or that he was under treatment in hospital for any disability while a member of the regiment mentioned.

GEO. ANDREWS,  
The Adjutant General.

Gentlemen, the record is speaking for itself. This is no telephone conversation. The correctness and truth of the commissioner's telephone statements are not supported by the official record. But I proceed.

Capt. King referred to Strait's Alphabetical List of Battles. So that the record may be complete, I supplement him by saying that on page 85 of that volume it shows what transpired in the nature of battles, engagements, sieges, or skirmishes at or near Memphis, and nowhere does it appear that any battle, engagement, or skirmish took place at any time during the war at Memphis on August 5 or thereabouts, so the commissioner who gave his record over the telephone fought in a battle of which nobody has a record except himself. Either Davenport is wrong or the war records are falsified. The record is speaking now, not the Commissioner of Pensions. His enlistment in the Fortieth Wisconsin Regiment—I read from Love, Wisconsin in the Rebellion, "Roster of Union Soldiers," not only recognized as an authority but accepted as such by the Pension Department, and it so appears in the volume quoted and it so appears in the records of the Pension Bureau; not only that, but it appears in the preface of Strait's Alphabetical List of Battles that the Commissioner of Pensions then accepted and now accepts it as authentic record of the battles. From this authority, "the men of the Fortieth Wisconsin were principally students of the Wisconsin colleges and seminaries and members of the several professions." That is evident from the fact that when the college term was out the latter part of May these young men, patriotic and valiant, engaged for 100 days in the war, and for perhaps longer if occasion should require. They enlisted, went forward to Tennessee, and there served, returning to their State and their colleges in ample time for the fall term. The Commissioner of Pensions seems to have abandoned his business of soldier-broker long enough then and thereafter to go to Tennessee with the college boys. The record from the official roster, on page 858 et sequentia, says that but three soldiers in the entire regiment received a wound of any kind, and that no soldier, officer or private, of Commissioner Davenport's company received an injury of any kind.

It further appears on page 1119 of the roster that the entire Fortieth Wisconsin Regiment, composed of 776 privates, mostly college boys, was mustered out in Wisconsin, where they enlisted, and that when the roll was called every soldier, every boy who went forward with the regiment, answered present except 13. The names of the 13 who did not answer present are there recorded. Every one of them is reported to have died from disease, and of the company in which the Commissioner of Pensions was a member only two are reported to have been fatally afflicted with disease of any kind, and no record in the War Department that the Commissioner made a charge upon the hospital. That is the Wisconsin regiment in which he served, and because of which service for nearly 30 years while he has served as an employee of the Pension Department he has been drawing \$16 a month, when these old veterans that Gen. Sherwood was talking about were receiving \$8, \$10, and \$12, although they fought where lives of men were swallowed up by blood and death.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman has stated heretofore that there are several ex-soldiers who are drawing pensions and who are receiving high salaries from the Government at the same time. Why does not he give some more of those cases instead of confining all of his remarks and criticisms to Commissioner Davenport, who happens to be a Republican official?

If he desires to be fair and impartial and to help correct what he regards as an abuse, why does he not refer to the cases of some Democratic officials as well? Why not give the cases of some others, like that of Gen. Black, for instance, who, to my knowledge, has been drawing a pension of \$100 a month for nearly 30 years on the theory that he is and has been all along a physical wreck, and yet nearly all of that time he has been serving the Government in some capacity or other, and has received much more salary and pension, too, than Commissioner Davenport has? He has been a Member of Congress. He was Commissioner of Pensions for a number of years and is now president of the Civil Service Commission, and has been a member of the commission for many years. I have no objection to all this. Gen. Black was a distinguished soldier and has been a faithful public official. I am his personal friend, and am not seeking to criticize him, but why does not the gentleman refer to some of these other cases instead of continually hammering at Commissioner Davenport and talking about him getting a fat salary and drawing a pension at the same time, just as if that is a crime and he the only man who ever committed it?

Mr. RODDENBERY. I am glad the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has again called attention to Gen. Black, and it is very appropriate in this connection; but if my friend will read the RECORD, and I am sure he usually does, he will find that my colleague [Mr. TRIBBLE] drew attention on the floor to Gen. Black's pension, and not only stated his salary, but the whole amount he has drawn in pensions and the whole amount he has drawn in his respective high public offices. The reason I call attention to Commissioner Davenport now is that I received a letter from Past Commander in Chief John R. King, giving me facts which I would not otherwise have known and which should be brought to the attention of the House. I immediately verified them and presented them to the House. Then the correctness of the statements were brought into question by Commissioner Davenport in conversation over the phone with my colleague [Mr. CURLEY], who accurately and correctly repeated on the floor what the commissioner said; that is, that he served five months; and I have proved by the War Department and the war records that he did not.

He stated that he was in the Battle of Memphis on August 5, 1864, and I have proved by the War Department records that he was not. In fact, have shown there was no such battle; that he tried to enlist and could not because he was under 18 years of age; and I have proved by the record, and now prove by his own autobiography in Who's Who in America that he was born on January 27, 1845, and that he could have entered nearly two years before he did and been clear of the age that he gave to my friend Mr. CURLEY.

I will also call attention to facts that seem appropriate when we are about to consider this commissioner's sad disappointment at not being able to break into the Army. On the first page of the bill we are now considering, on the first page of the report, and the first bill in the report, and the first item in the bill, is a paragraph authorizing a pension for a soldier who enlisted in the Union Army when he was 15 years old. Was this young American more diligent than the distinguished Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Did the gentleman notice the second page, where the pensioner was only 13 years of age when he enlisted?

Mr. RODDENBERY. I thank the gentleman. Yes; just 13 years of age, and, lo and behold, he comes from Wisconsin, the State in which the commissioner enlisted.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RODDENBERY. I will be glad to yield later, but let me finish just now. I turn to page 11 of the report and find that a young lad from Illinois, according to this report, enlisted in the Army at the age of 13 and rendered service on the battle field. What was the reason Commissioner Davenport could not get in at 16, 17, or 18 years of age?

In the same report, on page 15, we find young Hughey, of Ohio, who enlisted and served at the age of 14. What was the matter over in New Hampshire, that the Commissioner of Pensions could not get in after three futile efforts? Why, my God, if he had been as expeditious in getting into the war as he was in getting onto the pension roll, John C. Black and old Gen. SHERWOOD would be pigmies in battle by the side of him. [Applause.]

Turn to page 21 of the record and there you find another Ohio lad who, according to the record, was accepted and enlisted in the Army at 13 years of age. Where was the commissioner then? This young Ohio man was younger than the Commissioner of Pensions.

We find again, on page 32, out in Wisconsin, where the gentleman finally broke in to save the country, a lad who at 16

years of age enlisted and participated in the service of his country. We turn to page 54 and find that Bradley W. Hill, now 67 years old, entered the service at the age of 16. And, gentlemen, does it not astound you that this soldier enlisted in New Hampshire, where the Commissioner of Pensions made three fatal and futile efforts to enlist? So he says. I wonder what they had against him.

On page 57 of the record we find that Charles D. Jones, now 65, enlisted in the Army at 16 years of age; and, behold, this lad also was from New Hampshire. Where was the commissioner? He was over 18 years old at that time. But he contented himself by trying to explain to my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY] how he strove in New Hampshire to get into the Army and crossed the American Continent to the State of Wisconsin in order that he might do service to save the Republic and get upon the pension roll. [Laughter.]

On page 86 we find a 16-year-old lad from Wisconsin gets upon the fighting roll. We find on page 98 another 16-year-old lad; on page 100 another 14-year-old lad. We find on page 119, also from Wisconsin, a 16-year-old lad. But Commissioner Davenport, whose record, being questioned upon the floor of the House, sends by telephone from his luxurious office in the Pension Building, where he is drawing now \$5,000 a year from the people's Treasury, a demonstrated false statement in the desperate effort to exculpate himself from the charge made by his old comrade, Capt. King, saying over the phone to my colleague, "Tell the Congress I would have got there quicker but I was too young and they would not take me." Was he of sound mind and was he of fighting disposition? I can not tell you.

On page 121 another lad of 15 was able to get into the Army, and so on all through the report. On page 138 we find young Thurston at 17 years enlists and is accepted in the State of New Hampshire. He is four years younger than Davenport, but he went out to fight—not for a pension but for his country. I call your attention to it because my friend says that he knows the Commissioner of Pensions would not make a statement that was not correct, because the records would show it, and we have resorted to authentic sources and produced the records. They show what the facts are. Let Members now judge this man. What an incident, that Commissioner Davenport was the only 16 or 17 year old boy who could not enlist in New Hampshire.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia if Capt. King, whose name has been used here, or whose statement was used in this House to make an assault upon the worthy and efficient Commissioner of Pensions, is the same Capt. King who was pension agent in the city of Washington before the consolidation of the pension agencies?

Mr. RODDENBERY. Lately?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. RODDENBERY. I do not know. Gen. SHERWOOD can tell you.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it not a fact that his pension was granted and increased while holding the office of pension agent in this city, and that his fight on the Commissioner of Pensions grows out of the fact that the Commissioner of Pensions declined or refused to place him in the office of disbursing agent after the consolidation of the pension agencies?

Mr. RODDENBERY. So far as I know, it may be entirely true, and, again, so far as I know, it may be entirely incorrect.

Mr. AUSTIN. How long has he been pension agent—this man who now uses his position in the public service to assault his superior officer, a man of such splendid efficiency as Commissioner Davenport?

Mr. RODDENBERY. I do not know that Capt. King is now in the service. I do not know that he ever has been in the service; but I do know that according to his card he is past commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic of the United States. I do know that according to his card he was a member of the Sixth Missouri Volunteers; that he is past commander of the Department of Maryland; that he is District of Columbia commander of the Loyal Legion; that he is president of the Grand Army Club of Maryland. I do know that according to the records of the War Department this lad entered the war at about 17; that he stayed with it 2 years and 10 months; that he was in Gen. Keifer's brigade; that in the terrific Battle of the Wilderness, where America met America, he commanded his company; that when he came out of the war he had left flesh, blood, muscle, and bone on the field where he did battle for his country; and I know that for years he drew \$10 a month in this infirm condition when the Commissioner of Pensions was drawing \$16 a month, and never stumped his toe or had

the colic, so far as his military or hospital record shows. If Capt. King is not getting a liberal, fair pension, he ought to have it, and if Davenport is getting any it is a fraud on the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman from Georgia know that Capt. King made a personal appeal to the Commissioner of Pensions, Mr. Davenport, to have his pension increased beyond what the evidence in the case warranted, and that Mr. Davenport declined to increase it, and that that is probably the beginning of the animus he has displayed in this matter, and that it was probably aggravated later on when he blamed Mr. Davenport for not getting a place he wanted?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do not know.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, I do. I have been so informed, and, I think, reliably.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. But before I have finished I will show you that applicants and influences have appealed to Mr. Davenport for pensions contrary to law, contrary to the findings of the examiners, and that he has granted them in the face of both the law and the facts.

Mr. LANGLEY. That is a pretty serious charge, and it should be sustained or withdrawn.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I will show it, and don't you doubt it. In further answer to my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] in this connection, he says Mr. Davenport is a faithful, vallant, and efficient Commissioner of Pensions. I will make direct reference to it presently.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Certainly.

Mr. AUSTIN. Capt. King calls attention to the fact that the Commissioner of Pensions, while drawing a large salary, secured a pension.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Capt. King himself, while drawing a large salary as pension agent in this city, had his pension increased, and, I understand, then became displeased with the Commissioner of Pensions because he would not give him a further increase and would not recommend or appoint him disbursing clerk.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Yes; and Capt. King was entitled to his and Davenport was not, and I will prove both those statements. When Capt. King walks along the street you can see him limp, and if you will lift his trousers, you will see where braces of steel, knit around his muscles, strengthen his wounded limbs, where the bullets of the enemy tore away his bones to rot on the field of battle. Davenport is drawing a pension on the ground of chronic diarrhea that renders him permanently disabled for physical labor, and yet day after day he goes to the Pension Office, and at high functions he revels, in spite of his wasting disease, and cuts fantastic steps in "turkey-trot society." [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. In a moment. If my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] would call on Commissioner Davenport at the Pension Office some day about 1 or 2 o'clock, when he has returned from luncheon, I have no doubt the commissioner would recognize him; but if the gentleman from Tennessee, who habitually fashions his attire in the humble style which is characteristic of the country people, should see Davenport riding along in his limousine, with a silk plug hat on as high as a churn, and with a long-tailed coat that puts to shame the plumage of a peafowl, and with studs that sparkle like the eyes of a toad, the commissioner would know him not. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. As I remember the gentleman from Georgia has stood on the floor and criticized Government officials for drawing large salaries and at the same time drawing and enjoying a pension. In the King case, where he was pension agent in Washington City and drawing a salary of \$4,000 a year, the gentleman from Georgia says he is not only entitled to a pension but entitled to have the pension increased. I thought the gentleman from Georgia was consistent and I thought he was sincere in opposing Government officials drawing high salaries and pensions at the same time. Now he indorses that theory himself in King's case.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in principle, there is nothing in policy, there is nothing in any statement ever made by me on a pension policy that will justify the conclusion that a soldier who draws a pension because he has lost his arm, because he has lost a segment of his limb, caused by actual wounds or injuries sustained in the service,

that on that ground he is not entitled to a pension. There is nothing to bar him from obtaining the salary, the highest in the Republic, and drawing his pension at the same time; because the pension he is drawing for the wounds received or the injuries he sustained in a measure compensates his loss, and the salary he draws from the Government is for the service rendered to the Government.

But there is a principle and policy in my utterance, which I now reassert. I announce that a soldier who draws a pension from the Government on the ground that he is suffering from disease—chronic, incurable—which physically and totally disables him from service to the Government, lives a lie when he draws his pension and at the same time does full time in the employ of the Government. A soldier draws a pension because he is totally incapacitated from incurable disease; if that be true and he at the same time draws a salary from the Government, he is getting the salary for which he can not render service, because the rendition of service and incapacity to serve are paradoxical and inexplicably contradictory. It can not be.

If it is true that the Commissioner of Pensions is drawing a pension since 1886, obtained on the ground that he contracted a chronic disease that permanently and totally and physically disables and incapacitates him for labor, and therefore he was entitled to a pension, one of two things is true, either he obtained his pension on false grounds or he is drawing a salary in the perpetration of a fraud on the Government, because the propositions are absolutely irreconcilable and incompatible. He who works for the Government and earns a salary of \$5,000 can not at the same time be entitled to draw \$16 a month pension on the ground of incapacity and permanent disability from wasting, chronic, and incurable disease.

Mr. BATES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I will.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman believes in a pension under certain circumstances, or I so understand from his remarks?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Proceed.

Mr. BATES. Has the gentleman appeared before the Committee on Invalid Pensions, or any of its subcommittees, or attended the hearings, as a result of which they have reported this bill to the House carrying increase of pensions? In other words, I have listened to some strictures on the judgment of the Commissioner of Pensions, and I ask the gentleman how that is involved in this bill when this bill is a report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions carrying increases, and in a few instances original pensions, but all reflecting the judgment, not of the Commissioner of Pensions, but of a committee of this House, the gentleman's colleagues, sitting in their capacity as a committee to make up their reports from the testimony that is adduced before them as any other committee of this House is bound to do? Has the gentleman attended and asked to be heard on any single case that is provided for in this report or bill?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Before answering the gentleman I will say this, that if his question was inspired and was incorporated in the Bible we would have to correct the catechism which teaches the Sunday school children where the longest verse of the Scripture appears.

Mr. BATES. No; I asked the question in a spirit of fairness.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. The remarks I am making have nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. BATES. Have your criticisms of Mr. Davenport anything to do with this bill?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Not a thing; I am directing these remarks at the conduct of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman is not confining his remarks to the bill under discussion, as the rules require.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. My remarks deal with Commissioner Davenport drawing \$5,000 a year salary for hard labor, who is at the same time drawing \$16 a month pension obtained on the ground that he is not able to work at all. That is the proposition. He either is not qualified for a pension or not qualified for the office. He may be wanting in both. He can not be entitled to the two.

I want to say to the gentlemen you have now before you the war record of Mr. Davenport. Gentlemen have suggested that I am attacking Mr. Davenport. What I say is based on the writings of his comrades, on the records of the War Department, on his autobiography, on the records of the Wisconsin regiments, in one of which he served, on the authentic record of the battles of the country, on documents now pending before the House. I say to you, gentlemen, do not answer here by crying that it is a shame and an outrage for a Member to stand on the floor and assail a faithful servant. Go down yonder to the Pension Office, by telephone or otherwise, and bring to the

floor of this House the application of the commissioner for his pension, the examiner's testimony as to his abilities and disabilities, the evidence of the witnesses upon which he drew the pension, the statement of the surgeons that passed him, and let the Congress see, and, if general debate is still in progress, it will leave here full of holes faster than some of the spectators from the city of Washington left the hill down here in the early days of the war when they went forward to see it ended in a few minutes. Bring in the commissioner's record. He is getting a pension. He is not denying that. He had to get out papers to get the pension on. Bring them in here. I do not command them.

I have given you the War Department's record showing that he never participated in any fighting, and that he did not serve for five months. I have given you the Surgeon General's statement that there is no record of his illness. I give you the record of the regiment, which shows that he was not reported as sick. I have shown you that thousands of 16 and 17 year old boys got into the Army. Let sensible men say whether he could have done so if he had tried. Why was it that the commissioner, in 1864, when 19 years old, when there was more than one year of the war and six months of terrible fighting left—why is it that he went back to Wisconsin with the soldier college boys and did not stay down about Memphis, where in a few weeks afterwards there was bloody battle? The commissioner told my colleague that he tried to get in and on account of extreme youth they would not admit him, that finally he went to Wisconsin and was accepted, and that he served his country. The record shows he went where the fighting was, but when the schoolboys' vacation was over in the fall of 1864 he went back to Wisconsin with them. Why did not he enlist with some of the other depleted companies around Memphis when the siege was there, when the great batteries of the respective sides were in action, when a few weeks later a terrific and bloody fight took place? If the commissioner was too young in New Hampshire, he was not too young at Memphis and in Tennessee to be taken in. Why, Mr. Chairman, his own statement of inability to enlist stamps him as a fraud and an imposter on the pension rolls of the country. I make the statement upon the record. I did not say that he tried to get in and that he could not. He said that. I now say that if he wanted to get in in 1864, instead of going back and being mustered out, and rushing back to New Hampshire and later on to Washington for a pension, he could have gone to the front. Thousands of men perished between September, 1864, and June, 1865. Where was the Commissioner of Pensions in his yearning desire to fight for his country then?

But I made some promises to my friends just now. Under the rules of the House there are certain committees. One of those committees is the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department. The rule says that committee shall inquire into the honesty, the justness, and the legality of the expenditures made in the Interior Department. The Pension Bureau is under the Interior Department. The Interior Department expends money. The pension laws of the country are statutes. They are carried into execution by appropriations. I will ask for the benefit of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department convene his committee, summon witnesses, and make inquiry into the Interior Department and find out whether or not one pensioner, who draws a pension on certificate No. 1088170, did not take an examination under the law of 1890, and if he was not turned down by the examining board because his case was not meritorious. Then let them ascertain if a little later he was not again on application examined and turned down for the same reason. Then inquire if again he was not examined for the same case and turned down the third time in the Pension Department and by the examiners.

If the records of the Commissioner of Pensions do show that, then let this Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department find out if about November, 1911, when it looked as though Mr. Roosevelt was going to take the Republican nomination away from Mr. Taft, and when everyone, from Taft's first lieutenant, the Postmaster General, down to the private in the Pension Department, was trembling lest Roosevelt might grab the nomination and sweep the country and plunge them out of office—find out if about that time Mr. Roosevelt did not address to Mr. Davenport a communication and tell him to reopen that particular claim, reinvestigate it, and allow it. Then find out if it was not reopened—I could not tell you about its being reinvestigated—and see if the packet on which the pension is entered, if it is not destroyed, will not show that immediately in reply the Commissioner of Pensions wrote to Mr. Roosevelt that he would at once order it reopened and have the pensioner

allowed his pension. Finally, ascertain if he did not get a back pension, including a future pension, under the act of 1890, after having been rejected three times nearly seven years before.

Then see if in fact it was not so allowed and if he did not get more than \$500 back pension, and if that pension was not granted without new evidence, without new showing in any way different from what appears in the three hearings in which he was turned down. Now, gentlemen, if you want to find out whether or not Davenport is a faithful servant let your Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department make an inquiry and ascertain. I make the statement on the floor. It will not take any appropriation nor a resolution for a special commission to make the inquiry. Under the rules you can do it now. I suggest for the benefit of my friends of the committee that they can go further. Under the law we passed last summer appropriation and provision was made that extra clerks might be obtained by the Commissioner of Pensions, appointed and paid for the purpose of expediting the auditing, approval, and payment of the pensions to the old soldiers under the Sherwood law. Now, the Constitution, if I remember it rightly, states that no person convicted of a felony or high crimes or crimes involving moral turpitude, or words to that effect, shall hereafter enjoy or receive an office of trust or emolument from the Government. There is some such provision in the Constitution.

Let the Committee on Expenditures inquire if since we passed that law an applicant has not been appointed to one of these positions; also if the appointee had not been convicted of embezzling and defrauding the Government, served his sentence, and completed it. Further, ascertain if, with the stigma of the offense and the inhibition of the Constitution upon him, the Commissioner of Pensions has not as a personal appointment placed him in office on the pay roll and in the service, and if he is not on the pay roll now, when did they fire him and why? See how the Commissioner of Pensions will show up. Gentlemen, I am not through yet. Go to the telephone and answer now. Let the Committee on Expenditures investigate it. I give you the facts sufficient to base it upon, and, gentlemen, as the days go by we shall present some others. We have called attention to this matter at this time for reasons that have been already stated. No man is further than I from casting obliquity upon a man who does not deserve it. No man has greater antipathy and less respect for that reckless creature who will make a common traffic of another's conduct and without justification hold it up to public gaze. He who does it without cause, he who dares it without justification, will justly merit the execration and scorn of his fellows and of his countrymen. But he who points out corruption or malfeasance and does it justly has, in some measure, rendered a service to decency and done something toward promoting the virtues of honesty and integrity, both in public and private position. On what the outcome, judged by these standards, will be, without fear of the result of the issue, I now take my stand. The fittest will survive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. I know that. The Chair misunderstands me. I am asking the gentleman from Wisconsin to—

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] yields to me for the purpose of making a request to extend my remarks in the Record by including, among other matters, a copy of a letter of an ex-commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, bearing on the subject matter that the gentleman from Georgia has been discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by the inclusion of the letter which he has indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the letter is. I could not hear the gentleman's statement.

Mr. LANGLEY. The letter is from Ex-Commander in Chief Torrance, of the Grand Army of the Republic, addressed to Capt. King. The gentleman from Massachusetts is familiar—

Mr. MURRAY. What is it? Let us hear it. Will not the gentleman read it or have it read?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will send it to the Clerk's desk to be read in my own time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Kentucky; and if so, how much time?

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to have read at the Clerk's desk the letter indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LANGLEY. Being entitled to the floor for three minutes, I could, of course, have it read in my own time without unanimous consent, but it does not matter, so I get it read. I have no prejudice whatever against Capt. King, nor have I the slightest desire to injure him in any way. On the contrary, I have been his friend for many years, and I admire his excellent military record. But the gentleman from Georgia has quoted him repeatedly and seems to rely upon him as his chief witness. Therefore, in justice to all concerned, I think this letter from one of his distinguished comrades, himself an ex-commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, should go in the RECORD in connection with this debate, since it bears upon the credibility of the witness, so to speak. I therefore ask that it be read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 14, 1913.

Comrade JOHN R. KING, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR SIR: I have just read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the debate in the House of Representatives last Friday, when the pension bill (H. R. 27475) was under consideration, and was astonished beyond measure to read your letter of the 2d instant to Mr. RODDENBERRY.

Knowing, as I do, your long, intimate, and confidential relations with Commissioner Davenport and your off-professed friendship for him and your frequent tributes to his worth and good qualities, I can not conceive of any honest or manly justification for your discreditable treatment of him, and I feel that you have forfeited the confidence and respect of every decent comrade of the Grand Army of the Republic.

Not content with besmirching your own friend to the limit, your perpetual egotism had to assert itself in contrasting your own military record with that of Comrade Davenport. I am not a special friend of Davenport, but I have always regarded him as a gentleman, and I would a thousand times prefer his record to yours, with the spirit you possess. I do not care what provocation you may have had for writing such a letter, but I will guarantee that you will soon be able to count your friends on your two thumbs.

Yours, truly,

ELL TORRANCE.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the letter that it is not in order for any person to read into the RECORD a derogatory article on an old soldier of the Union who for over two years fought for his country and left his limbs on the battlefield—

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman is overruled.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of placing in the RECORD a great number of letters and extracts from letters of eminent and well-known men, and also extracts from editorials in newspapers and magazines and other periodicals regarding the exemption of American vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from Panama Canal tolls: [From Hon. George F. Edmunds, formerly United States Senator from Vermont.]

941 SOUTH ORANGE GROVE AVENUE,  
Pasadena, Cal., January 6, 1913.

ROBERT UNDERWOOD JOHNSON, Esq.,  
The Century, 33 East Seventeenth Street, New York.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have received your note of inquiry upon the subject, and have no hesitation in saying that I think the so-called Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from payment of tolls in passing the canal ought to be immediately repealed: First, because I believe that both the language and spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty compel us to subject our own coastwise vessels to the same tolls established for the commerce of all other nations making use of the canal. Such equality was, as everybody knows, the consideration made to Great Britain for her releasing us from the supposed obligations of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850. Although I am sure from the careful examination by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when the treaty made by President Arthur with the Republic of Nicaragua was under consideration that the United States was no longer bound by the stipulations of the treaty of 1850 and our engagement not to build a canal through the Isthmus had become entirely inoperative, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was made in language so clear for universal equality that it is impossible to successfully construe it in any other way. If we have made a bad bargain we are bound by every consideration, as well of expediency as of justice, to stand by it; second, if as a matter of expediency alone we withdraw the favor proposed to our own coastwise commerce, although we might have the right to grant it, the way will be left open to deal with the subject in future in such a way as the public interest should require.

Very truly, yours,

GEO. F. EDMUNDS.

THE "COASTWISE EXEMPTION."

I. OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

[Clarence Poe, president and editor the Progressive Farmer and Southern Farm Gazette, Birmingham, Ala.; Raleigh, N. C.; and Memphis, Tenn.]

The repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill, I think, is the best way out of a blunder that has already damaged our reputation throughout the rest of the world.

[William H. Robson, publisher the Indianapolis Trade Journal.]

I have always considered the passing of the bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from paying tolls as a most unnecessary and altogether shameful action.

[Clinton B. Evans, editor the Economist, Chicago.]

Irrespective of any obligation under the treaty, we should require the payment of tolls by American vessels simply out of self-respect and to show that we are not disposed to take any advantage of other nations, even if we have the power to do so.

[Editor of the Evening Herald, Norwalk, Ohio.]

While the Herald has not expressed itself editorially so far, I can say that personally I am very much in favor of the United States obeying to the letter a treaty that seems to have been made in good faith and with the eyes of our representatives wide open.

[F. Arford, editor Western Trade Journal, Chicago.]

The Western Trade Journal has from the first been opposed to the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill and is doing everything within its power to bring about the repeal of this section.

[Saginaw (Mich.) Daily News.]

We have no right to grant preferences to our shipping in the use of the canal. The obligation of good faith carried in this treaty provision is of greater international consequence to the United States than all the benefits it might possibly reap by violating it.

[Levi M. Wise, Butler (Pa.) Eagle.]

We can not afford to trifle with this matter, and we must carry out the agreement as it was understood by the parties to it. Otherwise we will suffer national disgrace.

[Richard W. Knott, editor Evening Post, Louisville, Ky.]

Trusting to a return of reason—not to the people, but to Congress, that has been misrepresenting the people.

[William Barnes, Jr., editor Albany Evening Journal.]

I heartily favor the repeal by Congress of the coastwise exemption provision in the Panama Canal bill. There should not be the slightest confusion in the mind of anyone on this proposition.

[George T. Lincoln, editor Banker and Tradesman, Boston.]

I am in favor of the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States. I do not see how any Senator or Representative can vote to retain on our statute books a law which they are afraid to submit to arbitration.

[J. L. Doyle, editor New Britain Record.]

No man or company should be given the use of the canal free.

[Lafayette Young, publisher the Des Moines Capital, Des Moines, Iowa.]

I think every vessel, regardless of ownership, should pay the same rate for going through the Panama Canal. There should be no favoritism.

[The Independent, New York, N. Y.]

The act of August 24, 1912, contained the clause: "No tolls shall be levied upon vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States."

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty, ratified by the Senate December 16, 1901, contains this clause: "The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions of traffic or otherwise."

Can even a Philadelphia lawyer make these two clauses agree? No wonder Great Britain protests. We protested when Canada attempted to rebate a part of the tolls on Canadian freight through the Welland Canal, and Canada conceded the point.

[A. S. Johnston, editor and publisher the Monroe Watchman, Union, W. Va.]

I favor the repeal of this provision, primarily because it is, in its present form, a violation of the plighted faith of this country as proclaimed in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[Norris G. Osborn, editor Morning Journal-Courier, New Haven, Conn.]

I think it—the Panama Canal bill—is a monstrous evasion, if not violation, of the Nation's honor. I did all in my power to defeat its passage and should welcome any movement that would promise its undoing.

[Merchant and Manufacturer, Nashville, Tenn.]

The Government must set an example to its citizens. If it breaks faith with other countries, as it unequivocally does when it gives preference to our coastwise vessels in canal rates, it tends to vitiate and weaken public standards of conduct everywhere.

The necessity for the repeal of the coastwise vessel preferential rates provision by Congress is so urgent that extensive argument favoring it is not needed.

[Maurice L. Muhleman, The Banking Law Journal, New York.]

Your circular letter on the subject of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama Canal bill was duly received.

The Banking Law Journal confines itself to subjects which do not include the matter.

The writer desires, however, to express his personal views. The clause in the bill exempting coastwise trade from tolls is not only in contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, but also in conflict with the treaty under which we obtained title to the Panama Zone.

[Utica Daily Press, Utica, N. Y.]

The United States can not afford to take the position before the world that it does not intend to observe every last letter of its agreement. A business man who does not keep his word is lightly thought of and the same is true of any government.

[Worcester Evening Post, Worcester, Mass.]

Can it be possible that this [arbitration of the canal-toll question] will be refused?

Certainly this question of subsidy to a special interest does not come within the excepted cases, and there is nothing in good faith for our Government to do except to comply with Great Britain's proposal.

[Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, Va.]

The national honor is, of course, the most important consideration involved in connection with the proposal to repeal the provision of the Panama Canal act granting exemption from tolls to American bottoms engaged in the intercoastal trade. There are material reasons of a compelling nature why Congress should be prompt to undo the mistake committed in the enactment of the provision in question.

[Utica Herald-Dispatch and Daily Gazette.]

To exempt coastwise vessels from payment of tolls will be simply to lay so much greater a burden on other shipping and on the Nation.

Particularly, it will be to impose heavy tolls upon our foreign commerce, which can ill afford them, for the sake of remitting tolls upon coastwise commerce, which can well afford them. Seeing also that our right to remit tolls on our shipping is seriously challenged by another nation under our treaty relations, it may well be asked if it is wise to raise such an issue of right for the sake of doing something which is neither necessary nor expedient.

[Every Evening, Wilmington, Del.]

It is certain the British minister has made out a good case against this country, on account of the gross violation of treaty faith involved in the discrimination of free use of the canal for vessels of the United States engaged in the coastwise trade.

We are wrong in two very important respects—in violating a treaty obligation by unfair discrimination and in imposing a financial burden upon our people thereby. The sooner we retrace our steps and get back to the solid ground of fair and square dealing the better it will be.

[The Gazette-Times, Pittsburgh, Pa.]

Great Britain's formal protest against exemption of American coastwise shipping from tolls for passing through the Panama Canal is a comprehensive and temperate statement, exhaustive in its analysis. There ought to be no hesitancy or delay on the part of our Government in opening negotiations either for adjustment of differences by mutual agreement or their reference for settlement by arbitration.

[Pittsburgh Christian Advocate.]

The suggestion that the ships of the United States are exempt from that provision (of equality under the Hay-Pauncefote treaty) because we built the canal must be regarded as little short of puerile.

[Robert Adams Suffern (Suffern's Quarterly).]

I am very strongly opposed to the present bill, and hope that the objectionable matter will be repealed.

[Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.]

A just interpretation of the clause must finally be reached. Nations no more than individuals may profitably stand upon technicalities when common honesty is the main question.

[The Sioux City Journal, Sioux City, Iowa.]

The remission of tolls on American coastwise traffic through the Panama Canal amounts to subsidy where subsidy is not needed, and can not be justified.

[St. Joseph Gazette, St. Joseph, Mo.]

We base opposition to free passage for American coasters upon the fact that that privilege would be a gift of \$1.30 to them for every ton of freight they carried, it being a proven fact that they now pay \$4 a ton for having their freight railroaded across the Isthmus.

This subject deserves considerable space and honest reasoning, because it is liable to involve us in bitter controversy and serious trouble with perhaps more nations than Great Britain.

[The Argus-Leader, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.]

No country is so great that it can afford to break its treaties, and certainly a great Republic like the United States, which has done more for the cause of arbitration than any other country in the world, can not refuse to submit a business question, involving the construction of a treaty, to arbitration.

[The Daily News, Chicago, Ill.]

The sooner Congress undertakes to revise the Panama Canal toll act and eliminate certain of its provisions, that ought never to have been incorporated in that measure, the better it will be for all concerned.

[Boston Globe, Boston, Mass.]

If the United States should offer to adopt measures providing that the Federal Treasury would regularly transfer to the canal account an amount sufficient to make up for the loss of tolls on the coastwise trade the main point in the British note would be met.

[Evening Post, Louisville, Ky.]

Keep the letter and spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty; keep open the canal on equal terms to the whole world.

Then, if you will, gentlemen of the predatory callings, exact your blood money of the American consumer and producers alike.

[The Baltimore News, Baltimore, Md.]

Without regard to other features of the case, a good many people will feel less regret about the disagreement over the treaty if the result is to make us pause in a hastily arranged plan to tap the public till for the benefit of the owners of coastwise vessels.

[The Dispatch, Pittsburgh, Pa.]

The United States has therefore, in the term of a single Congress, been brought down from its high position as the leader in establishing fair and honest arbitration to the position of the one that repudiates that advanced and beneficial principle rather than let its own pet jobs be inquired into. And the grim irony of the case is heightened by the fact that it is done to support a favor to the interest which least of all needs any such favor.

The greatest offense is against the United States, since it takes from a project that can not be self-sustaining for years a part of its proper revenue to give to an interest that has no claim either of justice or need. But it is a rank discredit to the United States that in that domestic job it took the pains to advertise to the world that when the whim takes it to carry out such a job treaty compacts are simply waste paper.

[Evening Post, New York.]

The straight and manly course would be to repeal the dubious and offensive clause of the canal act. By outright and speedy repeal we should at once avoid any international difficulty and escape from a domestic blunder. If Congress refuses to give heed, then it will, indeed, be necessary to submit the dispute to arbitration.

[The Rochester Herald, Rochester, N. Y.]

An arbitration of the points in dispute is asked for, and the United States can not in decency refuse. If it does refuse this reasonable and proper demand, no future treaty we may enter into should be considered worth the paper upon which it is written. The country is too old to begin the policy of playing chuck-a-luck with the rest of the world.

[Suffern's Quarterly and Foreign Trade Journal.]

Whether the treaty prohibits us from offering free registry to American ships or not, it certainly was very unwise for this country to arouse foreign antagonism as did the action of the Government in the

matter. The future will show that we made a serious diplomatic blunder, and one which did incredible injury to the commerce of the United States.

[The Post Express, Rochester, N. Y.]

Secretary Stimson recommends the repeal of the law of August last exempting from Panama Canal tolls our vessels in the coastwise trade, arguing that it is an unsound business policy which would increase the profits of a shipping monopoly. The British Government also protests against this discrimination in favor of American vessels as in derogation of the clear rights of England under the treaties of 1850 and 1891.

There is only one law of equity and just dealing, and it is the same for men and for groups of men or nations. Heretofore a lower standard of honor has prevailed in diplomacy, and it has been argued that a nation might properly do what would be shameful and dishonest in an individual. Against this theory we have fervently protested, and to fall back upon it now would be to convict ourselves of duplicity and hypocrisy.

[Boston Evening Transcript, Boston, Mass.]

The granting of free tolls to American vessels or its equivalent in rebates to the amount of such tolls would certainly be bad enough. It would make us guilty of what is known as sharp practice, and such a course with respect to solemn treaties could win for us neither the world's approval nor yet its respect. We have taken a position untenable in national honor and should promptly retrace our steps.

[The Chicago Journal, Chicago, Ill.]

The national honor of the United States is involved in Panama Canal tolls, but not in the way some ranting jingoes proclaim.

National honor depends on keeping national faith. The faith of this Nation was pledged to a canal open on equal terms to ships of all countries.

If we keep that pledge, keep it without quibbling, with caviling, and without waiting to be nagged into doing our duty, our national honor will be secure.

The Panama Canal bill should be amended by striking out the provisions of free tolls to the coastwise shipping, or by abolishing tolls altogether. This should be done, not because England wants it done, but because it is the only fair thing to do.

[The Record-Herald, Chicago, Ill.]

The progressive, sane position is this: That the arbitration treaty should be renewed, and even improved upon, and the toll-exemption provision repealed.

[Brooklyn Eagle, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

It is better to settle out of court a case there is not the slightest chance of winning. That is one way to save something besides expense. It is one way to escape humiliation.

And the way to settle a case in or out of court is to settle it right. In this matter the right way is to repeal the exemption clause. In this matter strength is a poor substitute for honor.

[The New York World, New York.]

In spite of sophistry and bluster, there can be no doubt that if we persist in our discrimination at Panama we shall presently be compelled to meet justice, honor, and civilization at The Hague or accept the consequences of world-wide contempt and condemnation. We are powerful enough to do almost anything except to find profit in bad faith.

[The Duluth Herald, Duluth, Minn.]

This Nation has pledged its word that the canal will be opened to all nations on equal terms. In the interest of a concealed ship syndicate our pledged word has been broken by the law giving American vessels special privileges.

Perhaps we should not have made this promise. Perhaps it would be to our material advantage to break it. But we did make it, and we can not break it in honor.

[The Post-Standard, Syracuse, N. Y.]

That the advocates of the bill as it stands talk seriously of refusing to submit the treaty to the tribunal at The Hague is evidence of their doubt about the validity of their position. We do not believe that America would refuse to submit it. Such action would give the lie to all our professions of faith in the principle of international arbitration.

[H. F. Bliss, managing editor, the Janesville-Gazette, Janesville, Wis.]

I am in hearty sympathy with the efforts being made to influence the repeal of the Panama Canal bill, and am at a loss to understand why Congress ever passed the measure. The honor of the Nation was entirely ignored.

[Allen Walker, publisher, the Index Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.]

We already have published editorials urging that the United States shall not repudiate her obligations in regard to the Panama Canal and that there be no violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Personally we are unable to see how it will be possible for the Federal Government to repudiate such an agreement under the circumstances.

[John P. Bowman, editor Loudonville (Ohio) Democrat.]

We would be for repeal of any provisions which might be in conflict with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty or mitigate against arbitration.

[The Sun, New York.]

There is no duty before the Congress more urgent than the repeal of the act of August 24, 1912, so far as it specifically exempts American shipping engaged in the coastwise trade from the payment of tolls at the Panama Canal.

[The Springfield Leader, Springfield, Mo.]

The idea seems to be slowly coming about that the United States has taken the wrong position in our Panama Canal controversy with Great Britain. It is really difficult to see how we can avoid the plain obligations of the treaty now existing.

[W. W. Screws, editor the Advertiser, Montgomery, Ala.]

The Advertiser hasn't the slightest doubt that if this case were taken before The Hague the United States would lose. Unbiased judges from other countries could hardly reach any other conclusion than that in seeking to exempt its own steamers from toll duty, the United States was violating the terms of an honorable treaty. It would be seriously embarrassing to our country for this matter to be decided against us. It would be far better, far more honorable, should we acknowledge the error into which some of our national representatives had fallen.

[The Bridgeport Standard, Bridgeport, Conn.]

The shortest way out of the last-named difficulty is through the repeal by Congress of the exemption provision in the Panama Canal bill. That would take the whole business out of the way and leave the conditions clear, as they should be.

[The Christian Work and Evangelist, continuing the New York Observer.]

If our Nation can so lightly break a treaty, who can trust her with any new ones? If the United States should refuse to arbitrate the question when Great Britain demands it, it will be impossible for her ever to say anything about arbitration again.

It is greatly to be desired that the United States should let this go to The Hague, if Congress does not rescind its action.

[Newark Evening News, Newark, N. J.]

The dispute should be taken to The Hague directly—if diplomacy fails—provided, of course, that we have a good case. And if the case is as dead open and shut against us as Mr. Roor and some others think, it should be abandoned without subjecting this country to the humiliation of an adverse arbitral award. Nothing can be more "galling" to right-minded patriots than to have their case thrown out of court, exposing them to the shame of the world.

[Paul E. More, editor the Nation, New York.]

The Nation has been steadily against the exemption of coastwise trade of the United States from the Panama tolls. I agree heartily with the arguments brought forward in favor of repealing the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting our coastwise trade.

[The Dayton Journal, Dayton, Ohio.]

The protest of the British foreign office simply calls attention to the fact that the proposed exemption of American vessels contravenes the specific agreement of the United States in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty that the canal shall be open to the merchant vessels of all nations on equal terms without discrimination in the matter of tolls or terms.

Difference of opinion, if it can not be settled in conference between the diplomatic representatives of the United States and of Great Britain, should certainly be proper matter for submission to The Hague tribunal.

A refusal of such submission on our part would place us in the lamentable position of attempting to cast discredit on the integrity of motive of a tribunal we helped to create and have always stoutly advocated.

[Rollin E. Smith, editor the Commercial West, Minneapolis, Minn.]

I am most decidedly in favor of the repeal of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade from toll.

[The Lewiston Daily Sun, Lewiston, Me.]

That theory that the United States by getting title to the canal strip absolves itself from its treaty with England is too thin. The land of brotherhood and equal rights becomes the gobble-up of everything in sight, and the millions of people, in this country and others, who have only what they earn, robbed.

More worthy of the great, richest Nation to let the ships of all nations through without any charge.

[The Youth's Companion, Boston, Mass.]

Perhaps the most of us will think that, all things considered, the best thing to do is to keep faith with England, keep our pennies in our pockets, and let our shipowners pay their tolls themselves.

[Stuart H. Perry, publisher the Adrian Daily Telegram, Adrian, Mich.]

We can only take our choice between repealing the law voluntarily and going into The Hague court to face almost certain defeat.

[The Daily News, Burlington, Vt.]

The important obligation now under discussion is not ownership, but the solemn promise of our Nation that the canal would be operated on the same basis for all nations, which would naturally include the United States. This agreement is in the treaty, and it can not honorably be removed except by the consent of the nations which signed the treaty. Lacking that unison, the question then, in honor, must be sent to arbitration at the nations' court at The Hague.

[Decatur Herald, Decatur, Ill.]

Congress must either rescind its action on canal tolls or agree to arbitration.

This is not lack of patriotism; it is patriotism of the highest kind; the demand that this country shall take a course now that will save it from shame in years to come.

[Scientific American.]

The fact is that this whole free-toll business has been engineered by powerful interests, who hope to fatten their bank accounts with the millions that rightly should go to the United States Treasury. England has protested, and rightly. The wording of the treaty that she calls to our attention is perfectly plain, and for any true American to try to interpret it differently is to invite suspicion and scorn from all civilized nations.

[The New York Times.]

The honorable way out is the repeal of the act remitting the tolls, as the Secretary [Stimson] recommends.

Sir Edward expresses the hope that a reference of the question to arbitration may be made unnecessary by some steps taken on the part of the United States to remove the objections urged against the act by the British Government. If no such steps are taken, arbitration will be inevitable, for we can not decline it without adding to the causes of reproach which we have already piled up against ourselves.

[Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.]

The exemption of the coastwise trade of the United States from tolls through the Panama Canal was, to begin with, flagrant and dishonest, a violation of the treaty obligations of the Nation, and, to end with, a gigantic and perpetual subsidy to a shipping trust quite as objectionable as the Sugar Trust or the Steel Trust.

[American Exporter, New York.]

Great Britain protests against proposed congressional acts freeing American vessels from tolls in the Panama Canal. However much we may want to foster American shipping, however strongly we may feel that the United States has built the canal on its own property, however bitter a sacrifice our expenditure on the canal may seem, however great our enmity against great railways, and however anxious we may be to impress our constituents with the idea that we are simon-pure American through and through, and what care we for the British lion or anyone else, yet there is no getting away from the plain

and simple language of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. No more plain, simple, and unmistakable language was ever written into a treaty solemnly signed by two nations. There is but one question before the people of the United States to-day, and that question is, Shall we or shall we not live up to our bargain—honor our signature? If we do not, we insure for ourselves the scorn and contempt of the nations of the world. That price no country can afford to pay.

[The Evening Press, Grand Rapids, Mich.]

The truth is—and this truth is more generally realized than it was a few months ago—that we were wrong when we attempted, against the plain obligations of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, to give a subsidy to American coastwise shipping by exempting it from tolls.

Now it is our duty to keep our word. This can be done by repealing the exemption clause of the canal bill.

[The Congregationalist.]

The way is still open for Congress to repeal the clause in the Panama bill which has brought us into evil odor with all the maritime nations of the world.

[The Grand Rapids Press.]

The canal is ours and we purchased possession of it by surrendering the right to do exactly as we pleased in the matter of canal tolls. In the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, which superseded the Clayton-Bulwer guaranteeing British cooperation in building and protection, we gave a pledge to treat all nations, including ourselves, alike. This pledge was given in return for Great Britain's relinquishment of the right to help us build and boss the canal.

The time to have protested against its provisions was when it was signed, not after the lapse of years. The quibble that coastwise traffic, being a national monopoly, is not involved in our pledge is unworthy of a great nation.

[The Century Magazine.]

But there remains for us another chance—or will, if Great Britain shall a little longer pursue her friendly and forbearing course of waiting for our public opinion to assert itself. The coastwise exemption should be repealed. And, our obligations aside, why should we enter upon a policy of subsidizing our ships just at the time when apparently we are giving up the policy of subsidizing our manufactures? Are we never to get away from the inequality of privilege that has already corrupted the sources of government by the "vicious circle," creating and feeding by legislation agencies whose natural interest it thus becomes to destroy the principle of equality? Why subsidize ships any more than subsidize railways, or newspapers, or authorship? But if we must subsidize our ships, let it be done outright, in bills for that purpose, and not through the violation of the plain words of a solemn treaty.

[Troy (N. Y.) Record.]

If the United States should refuse either to modify its law or to arbitrate, it would place itself on record as unworthy of its present position of moral leadership in the world.

[Sioux City Tribune.]

England has been wronged and all Europe offended in order that the United States may pay a bonus to her shipping interests.

[Mining and Scientific Press, San Francisco.]

What is important is that we have apparently blundered into a position that we seem afraid to defend before an international court of arbitration. This is serious. If Congress is not sufficiently sure of its position to warrant going into court, by all means repeal the law. The matter itself is not important, but the good faith and good name of the country must be preserved.

[Milwaukee Times.]

The movement which is now on foot to further the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States is one which ought to receive the hearty support of both the press and the public in general.

[Epworth Herald (Methodist), Chicago.]

We got power to dig the canal only through a treaty in which we agreed to certain conditions. The other party to the treaty protests that our new toll law does not harmonize with those conditions, by which we are pledged to stand. Therefore, the other party asks that the matter be arbitrated, but it seems that we are getting ready to say, "There is nothing to arbitrate." If, when the time comes, we actually do say that, we ought to tear up all our treaties with other nations, and frankly take our national place with the countries which do not believe in any law but that "they should take who have the power, and they should keep who can."

[New York Evening Post.]

What Congress has voted not to collect the shipowners will coolly put in their pockets as a subsidy, and a vicious kind of one at that. Prof. Johnson's whole argument is well worth studying, and it should help along the movement to induce Congress to undo its blunder by repeal.

[Edmund F. Merriam, editor the Watchman, Boston.]

John Hay was an honest man. In international diplomacy he substituted frank and fair dealing for the traditional tricks of diplomats. In agreeing to the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty no one can doubt that Mr. Hay meant just what he said—that the ships of all nations should use the Panama Canal on exactly the same terms. The action of Congress is a descent from the high plane of John Hay's diplomacy.

[Charles E. George, editor the Lawyer and Banker, San Francisco.]

There is nothing left for the United States in honor to do but to repeal the discriminative acts passed by a mixed Congress in favor of our own coasting ships. Not to do this, we at best force a submission of the matter to arbitration in The Hague Tribunal. An adverse decision there is certain. We regard the exemption of the coastwise trade of the United States from tolls through the Panama Canal as a political measure without color of law, in every sense flagrant and dishonest, a violation of the treaty obligations of this Nation which in the end will amount to a gigantic and perpetual subsidy to a shipping trust.

[W. C. Deming, editor Wyoming Tribune, Cheyenne.]

If it is good that individuals should avoid the appearance of evil, it is a thousandfold more important that a great nation should suffer no blot upon its honor. The exemption of American coastwise trade in the Panama Canal bill is inexcusable as a domestic policy. It is flagrantly pernicious as a violation of the spirit of our treaty with Great Britain. Let us rescind a hasty error, conceived in materialism and born in dishonor, by repealing the offensive clause or by submitting

to arbitration in the same big broad spirit that Great Britain has met the United States in the past.

[Howard C. Rowley, managing editor California Fruit Grower, San Francisco, Cal.]

The Panama Canal bill, in so far as it provides for coastwise shipping exemption and in any other way differentiates between any one nation's vessels and those of any other, is about the most humiliating piece of work that has been done by our national authorities in recent years. Let us amend this Panama Canal act and make it an entirely international affair, and then go to work and argue out our own national problems on their own merits.

[The New York Tribune.]

It would be inappropriate, to use no stronger term, for either party to a controversy which is practically in course of adjudication, or which is about to be submitted to adjudication, to declare by legislation that its side is right and to proceed to act upon that theory. That portion of last year's canal law which pertains to the disputed point should therefore be repealed pending agreement between the two powers.

[Henry Mills Alden, editor of Harper's Magazine.]

Arbitration obviously can lead to but one result, and it involves useless delay and expense. The shortest way out of the situation in which we have placed ourselves is to repeal promptly the legislation exempting from canal tolls our coastwise shipping. This legislation, moreover, confers an unreasonable privilege upon the owners of such shipping, and is an unjust discrimination against the great body of American taxpayers.

#### II. OPINIONS OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS.

[Francis Brown, president Union Theological Seminary.]

I have always been opposed to the provision of the Panama Canal bill which exempts the coastwise trade of the United States on the grounds that it violates treaty obligation.

[Elmer E. Brown, office of the chancellor, New York University, Washington Square, New York.]

I hope Congress will repeal the exemption of our coastwise trade rather than stand by a contention which, at best, hangs upon a narrow and unexpected interpretation of the terms of the treaty.

[Robert L. Kelly, president Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.]

This country entered into a solemn contract that there should be no discrimination in tolls or conditions in the management of the Panama Canal. Under the present circumstances the least humiliating thing Congress can do is to repeal the provisions of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[George Rice Hovey, president Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va.]

It gives me unusual pleasure to add my word in favor of a repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States. I believe that this provision is in contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[John Grier Hibben, president Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.]

Concerning the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, I am very glad to join in efforts to bring to the attention of Congress the imperative need of the immediate repeal of this bill.

I feel that this is not merely a matter of wisdom, but also of national honor, and I am glad to have any part, however humble, in helping to forward this cause.

[William Alfred Mielis, president Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.]

It has seemed to me that the "coastwise exemption" clause of the Panama Canal bill is clearly in contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and that for this reason its enactment was a mistake and its retention impossible.

[Louis Edward Holden, president University of Wooster, Ohio.]

To my mind the exemption is a penny-wise and pound-foolish measure and not in accord with our historic and generous treatment of other nations. It is my judgment that the proper and most graceful way to answer England's just protest is to repeal the bill by a unanimous vote, if that be possible.

[W. D. Agnew, president Hedding College, Abingdon, Ill.]

The "coastwise exemption" in the Panama bill—I am most heartily in favor of the repeal of this provision.

[E. J. Goodwin, principal of the Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

I am very positive in my belief that the Congress should repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill, which exempts the coastwise trade of the United States.

[J. C. Williams, president Westminster College, Tehuacana, Tex.]

I am heartily and earnestly in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption bill, because we now stand in an undesirable position before the world—more undesirable by far than after we have repealed the measure.

[F. W. McNair, president Michigan College of Mines, Houghton, Mich.]

Relative to the toll provision of the Panama Canal bill, I would say that I am heartily in favor of its repeal.

[Henry S. Drinker, president Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pa.]

The effect of exemption in reducing or keeping down transcontinental railway rates may be gains dearly bought at the cost of the discredit which will be reflected on us if we refuse Great Britain's request for arbitration in a matter which is wholly arbitrable, and which we can not refuse to arbitrate without discredit and a clear repudiation of our previous steady and consistent advocacy of arbitration.

[A. W. Harris, president Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.]

The United States can not afford to make any regulation or enact any law which raises justly a serious doubt in regard to the proper observance of treaty obligations. Coastwise exemption does raise such a doubt. I therefore favor its repeal.

[J. P. Greene, president William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.]

I am in favor of repealing the bill. If it is in contravention of our treaty contract, we certainly ought to repeal it. But I think it ought to be repealed on general principles.

[Frederick D. Kershner, president Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.]

I need scarcely say that I am most heartily in favor of the proposed repeal. I fail to see why the same standards of morality which obtain

among individuals should fail to obtain among nations. There ought to be but one opinion upon the subject.

[Fred W. Atkinson, president The Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

I am glad of the opportunity afforded to place myself on record as being opposed to the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Aug. Seifert, St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer, Collegeville P. O., Ind.]

It has always been incomprehensible to me how Congress could pass the Panama Canal bill, exempting the coastwise trade from its toll provisions. I do hope that Congress will rectify its mistake and save us from further humiliation.

[Leroy Weller, president Beaver College, Beaver, Pa.]

I am in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. This enactment has impeached the honor of the United States in the eyes of many Europeans.

[Rev. B. W. Valentine, president Benedict College, Columbia, S. C.]

I sincerely hope for the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. We can not be the moral force in world affairs as a Nation if we do such things as will cause the world to believe that we are not sincere.

[Mary E. Woolley, president Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.]

Concerning the proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill, may I say that I am heartily in favor of the repeal.

[Silas Evans, president Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.]

I believe that our discrimination and tolls in favor of our coastwise vessels is a violation in letter and in spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

I have yet to find among my friends any one cognizant with the facts who does not take this point of view.

[John M. Thomas, president Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.]

I am in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. The open canal of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was right and the proposed discrimination is doubly wrong—wrong in principle and wrong in departure from treaty obligation.

[T. M. Hodgman, president Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.]

I most cordially indorse the effort to secure the repeal by Congress of the prevention of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Wm. De W. Hyde, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.]

I beg to say that I am heartily in favor of the repeal by Congress of the provisions of the Panama Canal bill exempting coastwise trade of the United States.

[John Hanson Thomas Main, president Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa.]

I am heartily in favor of the repeal of this provision by Congress. It is my opinion that the action of Congress and of President Taft in approving that action is in contravention of our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, both in its letter and in its spirit.

[S. Avery, chancellor the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.]

I have always regarded the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States as a very grave mistake on the part of Congress. As an American citizen with quite a large acquaintance among prominent men in Europe I feel humiliated whenever the subject is mentioned.

[Nicholas Murray Butler, president Columbia University, in the city of New York.]

In my judgment the provision of the Panama Canal act exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from canal tolls is unwise as a matter of domestic policy, as well as in flat contravention of the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. No public act in recent years has so affected our national prestige abroad as this. The prompt repeal of this provision is the easy and honorable way out of the difficulty in which we now find ourselves. To insist upon this exemption means that we must go before the world with a bad case and be subjected to the humiliation of certain defeat before any court of arbitral justice, however constituted or of whomsoever composed.

Indeed, the trial of this issue before any one of our own national courts of high standing would, in my judgment, lead just as certainly to the defeat of the contention to which our Government is for the moment committed as would a trial before The Hague Tribunal.

[R. E. Blackwell, president Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.]

I am heartily in favor of the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States. The provision seems to be in contravention of our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[Eugene R. Long, president Arkansas College, Batesville, Ark.]

A reputation for smart twisting may be a desirable twentieth century possession for a great Nation. But a high-toned conformity to the spirit of solemn treaty obligations and "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind" we believe to be a much more valuable possession.

[H. A. Garfield, president Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.]

The spirit of the treaty forbids that we discriminate in favor of our vessels, and any construction contrary thereto, though justified by the letter, is unconscionable.

[Robert J. Aley, president University of Maine, Orono, Me.]

Our Government should play fair. Other nations have a right to expect this, because of our attitude in international affairs in the past. Congress should do whatever is necessary to bring our laws into conformity with international agreements.

[Charles Alexander Richmond, president Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.]

Responding to your request for a brief statement with respect to the "coastwise exemption" in the Panama bill, I will say that I consider it a breach of national good faith. Such a policy, if pursued, will inevitably react to our disadvantage.

[Alexander C. Humphreys, president Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.]

I am firmly of the opinion that our contract with Great Britain, as covered by the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, should not be violated. We should recede promptly from the unfortunate position we have taken.

[Robert S. Brookings, president Washington University, St. Louis.]

I am clearly of the opinion that the action taken by Congress on that portion of the Panama Canal bill exempting our coastwise trade was a mistake, and that such action should be repealed at the earliest possible date.

[E. C. Kellogg, president Walla Walla College.]

As I view the matter the action taken was a mistake, and I am in favor of a repeal.

[Samuel Hart, dean Berkeley Divinity School.]

I sincerely hope and would urge that the provision be repealed.

[William C. Daland, president Milton College, Milton, Wis.]

I believe that the repeal of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States would enhance our reputation for fidelity and justice, and that in the end it would benefit our commerce and advance the interests of international comity and peace.

[Carl G. Doney, president West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, W. Va.]

As a Christian and a patriot I believe the United States should carefully observe all its treaty obligations. Therefore it seems to me that we are bound in honor to make no discrimination in tolls on vessels passing through the Panama Canal.

[Edwin S. Todd, department of economics, Miami University.]

It is my own opinion, and I believe the opinion of the leading men on our faculty, that that part of the law relating to exemption of tolls for coastwise traffic is in direct contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and that it should be repealed.

[James G. K. McClure, president McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.]

With reference to the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, I am obliged to say that so far as I understand the case my opinion is in favor of the repeal.

[C. A. Danlway, president the University of Wyoming, Laramie.]

I believe that a candid examination of the circumstances of the negotiation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and also a reasonable interpretation of the language used in the instrument should convince a reasonable man that the existing exemption in favor of coastwise trade with the United States is contrary to our international engagements.

The best way of escape from the predicament in which we now find ourselves as a Nation seems to me to be the proposed repeal of this special exemption.

[S. F. Kerfoot, president Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.]

My own judgment is that this matter should be submitted to arbitration.

[R. W. McGranahan, president Knoxville College, Knoxville, Tenn.]

I agree most heartily with the statement of the reasons that are set forth as to why the act should be repealed. I am exceedingly rejoiced in the effort that is being put forth to secure this repeal before it puts the United States in a position of embarrassment or in any way will throw the influence of the United States against the great fundamental principle of arbitration.

[Carleton B. Gibson, president Mechanics Institute, Rochester, N. Y.]

I am very glad to express myself as being very strongly opposed to the coastwise exemption of American vessels passing through the Panama Canal, and heartily in favor of the repeal of the recent legislation, which seems to be in conflict with the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and in opposition to the spirit of international fraternity which seems to have been developing in recent years.

[Virginia C. Gildersleeve, dean Barnard College, Columbia University, N. Y.]

I approve most heartily of the proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill.

[Hill M. Bell, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa.]

I consider the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States the most unfortunate enactment of the present generation. I am sure that it will discount the prestige of our country in every part of the world. The only sane thing to do is to repeal that provision.

[Isaac Sharpless, president Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.]

It is impossible for me, without a more careful study of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty than I have been able to give, to form a judgment as to the violation of its provisions by the recent Panama Canal bill. It is certain, however, that it is a doubtful question, and that a good American would feel that our country was disgraced if we should refuse to submit the matter to arbitration.

[W. E. Stern, president Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.]

My feeling about the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is that the United States must keep faith absolutely and literally with everybody, and no evasion, technical or otherwise, is to be tolerated no matter at how much disadvantage it may place us.

[A. W. Meyer, president St. Johns College, Winfield, Kans.]

I have never favored ignoring, or rather violating, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. The moral effects of such an act on the young American or on our standing as a Nation must be disastrous.

[A. R. Taylor, president the James Millikin University, Decatur, Ill.]

I most heartily favor the repeal of the Panama exemption law. It has seemed to me from the first as breaking faith with the other nations, even though limited to the coastwise trade of the United States.

[M. L. Burton, president Smith College, Northampton, Mass.]

I believe that absolutely no consideration should stand in the way of our guarding most jealously our honor in all treaty obligations. If the exemption of coastwise trade of the United States is in contravention to the definite agreement of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, then there is but one conclusion, and that is its repeal. If our most able statesmen and best jurists believe that the Panama bill is no violation of our treaty obligations, then certainly there is but one honorable thing to do, and that is to refer it to The Hague tribunal.

[C. A. Cockayne, president Toledo University, Toledo, Ohio.]

Since a serious difference of opinion has arisen as to whether coastwise exemption is contrary to the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, I hesitate to express judgment without a copy of the treaty before me.

However, the proper course would seem to be to submit the matter for arbitration.

[R. F. Stevenson, vice president Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.]

While not sure in my own mind upon all the legal processes involved, I am very much impressed with the fact that a nation tied up as ours is with the spirit of The Hague conference and its efforts at practical amelioration of the distresses of war between nations can and ought to say of itself as Phillips Brooks once said of men: "No man has a right to all his rights."

[G. Leland Green, principal Vermont State School of Agriculture, Randolph Center, Vt.]

My position concerning same is that there is no need of any discrimination in tolls. I furthermore believe that the United States should pass no bill which will throw us out of harmony with the great nations of the earth and thus injure our trade.

[R. C. H. Lenski, president pro tempore Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.]

I agree in full with your summing up of the situation and second your proposal heartily in my double capacity as president (pro tempore) of Capital University and as editor in chief of the Lutherische Kirchenzeitung, the German organ of the joint synod of Ohio and other States (Evangelical Lutheran).

[M. Woolsey Stryker, president Hamilton College.]

Loving my country, I long that she may not plunge, out of mere commercial lust, into violation of the solemn treaty with England upon the Panama tolls.

[D. H. Hill, president the North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, West Raleigh, N. C.]

Nations, like individuals, live up to the best that is in them when they make contracts carefully and then live up to them scrupulously. In view of this fact, it seems to me that we ought to observe every line of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[Alston Ellis, president Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.]

We, as a Nation, can not afford to violate our treaty obligations. I have always been of the opinion that legislation making discrimination in the way of tolls, in favor of our coastwise trade was in contravention of the provisions of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[John B. Vanmeter, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.]

I heartily favor the repeal by Congress of that provision of the Panama Canal bill which exempts the coastwise trade of the United States from tolls to which other shipping is subject.

[George C. Chase, president Bates College, Lewiston, Me.]

I earnestly hope, for the sake of the good name of our country, and of the maintenance of a national honor, which alone can insure it a worthy name, that our Congress will repeal, at the earliest practicable date, the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Anderson Sledd, president Southern University, Greensboro, Ala.]

I beg to say that I am firmly convinced that the coastwise exemption provision in the Panama Canal bill ought, by all means, to be repealed. Candor in dealing with a great friendly power, and national good faith in observing the plain obligations of our treaties, seem to me to demand such action.

[Thos. C. Blaisdell, president Alma College, Alma, Mich.]

From the beginning of the discussion my conclusion has been that it would be a mistake to exempt the coastwise trade of the United States from the Panama Canal toll. Our Nation can not afford to put itself into a place where it must refuse arbitration, of which it has been a foremost advocate, or face almost certain defeat if it consents to arbitration in this matter.

[Henry Louis Smith, president Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.]

The provision of the canal bill, exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, I have always believed to be in direct contravention of the treaty. I believe also that our refusal to submit this matter to arbitration would convict us of insincerity and be a national dishonor.

I am, therefore, most heartily in favor of the repeal by Congress of this exemption.

[John S. Nollen, president Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.]

It seems to me that the question is not at all whether we have a technical right to make the exemption provided for in the present bill. The question is not one of legal technicalities, but simply of national self-respect and international good faith. We owe it to ourselves as well as to our reputation abroad to repeal the present bill at the earliest possible moment.

[J. M. P. Metcalf, president Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.]

I am very heartily in favor of the proposed repeal, believing it to be a contravention of our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[Simeon H. Bing, president Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio.]

I am heartily opposed to that part of the Panama Canal bill that exempts our coastwise trade, and shall be glad to add my own opinion to that of a large and growing sentiment in this part of the Union for its repeal.

[H. C. Culbertson, president The College of Emporia, Emporia, Kans.]

I heartily favor the repeal of the exemption clause in the Panama Canal bill. It certainly seems to me that the spirit if not the letter of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty compels us to avoid all discrimination between American and English vessels in the matter of canal tolls.

[Edmund C. Sanford, president Clark College, Worcester, Mass.]

I am glad of the opportunity of putting on record my earnest hope that the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from the payment of tolls will be repealed.

[Palmer C. Ricketts, president Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.]

I am strongly of the opinion that the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the owners of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from the payment of tolls should be repealed. This provision, in my opinion, is not in accordance with the intent of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[Frank K. Sanders, president Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.]

I take pleasure in expressing a protest against the passage by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

I can not see how as a country we can decline to arbitrate a question like this. Furthermore, it seems clear to me that such arbitration will result in a humiliating decision against the United States. I sincerely hope that Congress may be induced to repeal this objectionable provision.

[William F. Slocum, president Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo.]

In regard to the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, I think with the largest possible interpretation that it is in contravention of our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and that it has seriously injured our prestige abroad. I am sure that the best sentiment of the country is in favor of a repeal.

[Paul Shorey, The University of Chicago.]

I am opposed to the exemption of the coastwise trade of the United States from Panama Canal dues. Such action is in apparent contravention of the spirit of our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and will be so regarded by international public opinion. It is a special privilege at the cost of taxpayers, and most of the problems with which the statesmanship of to-day is wrestling arise out of special privileges recklessly granted in the past.

[Levi T. Penningham, president Pacific College, Newberg, Oreg.]

I see no reason why American vessels, privately owned, should not pay the Government for the use of a canal provided at the expense of the whole people. I certainly do not see any excuse for the violation of our treaty.

[D. C. Reber, president Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa.]

I am heartily in favor of such repeal as proposed. I think that the Panama Canal is of such national and cosmopolitan interest and the United States is performing such a noble and unselfish act, I trust, that it would be only fair to place all nations on an equality as we have already agreed to in a national treaty.

[Enoch A. Bryan, president the State College of Washington.]

It seems to me that as I read the treaty agreements we are, in passing the exemption bill, contravening the spirit if not the letter of the agreement.

[C. H. Stockton, rear admiral, U. S. N., retired, president the George Washington University, Washington, D. C.]

I feel ashamed of the action of Congress and of the President in this matter.

[J. A. Marquis, president Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.]

On the surface it looks as though we solemnly guaranteed not to give the ships of our own or any other country a preference. If this is true, we ought to be by all means to stand by it.

[Henry Churchill King, president Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.]

I am glad to say that my own belief is that the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States ought to be repealed both as unwise in itself and as setting us in a wrong light in the eyes of other nations. It seems to me to have been a serious blunder.

[Edward D. Eaton, president Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.]

It seems to me of great importance that our Congress should reconsider the provisions of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, in the light of the judgment of eminent students of international affairs that the bill is in violation of our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[H. H. Wright, dean Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.]

It seems to me that the common people would interpret the meaning of the language of the treaty in accordance with the view expressed in paragraph No. 1, and that the action of Congress contravenes the treaty. Therefore the previous action of Congress should be repealed.

[Benjamin I. Wheeler, president University of California.]

I hope either that Congress will repeal that provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, or that we may submit the matter immediately to arbitration. The former is far the better course to take.

[Arthur H. Wilde, president University of Arizona.]

In my judgment, this Nation can not afford to be in its present position regarding this treaty. If we are sure the treaty does not concern coastwise trade, we ought to invite arbitration with confidence; if we are not sure of it, we should give Great Britain the benefit of the doubt.

[James Fraser, president New Windsor College, New Windsor, Md.]

I have your communication in reference to the proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill, and I very heartily approve of the movement looking toward the repeal by Congress of this exemption in that bill.

[Arthur A. Hammerschlag, director Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.]

No immediate benefit or hardship to accrue to any interest temporarily should weigh against the duty of safeguarding our national belief in the sacredness of international treaties.

[Ernest Fox Nichols, president Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.]

As an American citizen who respects the moral integrity of his National Government, I favor a suitable amendment to the Panama Canal act in Congress.

[W. O. Thompson, president Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.]

The Hay-Pauncefote treaty should be submitted to The Hague Court for interpretation, and, if necessary, the terms of the law governing tolls should be trusted to the interpretation.

[James M. Taylor, president Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.]

The Panama legislation was in defiance of our treaty and a dishonor to our Nation and should be repealed. Failing that, we can not refuse arbitration without discrediting our record for the advantage of a few. We are inviting the just condemnation of the world.

[Ethelbert D. Warfield, president Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.]

I favor the immediate repeal of the recent act of Congress, the scrupulous fulfillment of our pledge, and such steps as shall redeem our national honor from all reproach as a breaker of treaties.

[George C. Chase, president Bates College, Lewiston, Me.]

The honor of our Nation requires direct and unequivocal action to this end.

[Isaac Sharpless, president Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.]

It seems that the act is in violation of the treaty. If so, Congress should amend it. If it does not, the question should be submitted to arbitration. The honor of the Nation seems to be involved.

[F. S. Luther, president Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.]

It seems to me that the question is one for arbitration.

[W. P. Darfee, acting president Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.]

I think the act should be amended so that all nations shall be treated alike.

[Booker T. Washington, president Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.]

The Panama Canal question, it appears to me, is purely a moral one. As to the arbitration treaty agreement it most clearly seems to me that we can not in honor refuse to submit the question to The Hague for settlement.

[H. D. Hoover, president Carthage College.]

According to the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty it does seem entirely wrong for the United States to take the position she has taken with reference to Panama Canal tolls, and I should be heartily in favor of a repeal of the act exempting coastwise trade vessels from paying toll.

[Rush Rhees, president the University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.]

I most earnestly favor the repeal of the legislation providing for the exemption of the American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls in the use of the Panama Canal.

[M. Friedman, superintendent Carlisle Indian School.]

The Panama Canal act should be amended so that the high ideals which were declared to the world when we commenced the gigantic task of building the canal shall find fruition by our keeping faith with the world when the canal is completed, even when it touches the national pocketbook.

[Alexander C. Humphreys, president Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.]

We should recede promptly from the unfortunate position we have taken.

[Chancellor Day, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.]

If we made a bad bargain we should nevertheless stick to it. We should not repudiate the contract.

[Lyon G. Tyler, president William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va.]

I have read the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and I can not see that the United States has any excuse to exempt its coast trade from tolls.

[David Starr Jordan, president Leland Stanford University, Palo Alto, Cal.]

By all means amend the Panama act to make it free to all or free to none. It is wretched statesmanship to violate a treaty or even to appear to do so, and wretched policy to grant ship subsidy in such form, needlessly creating a new privilege, when we are trying to eliminate old ones. Cut it out.

[J. A. Aasgaard, president Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.]

I am entirely in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. First, I believe it is a direct breach of contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and, second, it is an indirect way of voting ship subsidy which has been defeated so often in Congress.

[John J. Hattstaedt, president American Conservatory of Music, Chicago, Ill.]

The selfishness and rapacity displayed by great civilized nations has become so pronounced that no other policy is expected any more.

I suppose the United States wished to contribute its mite in that direction when its Congress voted to exempt its coastwise trade from toll. I sincerely hope that the above-mentioned section of the Panama Canal regulations will be repealed.

[H. B. Hutchins, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.]

I beg to say that, in my judgment, the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States should be repealed.

[L. J. Corbly, president Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va.]

I unhesitatingly recommend that the interpretation of the treaty be submitted to The Hague tribunal for interpretation without further delay or quibble.

[M. S. Wildman, professor (executive of economics), Leland Stanford Junior University.]

I am strongly in favor of the repeal of the coastwise-exemption feature of the Panama Canal law.

[Thomas McClelland, president Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.]

I trust Congress may be wise enough to undo as far as possible the injury which we have already sustained by repealing their action with regard to exempting our coastwise trade.

[Dr. Charles F. Thwing, president Western Reserve University and Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio.]

You have marked out the proper method: "Repeal the exemption." Let us keep our covenants. Gentlemen do; why should not nations?

[A. W. Harris, president Northwestern University, Evanston-Chicago.]

In my opinion the United States can not afford to make any regulation or enact any law which raises justly any serious doubt in regard to proper observance of treaty obligations. Coastwise exemption does raise such a doubt. I therefore favor its repeal.

[Dr. James B. Angell, former president of the University of Michigan, late American minister to Turkey, Ann Arbor.]

I regard the passage of the bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from Panama Canal tolls as a violation of our treaty stipulations, and therefore reflecting most discreditably on our national honor.

[Stephen F. Weston, secretary Intercollegiate Peace Association, Yellow Springs, Ohio.]

Let us hope that upon second thought Congress will undo the wrong and retrieve the fair name that we have maintained in acting openly, honestly, and justly in our dealings with other nations. It is not a question of dollars, but of sincerity of pretensions, of squaring our national conduct with our national ideal of applying the doctrine of

truth, not the doctrine of hypocrisy, in our international dealings. I believe the sentiment of all those who are connected with our work is substantially in agreement with the views I have expressed.

[S. C. Mitchell, president University of South Carolina, Columbia.]

It seems plain to me that we violate the letter and spirit of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty with Great Britain by exempting American coastwise shipping from Panama tolls. Hence I favor an immediate repeal of the coastwise exemption. That is a straightforward way out of the difficulty, and American character has been so high and strong in international dealings hitherto that we can afford to take the manly and clean course. All commercial considerations aside, let Congress repeal that exemption and set ourselves straight with other nations.

[W. M. Pearce, president Ogden College, Bowling Green, Ky.]

I am heartily in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the bill named.

[Frank Clare English, president William and Vashti College, Aledo, Ill.]

I am in hearty concurrence with you concerning the proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. I most earnestly trust that Congress will reverse its action. If the recent action of Congress stands, it must rebound upon the heads of American citizens and upon our national honor.

[A. B. McCormick, chancellor the University of Pittsburgh.]

The United States Government must arbitrate the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting coastwise trade of the United States, or it must change this provision so that arbitration will become unnecessary. If any reason exists whereby the United States should hesitate to submit the question to the Hague tribunal, then obviously it is the duty of Congress so to change the act as that its fairness and propriety will be universally recognized.

[A. J. Burrows, president St. Louis University.]

I am certainly in favor of living up to our contracts, especially if they have been made with due deliberation and we have reaped the benefit mainly through a concession we wish now to repudiate. This is the honorable mode of acting which befits nations as well as individuals.

[William I. Hull, professor, Swarthmore College, Pa.]

In view of its past history and its present leadership in the cause of international peace and justice, it would be a national and international calamity for the United States to refuse to arbitrate the Panama Canal tolls question. Every consideration of fair play and wise policy demands that this question shall be submitted to arbitration; and if we desire to reassure the rest of the world as to our absolute sincerity in our advocacy of international justice, we should submit this question to the jurisdiction of the permanent court at The Hague and should reject any compromise short of that step, whatever it may be.

[E. G. Bauman, superintendent of schools, Quincy, Ill.]

In my opinion, based upon what I have read with regard to the Panama Canal situation, action should be taken against the coastwise exemption.

[Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin, department of political economy, University of Chicago.]

I regard the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States as an unjustifiable attempt to favor some particular interest at the expense of our treaty obligations and the good faith of the United States. It has been a grievance to many fair-minded citizens who care for the good repute of their country. The only right and honorable course to be pursued is to repeal that special provision of the bill. I earnestly hope Congress will be led to take this point of view.

#### A PETITION FROM CALIFORNIA.

To His Excellency, William Howard Taft, President of the United States:

Sir: The undersigned citizens of the United States, resident in California, would respectfully petition that, since portions of the Panama Canal act seem to many persons both in the United States and in England a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, the administration seek an amicable and honorable settlement of this matter, either through diplomatic negotiation or by recommending to Congress the amendment of such parts of its recent act as may be questionable.

The matter at issue is whether our country is observing an international pledge. Even were it clear to all our people that the action of Congress is entirely consistent with our treaty, yet our Government can not with self-respect take the position that one party to a solemn covenant has the right independently to interpret that covenant. Such a position taken by a foreign power we should certainly resent.

We believe that our Government should be ready and willing, as a last resort, to submit this matter to arbitration. But our pride compels us to urge that our Nation itself hasten to correct any wrong that may have been committed rather than await the formal award of a tribunal of arbitration. It is our most earnest conviction that as a people we can better suffer some limitation of our freedom of legislation and some commercial disadvantage rather than disregard or appear to disregard a treaty negotiated in good faith and solemnly ratified.

Benj. Ide Wheeler, president of the University of California; David Starr Jordan, president of the Stanford University; Patrick William Riordan, archbishop of San Francisco; John L. Howard, president of the Western Fuel Co., of San Francisco; Warren Olney, of the San Francisco bar, formerly mayor of Oakland, Cal.; Wm. A. Thorsen, president of the West Side Lumber Co., of Tuolumne and San Francisco; Anson L. Blake, president of the Oakland Paving Co.; James K. Moffitt, cashier of the First National Bank of San Francisco; Herbert C. Moffitt, dean of the College of Medicine, University of California; Edward Robeson Taylor, dean of the Hastings College of Law, formerly mayor of San Francisco; Martin A. Meyer, rabbi Temple Emanu El, San Francisco; Charles W. Slack, of the San Francisco bar, formerly judge of the Superior Court; Horace Davis, president of the board of trustees of Stanford University, formerly Member of Congress from California; P. J. Van Loben Sels, of Oakland, Cal.; Wm. Carey Jones, head of the School of Jurisprudence, University of California; Frederick C. Woodward, professor of law, head of the Law School, Stanford University; W. T. Reid, of Belmont, Cal.; David P. Burrows, professor of political science, University of California; William Kent, Member of Congress from California.

#### III. OPINIONS OF CLERGYMEN AND MINISTERS.

[W. M. Anderson, D. D., minister First Presbyterian Church, Dallas, Tex.]

I think it very important that the coastwise exemption of the Panama bill be repealed.

[John Balcom Shaw, pastor Second Presbyterian Church, Chicago.]

I am strongly of the opinion that the recent action of Congress regarding the coastwise trade of the United States should be at once repealed. The honor and the good faith of our Nation are involved.

[Harry R. Miles, pastor First Congregational Church, Berkeley, Cal.]

The Panama treaty guarantees the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, which accords the same treatment to British and American ships.

The action of Congress seems to me to put in question our good faith, and I earnestly hope that Congress will reconsider and put the integrity of our treaty above consideration of commercial gain.

[A. W. Vernon, pastor Harvard Church, Brookline, Mass.]

It is exceedingly unfortunate that any question should arise in connection with the use of the canal that would seem to put no occupation of territory in the same class with the nefarious obligations of the European powers. We should lift a treaty obligation to a higher place in international codes of honor.

[Henry Kingman, pastor Claremont Congregational Church, Claremont, Cal.]

There seems no reason why a nation should not have as keen a sensitiveness to honor as an individual. For a trifling material gain—even if it were proved to be a gain—we can not afford to put ourselves in the estimation of the nations of the world in the class of those who repudiate honorable obligations. For the sake of every citizen of the United States the objectionable provision should be repealed.

[Charles E. Diehl, minister First Presbyterian Church, Clarksville, Tenn.]

Not only in the interests of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, but in the interests of justice and right, should Congress repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Bunyan McLeod, pastor First Presbyterian Church, Harrodsburg, Ky.]

The proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill is a consummation devoutly to be wished by all fair-minded Americans.

[W. H. Pennhalegon, D. D., pastor First Presbyterian Church, Decatur, Ill.]

In the interest of national honor and international peace, I am strongly in favor of the repeal by Congress of that provision of the Panama Canal bill which exempts the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Murray Hefley Howland, pastor Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, Buffalo, N. Y.]

I am in hearty sympathy with the movement to repeal the coastwise exemption bill. I know from my touch with many men that there is a deep feeling of shame that for the sake of pecuniary advantage our country should stultify its position in favor of arbitration and should stoop to repudiation of its treaty obligations.

[A. B. Curry, pastor Second Presbyterian Church, Memphis, Tenn.]

I am decidedly in favor of the proposed repeal. To exempt the coastwise vessels would be simply favoring a certain class of citizens, and a comparatively small class, at the expense of the whole body of citizens.

[J. C. Molloy, D. D., pastor First Presbyterian Church, Columbia, Tenn.]

I think our Government should run the canal as a business firm would—receiving from all craft, save Government vessels, the toll due for the privilege of using it.

[Henry Stiles Bradley, pastor Piedmont Congregational Church, Worcester, Mass.]

I sincerely hope that Congress will remedy as speedily as possible the wrong it has already done in placing our country before the nations as one unfaithful to its pledges.

[Rev. John Archibald MacCallum, minister Walnut Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.]

It is my very earnest hope that Congress will repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Thomas Cummins, pastor First Presbyterian Church, Henderson, Ky.]

I hasten to say that the provisions of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States ought to be repealed. Fair play demands it. Justice demands it. The honor and good name of the country demand it. The passage of the bill was, in my judgment, the most unfair, unjust, dishonorable, and the most high-handed iniquitous thing Congress has ever done. A palpable fraud in the interest of the interests. A veiled ship-subsidy measure with so thin a veil that all the people of the United States, who are not blinded because the "interests" have blinded them, must see through the veil as they have come to see through the protective tariff veil; the high-handed fraud, the broad daylight robbery that regards neither God nor man nor justice nor honor—all for the "interests."

[Washington Gladden, pastor First Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio.]

I most heartily agree with the protest against that coastwise exemption. I am ashamed of it. It puts this Nation in the wrong. It cripples the Nation in its advocacy of international arbitration.

[William Pierson Merrill, pastor The Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City.]

It seems to me quite clear that the exemption specified does not contravene the contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. I do feel, however, that the main issue is the upholding of arbitration. I should consider it an international sin if the United States should refuse to refer such a matter to arbitration.

I also feel very strongly that our Nation can not afford to put itself in a doubtful position with regard to its honor. Far better waive assumed or real rights than appear dishonorable in the eyes of other nations. For these reasons I am inclined to favor the repeal of the coastwise exemption.

[David Beaton, pastor Congregational Church, Janesville, Wis.]

I am earnestly in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill.

[A. M. C. Covert, pastor Forty-first Street Presbyterian Church, Chicago.]

I am glad to indicate to you my sincere opposition to the coastwise exemption clause in the Panama bill, on the ground that it seems to me to be a contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and to set us against a forward movement for amicable international relations.

[Rev. D. Clay Lilly, pastor Grace Street Presbyterian Church, Richmond, Va.]

I heartily favor the repeal of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States. It violates the plain provision of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[A. Edwin Kelgwin, pastor West End Presbyterian Church, New York.]

We shall only invite dishonesty if the Panama Canal bill remains as at present.

[S. Parkes Cadman, pastor Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

It is certainly the bounden duty and obligation of the United States Government to submit to arbitration this entire matter concerning the proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. I am strongly convinced that the whole action as it now stands is unfortunate for the honor and reputation of our Government.

[Samuel Charles Black, D. D., pastor Collingwood Avenue Presbyterian Church, Toledo, Ohio.]

I sincerely hope that the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States will be repealed.

[Rev. George H. Cornelson, jr., D. D., pastor First Presbyterian Church, New Orleans, La.]

So far as I have been able to formulate an opinion in regard to the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill, I am persuaded that the wisest action that can be taken by our country would be to have Congress repeal the provision exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Ernest L. Wismer, minister First Congregational Church, Bristol, Conn.]

Every self-respecting American ought to blush for shame at the sophistry offered in defense of a plain violation of a treaty. The only manly thing to do is to repeal the clause that exempts coastwise vessels from toll.

[Russell Cecil, pastor Second Presbyterian Church, Richmond, Va.]

The movement to further the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States accords with my conviction on the subject. In my judgment the position of our Government is untenable, and the sooner it is receded from the more creditable it will be to us.

[John Lewis Clark, minister the Bushwick Avenue Congregational Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.]

The coastwise exemption seems to be in direct violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. One should hesitate to violate even the spirit of the treaty.

[Rockwell Harmon Potter, D. D., minister the First Church of Christ, Center Congregational, Hartford, Conn.]

I am glad to go on record as in favor of the proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill.

[W. Bristow Gray, minister First Presbyterian Church, Greenville, Miss.]

Allow me to express my unqualified disapproval of the provision in the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade.

Common honesty and a square deal demands that we repeal the measure.

[Robert S. Boyd, pastor James Lees Memorial Presbyterian Church, Louisville, Ky.]

I wish to express myself as deeply in sympathy with the effort to secure the repeal of the coastwise exemption of the Panama bill by Congress.

[Charles M. Sheldon, minister at large, Central Church, Topeka, Kans.]

I am heartily in favor of repeal. As the bill stands now, it is a dishonor to our treaty.

[J. Keir G. Fraser, minister Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C.]

It is difficult for me to understand how there can be a doubt in the mind of anyone that that part of the Panama Canal bill which exempts American coastwise ships from the payment of tolls is in violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. Congress ought to repeal the act, or, at least, submit to arbitration.

[Rt. Rev. L. J. Coppin, D. D., presiding bishop second Episcopal district, Philadelphia, Pa.]

After careful study of the question concerning the appeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill, I am firmly of the opinion that the repeal will be wise and just, and is the way to save the United States from very unnecessary humiliation, to say the least.

[Frederick Burgess, bishop of Long Island.]

I am heartily in favor of the arbitration movement, and believe that our country will be justified in submitting this whole question to arbitration as soon as practicable.

[Harmon H. McQuilkin, pastor First Presbyterian Church, San Jose, Cal.]

In common with multitudes of my fellow countrymen, I deeply deplore the patent injustice of the coastwise exemption feature in the Panama Canal bill, and sincerely trust that our Nation may be rescued from the humiliation of its consequences by a speedy repeal of the unjust discriminative provision.

[John Scarborough, bishop of New Jersey.]

I hope the Government will keep good faith with promises made, without any reference to loss or gain. National honor must be maintained at any cost.

[Junius B. Remensnyder, D. D., LL. D., president of Commission on Practicability of the Federal Council of Churches and president of the general synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States.]

Our country stands doubly pledged by its original declaration of equal terms to all nations and, by its agreement, to submit such differences to The Hague arbitration court, not to take the decision violently in its own hands. It is an amazing fact that when our journals of highest tone, practically without exception, and our foremost citizens of character and influence in the world of religion, letters, and business voice their strongest protest against a course of such moral reaction.

[Geo. W. Sandt, D. D., editor The Lutheran.]

Quote me as being in favor of the only proper ethical position which this country can take if it is to maintain its correct position and self-respect among nations. There are some things worth more than dollars, and this is one of them.

[Rev. Daniel S. Tuttle, bishop of Missouri, St. Louis.]

The Cuba page of our country's international doings is one of fair, unsoiled altruism. I should be sorry to think that the canal page should be one of studied egoism.

[Rev. Earl Cranston, resident bishop Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.]

My sympathies are strongly with the movement for the repeal of the provision of the canal bill exempting our own ships from charges for use of the canal. Our national honor is at stake. We are in danger of reversing our record on a most important point—open and square dealing with all nations on all international questions. After paying twenty millions for islands already won in war, and returning other millions of the Chinese indemnity unasked, we can not afford to send to arbitration even, much less to persist in the violation of the plain agreement of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[Rev. Walter L. Caldwell, Nashville, Tenn.]

I am glad to learn that there is a movement on foot seeking the repeal of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States. I regard the provision as unwise and unjust. It is a species of class legislation, to which I am opposed always. This is the age of fair play, and I do not believe the people of the United States will stand for the aforesaid provision.

[Right Rev. Charles T. Olmsted, bishop of central New York, Utica.]

My first thought, when the act of exemption was adopted by Congress, was that it was only fair, because the United States had borne the expense of building the canal. But when I learned that it was contrary to the treaty, I saw at once that we could not honorably insist upon it. It would be far better to repeal the bill; but if that be not done, then of course the case should be submitted to arbitration. That we Americans, who have done so much for the cause of peace in general, should reject the principle of arbitration because it might bear heavily upon our own pockets would be intolerable.

[Rev. William Burt, bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Buffalo.]

I most heartily favor the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. We should offer the world an example of equality for all and of a generosity that will promote peace and harmony among the nations. The present arrangement, if continued, will be a constant source of irritation. If we would command the respect and admiration of the civilized world, we must open the canal for all on equal terms.

[Bishop Benjamin Tucker Tanner, Philadelphia.]

America is too strong to ever take an advantage, howsoever well it may be authorized.

[Rev. W. Moore Scott, Savannah, Ga.]

I should very much regret to see the United States take any step in this or any other matter which would be in the least open to criticism or at all disturb the close relation between us and England. We might be within our strict legal rights in this matter, and yet courtesy, policy, and our best interests be seriously offended thereby. I trust that we shall move in this vital matter with great care and unselfishness.

[Rev. Willard Brown Thorp, San Diego, Cal.]

I am in hearty sympathy with the efforts that are being made to secure the repeal of the unfortunate action of Congress exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from Panama Canal tolls. Our standing and influence among the nations of the world would be immeasurably injured if that apparent violation of treaty obligations should be permitted to stand.

[Right Rev. Arthur C. A. Hall, bishop of Vermont, Burlington.]

I most earnestly trust that either by a repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama Canal bill or by a submission of the matter to arbitration Congress will free our country from the disgrace, which I fear we must otherwise accept, of dishonesty in international dealings.

[Right Rev. Frederick F. Reese, bishop of Georgia, Savannah.]

I cordially approve the effort to secure the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from the payment of tolls: First, because I believe it to be a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty; and, second, because I believe it to be an indirect form of subsidy to a special interest.

[Right Rev. Samuel Cook Edsall, D. D., bishop of Minnesota, Minneapolis.]

It is clear to my mind that Congress should repeal the provision exempting coastwise trade of the United States. Our country can not afford to be placed in the position of insisting on a matter of doubtful legality or of not submitting it to arbitration.

[Right Rev. John N. McCormick, bishop of Western Michigan, Grand Rapids.]

In regard to the repeal by Congress of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill, I beg to say that I am in favor of such repeal and hope that it may be passed. It appears to me that this would be at once the most honorable and the most expedient course to pursue.

[Right Rev. G. Mott Williams, bishop of Marquette, Mich.]

As I understand it, America has proclaimed to the world that by completing the Panama Canal she was aiming to do the world an unselfish service. Quite independently of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, therefore, we were estopped from a selfish use of the canal. The treaty, of course, ought to govern, and the discrimination in behalf of our coastwise shipping ought to be repealed. There is no other honest course.

[Right Rev. Thomas F. Gailor, bishop of Tennessee, Memphis.]

I sincerely hope that the exemption will be repealed, because it is in every way unworthy of us as true Americans. This exemption in favor of our own coastwise trade is an exhibition of an ungenerous and selfish spirit, which is just as vulgar in a nation as it is in an individual; it is a species of jingoism—"might makes right"—that would put a cheap, commercial stain upon our great canal enterprise, an enterprise the conduct of which ought to go down in history as a noble and splendid contribution by a great people not to their own aggrandizement, but to the closer intercourse and the friendlier relationship of all the nations of the world.

[Rev. Le Roy G. Henderson, Americus, Ga.]

Any movement that makes for the cause of true arbitration, as you point out in your letter, meets with my heartiest approval.

[Right Rev. Arthur L. Williams, bishop of Nebraska, Omaha.]

I am for world-wide competition, a free canal, and against coastwise exemption.

[Rev. I. S. McElroy, Columbus, Ga.]

If the coastwise exemption is in violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty beyond any reasonable doubt, then it should be repealed, for nations no less than individuals should keep faith with each other. If there be room for a reasonable doubt, then the question should be submitted for arbitration, not to The Hague, but to a board selected by the two governments interested.

[Rev. Eugene Russell Hendrix, bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Kansas City, Mo.]

I must express the hope that the Congress of the United States will so modify its action in exemption the coastwise trade of the United States from tolls in passing through the Panama Canal as to save us from humiliation in the event of an adverse decision at The Hague conference, should the matter be submitted to arbitration, which we can not refuse. The immense cost of the canal does not leave us in position to ignore the considerable revenue which our coastwise trade should pay, while our refusal to submit to arbitration the questions involved in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty puts our Nation, the special friend and advocate of arbitration, at a grave disadvantage in every way before the other nations of the earth. A treaty, "the solemn oath of a nation," can not be set aside for personal advantage save to our immense discredit as a Christian Nation.

[Right Rev. Cortlandt Whitehead, bishop of Pittsburgh.]

Any citizen of the United States who has a patriotic pride in his country and wishes to continue it must repudiate with emphasis the action of Congress in the matter of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill. In every possible way I desire to express and emphasize the sentiment that the United States should speedily repudiate and rescind the action taken by Congress and should proclaim to the world hearty appreciation of what is due from a generous and high-minded people.

[Rev. J. H. Jones, A. M., D. D., presiding bishop Ninth Episcopal District African Methodist Episcopal Church, comprising the States of Tennessee and Alabama, Wilberforce, Ohio.]

As an American I feel keenly the desire to encourage our own steamship trade, but far above that feeling is our national honor, by which honor we are bound to live. No nation can afford to disrespect its contracts and be false to its promises. To do so is to stand discredited, dishonored as hypocrites. Above all things the Nation must be fundamentally honest and must maintain itself in righteousness. I therefore humbly and sincerely beg our Government to repeal the Panama Canal coastwise exemption bill and bring to a close the contention between our Government and Great Britain without arbitration and with honor and dignity to ourselves.

[Rev. Joseph Silverman, Temple Emanu-El, New York.]

The only logical action for all concerned to take is to submit the differences to arbitration.

[Rev. C. T. Dole, First Congregational Society, Jamaica Plain, Mass.]

I wish to be counted among those who are earnestly petitioning Congress to reverse what we all know was hasty action in passing the Panama Canal Act. This measure was never supported by any popular demand; it has put a stain of dishonor upon our conduct, touching our sister nation of Great Britain, and it threatens, unless repealed, to lay a burden of expense upon all our people in favor of a class already privileged.

[Right Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster, bishop of Connecticut, Hartford.]

The stronger the ground for the claim that the provision contravenes our solemn contract (and to me that ground seems very strong), the more imperative reason is there for repealing the provision in order to save this country from dishonor and disgrace. I count it a privilege, so far as in me lies, to further this movement, and I earnestly hope that Congress will take the action which under the circumstances is reasonable and honorable and repeal the provision referred to.

[Rev. J. W. Bachman, Chattanooga, Tenn.]

The United States is rich enough to lose, but it can not afford to break its word.

[Rev. F. T. McFaden, Richmond, Va.]

I do not see how our Government can make any discrimination in tolls or conditions in favor of the coastwise or any other trade of this country in the use of the Panama Canal. To do so, in view of all our former actions, and especially the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, would be to stultify ourselves in the estimation of all the Governments of the world.

#### IV. OPINIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

[Duncan MacKinnon, San Diego, Cal.]

If we are to retain our self-respect and national honor, Congress must repeal the provision of the Panama bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[C. W. Mickens, Adrian, Mich.]

The submission to arbitration of the proposed difficulty in question would be a proper solution.

[C. H. Young, Lebanon, Ohio.]

I am in favor of repealing the Panama Canal bill exempting coastwise trade of the United States.

[F. T. Appleby, president Lafayette College, Lafayette, Ala.]

I feel that the clause should be repealed, that our splendid standing before all the nations of the world may not in any way be weakened.

[E. O. Holland, Louisville, Ky.]

The question of "Panama tolls" was discussed at a meeting of a number of the leading business and professional men of this city on last Saturday, December 28, 1912. After a careful analysis of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, it was the unanimous conviction of this group of men that Congress owes it to the American people to repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill which exempts the coastwise trade of the United States.

The honor of a country should be as sacred as the honor of an individual. Therefore a contract solemnly entered into by the accredited representatives of our country should be held inviolate.

[S. D. Largent, superintendent board of education, Great Falls, Mont.]

I believe that this Nation should stand strictly for the spirit as well as the letter of every treaty entered into with any other nation.

I am not in sympathy with the coastwise exemption of tolls. I see no good reason for it, and I do not believe that it is right.

[William O. Riddell, superintendent Board of Education, Des Moines.]

It is my individual opinion that whoever uses the Panama Canal should pay toll at the same rate that every other user pays; that there should be no discrimination whatever in tolls or conditions in favor of coastwise trade or any other special interest.

[H. M. Comins, superintendent Ripon public schools, Ripon, Wis.]

I incline to the "Independent" rather than the "Outlook" view in the matter of our coastwise shipping in connection with our Panama Canal. It seems to me we can hardly refuse to arbitrate the question, and in that event the decision must be adverse to the United States.

[Francis A. Soper, superintendent department of education, Baltimore, Md.]

I am decidedly opposed to the exemption of the coastwise trade of the United States as contained in the Panama Canal bill.

[G. J. Graham, superintendent of schools, Xenia, Ohio.]

I most assuredly feel that our Government has made a very grave mistake in the Panama Canal bill, in making an exception of the coastwise trade of the United States, as it is a direct violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[R. O. Stoops, superintendent of city schools, Joliet, Ill.]

I heartily favor the proposed repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill.

[J. N. Adee, superintendent Johnstown public schools, Johnstown, Pa.]

I sincerely believe it will be better for our Nation's future and world-wide peace for us to observe the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which treats the vessels of all countries alike in respect to tolls on the Panama Canal.

[N. Winton Palmer, superintendent public schools, Penn Yan, N. Y.]

It is my candid opinion that the provision of the so-called Panama Canal bill exempting coastwise trade of the United States should be repealed.

[Henry P. Emerson, superintendent department of public instruction, Buffalo, N. Y.]

I am in favor of the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States on the ground that it is a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[H. O. Sluss, superintendent of public schools, Covington, Ky.]

I have not had the time to look into the various phases of the proposed repeal of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States. However, the objections seem to me valid.

[F. H. Beede, superintendent of schools, New Haven, Conn.]

I favor the repeal of the bill.

[J. A. C. Chandler, superintendent public schools, Richmond, Va.]

I favor a repeal of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States on the grounds that it should not be said that the United States of America in any way violated the contract that it had made with Great Britain.

[Richard E. Clement, superintendent of public schools, Elizabeth, N. J.]

If given an opportunity I should certainly vote for the repeal of the law relative to tolls to be charged for the use of the Panama Canal, and the enactment of such law as would enable every American citizen to hold his head high and look the whole world straight in the face.

[William H. Maxwell, superintendent of schools, New York City.]

I regard the action of Congress in exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from tolls and conditions to which the ships of other nations are subjected as a violation of the treaty into which we entered with England.

I earnestly hope that Congress will repeal the obnoxious provision.

[R. E. Laramy, superintendent Phoenixville school district, Phoenixville, Pa.]

I feel personally that in this matter of exemption from tolls the moral tone of our Nation is in danger. This is of more importance than shakels.

[J. H. Van Sickle, superintendent of schools, Springfield, Mass.]

By all means the coastwise exemption in the Panama Canal bill should be repealed.

[H. P. Lewis, superintendent of public schools, Worcester, Mass.]

I have made no serious study of the subject, but I am inclined to the belief that our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty requires us to place all vessels passing through the Panama Canal upon an equality.

I think that the maintenance of the national honor is of far greater importance than the securing of some financial advantage.

[J. A. Whiteford, superintendent of schools, school district of St. Joseph, Mo.]

Replying to yours in reference to repeal of coastwise exemption in Panama bill, will say that from what I know of the situation I should be pleased to learn that this clause of the bill has been set aside by Congress. Its repeal would do much toward relieving an embarrassing situation.

[S. C. Hutchinson, superintendent of schools, Montpelier, Vt.]

I regret extremely the action of Congress in exempting the coastwise trade of the United States in the Panama bill. I am correspondingly glad that a movement is on foot to bring about its repeal.

[R. F. Hight, superintendent public schools, Lafayette, Ind.]

I am in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill.

[Jonathan Fairbanks, city superintendent of schools, Springfield, Mo.]

In response to your circular just received, I will say that in consequence of our treaty we should tax our coastwise ships passing through the canal same as foreign ships. Show no favors to any—our vessels as well as foreign.

While we built the canal, and the territory through which it passes is ours also, yet it would be well to make our ships pay the same as others. Then our relations with foreign countries would be much

strengthened or much more harmonious. I trust that the present canal bill will be repealed.

[G. A. Stuart, superintendent school department, Rockland, Me.]

I think that if we wish to be regarded as honorable in our international dealings and live up to treaty obligations we can do no less than repeal the provision mentioned.

V. OPINIONS OF OTHER PROMINENT MEN.

[A. Barton Hepburn, New York.]

I am clearly of the opinion that the recent act of Congress exempting the coastwise trade of the United States from the payment of tolls is an infringement of our treaty obligations.

[William Lyon Phelps, professor of English literature, Yale University, New Haven.]

I believe that Congress should repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, because I think such a clause is really a contravention of our plain contract made in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[E. R. L. Gould.]

Sticking to a bargain freely made characterizes an honorable man. National honor demands similar conduct from the Government.

[Oscar S. Straus.]

I would deem it advisable if the Senate could be prevailed upon to amend the Panama act by eliminating that section which frees from toll our coastwise shipping, and I think every effort should be made to bring about that result. Failing in that, I know of no valid reason why we should not, if requested by Great Britain, arbitrate that clause of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty above referred to.

[George McLean Harper, Princeton, N. J.]

I hope Congress will repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States, because it is plainly a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. No amount of word juggling can make it appear otherwise.

[Andrew F. West, Princeton University.]

The coastwise exemption provisions in the Panama Canal bill are bad from the standpoint of our national honor and also bad from the business point of view. If our coastwise trade through the canal needs special consideration in view of international competition, this should not be given in the form of lower tolls, against one well-understood pledge to the world of equal tolls, but by some form of compensating allowance made by the United States.

I hope the coastwise-exemption provision will be repealed promptly. If this can not be secured, it would be disgraceful not to submit the matter to arbitration.

[William Morton Payne, Chicago.]

I can hardly find words to express my abhorrence of the legislation which exempts any American shipping from the payment of canal tolls.

[George Burnham, jr., Philadelphia.]

For a totally unnecessary subsidy to a particular industry, granted in a moment of sentimental enthusiasm, we are going to barter away our honor and our standing among the nations.

[A. C. Stratford, president Board of Trade, Jersey City.]

The United States Government should arbitrate the matter of Panama Canal tolls. I can not see any other way honorably out of the controversy.

[David Davis, attorney at law, Cincinnati.]

I take this opportunity to protest against Congress of the United States interfering with the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and as earnestly request that Congress repeal the exemption act.

I voice the sentiment that the people of Ohio are in favor of adhering to our solemn contract, and if there can be any difference that such difference be submitted to the highest and most useful court in the world—The Hague.

[H. C. Phillips, secretary Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, Mohonk Lake, Ulster County, N. Y.]

It certainly seems to me that the United States can not afford to refuse to arbitrate the construction of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty with reference to the recent Panama Canal act.

[A. B. Farquhar, York, Pa.]

Let the American flag be planted on Panama as a symbol of justice and righteousness in dealing with other nations, and not in the protection of partiality to petty interests at home and international shame. The word "all" in the treaty means all.

[Henry Van Dyke, Princeton, N. J.]

It is already evident that the coastwise exemption clause in the Panama Canal bill comes in a questionable shape and is likely to lead to misunderstanding with Great Britain and with other friendly nations. Why create a necessity for arbitration? The simplest way out of the impending difficulty would seem to be the repeal of the confusing clause.

[Paul Fuller, New York City.]

I see no justification for such an exemption.

[J. Bishop Putnam.]

Every American citizen with the slightest regard for the dignity of his country can have but one opinion as to the course that we should take in connection with this matter, and the thought that we could honorably refuse to arbitrate a question of this kind is humiliating.

[Charles Francis Adams.]

In regard to the proposed repeal of the "coastwise exemption" in the Panama bill, I have merely this to say: "A man's self-respect is worth something, and what is true of the individual is true of the community."

[Robert Erskine Ely, director, League for Political Education.]  
The American people ought not to permit any doubt as to whether or not they propose to live up to their treaty obligations.

[William Jay Schieffelin.]

The reputation for fair dealing which our country has earned in the past will deservedly suffer unless we are true to the agreement that there shall be no discrimination in the Panama Canal tolls.

[Robert C. Ogden.]

In my judgment, there is only one honorable course for Congress to pursue concerning the provision in the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States and that is promptly to repeal it.

[Seth Low.]

If the United States and Great Britain fail to adjust their differences of opinion on the subject of Panama Canal tolls, I am very earnestly of opinion that the difference between the two countries on the interpretation of the treaty should be arbitrated.

My own personal opinion is that the game is not worth the candle, and I am sorry that this discrimination has been made.

[Alton B. Parker.]

Believing our country should faithfully fulfill, in both letter and spirit, every treaty obligation, I am necessarily heartily anxious that the provisions of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States should be repealed.

[Daniel C. French.]

It gives me pleasure to express myself as heartily in favor of the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise traffic of the United States from payment of tolls. The United States can not afford to run the risk of an accusation of unfairness or breach of faith in regard to this point.

[Alfred E. Marling, New York.]

I hope Congress will repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Cleveland H. Dodge, New York.]

I sincerely trust that the effort to bring about the repeal may be successful.

[Charles De Kay, New York.]

Regarding repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama Canal bill by Congress, I hope Congress will see this matter from a higher outlook and correct what I believe to be a strategic and diplomatic mistake.

[John Burroughs, West Park, N. Y.]

I think that to fail to keep faith with Great Britain in the matter of the Panama Canal treaty or to refuse to submit the question in dispute to arbitration, would be a stigma upon our honor as a Nation.

[William Roscoe Thayer, Cambridge, Mass.]

In the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the United States solemnly agreed to do a certain thing and it is bound, like every honest man, to keep its pledge.

[Brooks Adams, Boston, Mass.]

I consider the Panama Canal bill a breach of faith and in the last degree disgraceful to the country.

[James Schouler, Intervale, N. H.]

I favor a repeal by Congress of the United States coastwise-trade exemption.

[John Luther Long.]

Concerning the national iniquity compounded in the coastwise-exemption clause of the Panama Canal bill, I am very glad to raise my voice against it.

[Edward S. Martin, New York.]

I would like to see the coastwise trade clause of the canal bill repealed.

If that can not be done, I should like to see it arbitrated.

[James Ford Rhodes, Boston, Mass.]

My first bias was favorable to the bill as passed by Congress. But a careful historical examination of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 and of the present Hay-Pauncefote treaty, ratified by the Senate on December 16, 1901, has convinced me beyond any question that the words "free and open to the vessels of commerce \* \* \* of all nations" mean all merchant vessels, including vessels in our coastwise trade. I think that if the bill had not been passed at the close of a long and exhausting session the undesirable coastwise provision would not have been included. The wise thing for Congress now to do is to repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States.

[Montgomery Schuyler, New Rochelle, N. Y.]

Regarding the question of the exemption from tolls provision as primarily one of national honor, it is necessary for me to say that I am warmly in sympathy with repeal. The adverse arguments seem to me properly describable as "pettifogging."

[H. D. Sedgwick, New York City.]

American good faith is wounded by the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting our coastwise trade from tolls; that provision should be repealed.

[Robert E. Telford, Abbeville, S. C.]

My sentiments are very strongly in favor of the proposed repeal for the sake of our national honor and in justice to all concerned.

[Basil L. Gildersleeve, Baltimore, Md.]

A strict constructionist in all matters that pertain to personal and national honors, I consider any evasion of our treaty obligations a disgrace to the country.

[Andrew D. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.]

I have steadily been and remain a supporter of the idea of submitting the Panama Canal matter to arbitration at The Hague.

[Henry U. Johnson, ex-Member of Congress, Richmond, Ind.]

The coastwise provision of the Panama Canal act should be promptly repealed by Congress. Every consideration of national honor demands that this shall be done. It is also an expedient step to take, and will prove to be a profitable one in the long run.

[John G. Milburn, New York.]

I beg to say that I feel very strongly that the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States should be repealed by Congress.

[W. D. Howells.]

As to the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama bill, I have only to say that I like a nation that keeps its word, even though it loses by its good faith, just as I like a man that sweareth to his hurt and changeth not. I am not concerned so much for our shame before the world as for our shame before ourselves if we break the promise we made in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

[Everett P. Wheeler, New York.]

I am very clear that that clause in the bill ought to be repealed.

[George Foster Peabody.]

I beg to say that I am very heartily in sympathy with the proposition that this exemption should be repealed.

It seems to me a case where the public sentiment should be aroused to express its faith in the doctrine that "righteousness exalteth a nation."

[Frank T. Bayley, Denver, Col.]

I earnestly hope for the repeal by Congress of the coastwise exemption feature of the canal bill. I believe its retention will cost us heavily in moral prestige and national influence.

[Edward A. Reed, Holyoke, Mass.]

I am heartily in favor of the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama Canal bill, simply because it is a breach of good faith.

[Selden P. Spencer, St. Louis, Mo.]

For the United States, accepting as it does the principle of international arbitration, to be reluctant to admit the application of that principle to an honest and important difference of opinion between it and Great Britain in regard to the provisions of a treaty between them (to say nothing of the express provision of the separate treaty which we have with Great Britain, by which each undertakes to submit to arbitration disputed questions arising out of treaties between the two nations) is to invite the suspicion of the civilized world as to the integrity and honesty of the United States, thus hesitating, and speaking for peace with the voice of Jacob but in action extending the fraudulent hands of Esau.

[Samuel B. Capen, Boston.]

If there is any necessity to subsidize our shipping which uses the canal, we ought to do it directly and in the open, and not jeopardize our honor and our leadership in the peace movement at the same time. I trust that before the present Congress adjourns legislation may be enacted so that there shall be no discrimination in tolls or conditions among all nations.

[A. W. Hazen, Middletown, Conn.]

I am in hearty sympathy with the movement to further the repeal of the coastwise exemption in the Panama Canal bill. It has been a matter of deep regret to me that the Nation was so dishonored by its Congress as in the passing of that section of the bill.

[Charles L. Hutchinson, Chicago.]

I sincerely hope that Congress may repeal the provision of the Panama Canal bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States. It was, in my opinion, a mistake ever to exempt the coastwise trade, and I hope that Congress may rectify the error before called upon to arbitrate the question.

[Charles Matteson, Providence, R. I.]

I am heartily in sympathy with the movement to obtain a recession by Congress of this exemption, believing as I do that all vessels passing through the canal should be treated alike and that all should pay tolls. If this can not be accomplished, I believe that the interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty should be referred to The Hague Tribunal.

[Fred S. Ball, Montgomery, Ala.]

In my judgment the matter in controversy should be adjusted, and it seems clear from the language of the treaty that the act of Congress is without justification.

[J. H. Moores, Lansing, Mich.]

If the agreement in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty is that "there shall be no discrimination in tolls or conditions as among all nations," then I say let our coast-line shipping be on the same footing as that of all other nations. Let us keep our contract.

[Samuel T. Dutton, American Peace Society, New York.]

The United States can well afford to subsidize its coastwise ships if necessary, but can not afford to get a reputation for sharp practice or loose dealings with other nations.

[From a letter to a citizen who requested his eminence's opinion on the Panama tolls question.]

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,  
408 NORTH CHARLES STREET,  
Baltimore, Md., January 18, 1913.

I am most anxious that in this all-important matter the honor and prestige of our country be preserved. This I feel can be reached if the matter is given serious consideration and is carefully debated in both branches of Congress. Furthermore, this would result in a just settlement of the matter without having to have recourse to arbitration, for we most certainly can not refuse arbitration once it is proposed without placing ourselves in a most humiliating position before the world, and if arbitration is accepted it would undoubtedly result in our defeat. Hence I feel that the matter should be settled in Congress.

Very sincerely, yours,

J. CARDINAL GIBBONS,  
Archbishop of Baltimore.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if there is no desire by anyone else to be heard, I move that general debate be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order to close the general debate, but, unless somebody desires the floor, the Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read for amendment, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 28282) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

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 Alban G. Knobe, late of Company H, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Nineteenth 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 David Lloyd, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth 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 Jesse A. Linn, late of Company K, Twelfth 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 John T. Chiles, late of Company H, First 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 James Taylor, second, late of Company E, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Fifteenth 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 Milton Lee, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteers, and Company L, 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 Betsey Ann Phelps, widow of Elias Phelps, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth 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 George Hobbs, late of Company G, Seventh 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 Pressley R. Baldrige, musician, late of Fifty-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 C. Martin, late of Company F, Forty-second 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 Hugh Baker, late of Company C, Fourth 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 A. Peterson, late of Company B, Sixty-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 William D. Wood, late of Company K, 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 Patrick Fitzpatrick, late of Company C, Fifty-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 Stephen Vogel, late of Company G, Two hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezekiel Justice, late of Company F, One hundred and 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 W. Gallagher, late of Company D, 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 Solomon D. Sturtz, late of Company E, One hundred and sixtieth 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 George Goodpastor, late of Company F, First Battalion Nevada 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 Ruben Driskill, helpless and dependent son of William Driskill, late of Company H, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lottie Menefee, widow of John Menefee, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John T. Bates, late of Fourth 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 Jacob Schumacher, late of Company I, 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 Charles W. Wood, late of Company E, Thirteenth 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 Frank D. Morse, helpless and dependent child of Martin K. Morse, late of Company G, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Anne M. Haysmer, widow of James Haysmer, late of Company F, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William J. Chinn, late of Company H, Forty-second 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 Isaac B. Hugley, late of Company E, Eleventh 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 Orlando A. Hays, late of Company H, 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 Francis H. Turner, late of Company H, Eighty-seventh 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 H. Brown, late of Company E, Fifty-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 Lewis Quillen, late of Company I, First 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 B. Whisler, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-fourth 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 Henry Wilber, late of Company B, One hundred and eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Eighteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Green, late of Company K, Twenty-first 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 Frank Kirkey, late of Company L, 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 David Blubaugh, late of Company K, Forty-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 Andrew B. Keith, late of Company F, One hundred and twentieth 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 James F. Rowley, late of Company C, Eighth 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 John S. Bell, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-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 Samuel McQuate, late of Company G, Twenty-first 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 William G. Shute, late of Company E, Ninety-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 William Henderson, late of Company F, 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 Morgan T. Williams, late of Company E, Fourteenth 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 John Hoffman, late of Company B, Forty-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 Richard H. Robertson, 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 Adam Lichty, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-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 Anna O. Stanton, widow of Clark Stanton, late of Company A, First Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John M. Hines, late of Company I, Thirty-third 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 Erwin M. Bergstresser, now Harley, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, One hundred and 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 Josiah Gough, late of Company B, Fourth Battalion 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 Thomas J. Gustin, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-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 Frank L. Dunlap, late of Company F, 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 Josiah Ketchum, late of Company A, 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 Phillip Kohler, late of Company B, Two hundred and 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 David McClintock, late of Company B, Seventh 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 Clayton P. White, late of United States Marine Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis Westerfield, late of Company F, Eleventh 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 H. Dorrance, late of Company F, 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 Benjamin M. Curtis, late of Company H, 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 John J. Dillon, late of Company E, 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 Gardner Roberts, Jr., late of Company E, Twenty-fourth 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 W. Randels, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-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 Charles Torrey Phillips, late of Company I, Sixty-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 Rosaline V. Cook, widow of Thomas W. Cook, late of Company C, Seventh Battalion District of Columbia Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jacob L. Batchelder, late of Company C, Twenty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and musician in Company F, Thirty-sixth 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 Sarah Demree, widow of David P. Demree, late of Company C, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Sixteenth 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 Lafayette Cook, late of Company F, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, 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 Daniel D. Murphy, late of Company I, Third 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 Thomas J. Thorp, late of Company E, Eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Lieutenant colonel in One hundred and thirtieth 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 Muster, late of Company H, Twenty-seventh 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 Emma Schuette, helpless and dependent daughter of Frederick Schuette, late of Company E, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Vasterling, late of Company E, Second Regiment Missouri 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 William V. Fish, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia 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 Elexander Tittle, late of Company D, Third Regiment Ohio 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 Thomas E. Smith, late of Company H, 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 Joseph D. Fulmer, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted 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 Henry C. Adams, late of Company E, Second 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 Nahum A. Reed, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Holbrook, former widow of Frederick H. Boynton, late of Company F, One hundred and sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Henry Selover, late of Company G, Eighth 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 Marlon Ridgley, late of Company E, Seventy-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 Michael Normile, late of Company D, 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 James Mansfield, late of Company K, 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 Thomas Kenney, late of Forty-fourth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and Company I, 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 Thomas Stevenson, late of Independent Battery G, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lyman A. Babcock, late of Company E, Tenth 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 M. Abney, late of Company C, Eleventh 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 Joel L. Cudworth, late of Company H, Fourteenth 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 Daniel W. Bressler, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-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 Charles H. Webber, late of Company F, First Regiment United States Artillery, and Company I, Fourteenth 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 John Sepin, late of Company C, Ninth 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 Perry S. Grindle, late landsman on U. S. S. Chillicothe, 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 William H. Harrison, late of Company M, Thirteenth 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 S. Davidson, late of Company I, Ninety-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 Kels Risner, late of Company F, Fourteenth 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 Maynard, late of Company A, 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 Harvey Mahannah, late of Company G, 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 David C. Cass, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-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 Oscar F. Maynard, late of Company F, Ninety-third Regiment New York 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 Mead, late landsman, U. S. S. Canandaigua, 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 David J. Chinn, late of Company B, Second 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 Mary E. Farrell, widow of Andrew Farrell, late of Company I, Seventh 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 Caleb Crozier, late of Company I, One hundred and 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 George W. Peterson, late of Company F, Seventy-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 John A. Felton, late of Company H, Twenty-second 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 Maston G. Strong, late of Company G, Fifty-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 William H. Bates, late of Company D, 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 John S. Hufford, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Lovett, late of Company K, Forty-seventh 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 Samuel A. Gibson, late of Company B, 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 Isaac N. Strickler, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and in band Fiftieth 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 Zimmerman, late of Company F, Seventy-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 William J. Aylsworth, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Fifth Regiment New York 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 Margaret E. Fickle, widow of Isaac E. Fickle, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph Scharborough, late of Company B, 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 Osmus F. Devault, late of Company A, Eleventh 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 Edwin F. Miller, late of Company F, Ninety-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 Edward M. Drohan, late of Company A, Eighty-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 John Bacon, late of Company D, Twenty-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 Clementine Richards, widow of Charles F. Richards, late of Company F, Fourth 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 Margaret J. Brophy, widow of James H. Brophy, late of Company C, Second Regiment Rhode Island 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 Orman P. Babb, late of Twelfth Battery Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company E, Seventieth 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 T. Ferguson, late of Company F, Eighty-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 Martin V. B. Cross, late of Company K, 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 John Y. Lambert, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-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 Stephen H. Haley, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, 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 George W. Enslow, late of Company G, Ninety-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, 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 Slick, late of Company H, Fifty-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 David Stevens, late of Company D, Thirty-third 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 Lucy Ann Harper, widow of Hamilton Harper, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William M. Anderson, late of First Battery Kansas 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 McGrade, late of Company E, First Regiment New York Veteran 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 Benjamin White, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Galligan, alias William Callighan, late of Company F, 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 John C. Lewis, 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 Ida Newcomer, helpless child of Henry Newcomer, late of Company K, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William B. Heinbach, late of Company G, One hundred and sixteenth 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 Jason Johnson, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, First Regiment United States Veteran Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John N. Conely, late of Company I, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Second 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 Oliver C. Stringer, late of Company A, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Second 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 Bradley W. Hill, late of Company F, Fifth 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 Asa H. Patrey, late of Company E, Ninety-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 Samuel F. Garrett, late of Company I, Thirty-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 Jephtha Pierson, late of Company G, One hundredth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and fifty-second 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 Chauncey Cronk, late of Company B, Ninth 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 Kinnear, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-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 Asa H. Patrey, late of Company E, Ninety-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 Samuel F. Garrett, late of Company I, Thirty-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 Jephtha Pierson, late of Company G, One hundredth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and fifty-second 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 Chauncey Cronk, late of Company B, Ninth 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 Kinnear, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-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 Harrison T. Fleenor, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Sixth 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 P. Farmer, late of Company A, Third 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 Charles D. Jones, late of Company H, 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 Michael Shuppert, late of Company C, One hundred and first 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 Steward P. Powers, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-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 Lucy C. Andes, widow of Daniel Andes, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Illinois 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 John M. Carson, late of unassigned Fifth 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 Calvin Musser, late of Company F, One hundred and eleventh 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 C. Smith, 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 John M. Shirley, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois 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 Mary A. Pfister, widow of Reinhard Pfister, late of detachment of Artillery, United States Military Academy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Parker, late of Company A, One hundred and 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 Frances A. Ayers, widow of Benjamin S. Ayers, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The name of Jesse M. Silvers, late of Company L, First 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 Philippine Steins, widow of Gustavus A. Steins, late acting ensign, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rosa Prentiss, widow of Leander P. Prentiss, late of Company E, Fifth 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 Elizabeth Phillips, widow of William C. Phillips, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary J. Chase, widow of Charles Chase, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph N. Wilson, late of Company C, Sixtieth 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 Graham, late of Company I, Fourteenth 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 Peter F. Dixon, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Georgina Jonas, widow of George B. Jonas, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment New York 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 Henry Milton Babeock, helpless and dependent child of William J. Babeock, late of Companies E and B, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isabella H. Watson, widow of William N. Watson, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isaac J. Nichols, late of Company A, First Regiment Alabama 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 James W. Mayfield, late of Company I, 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 Daniel Hilliard, late of Company C, Fifty-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 John H. Ruff, late of Company H, 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 Henry A. Grove, late of Company B, 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 George W. Short, late of Company B, 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 William H. Brown, late of Company E, Thirty-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 Jacob Row, late of Company F, Second 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 Ellen G. Frame, widow of John O. Frame, late of Company F, 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 Washington McCartney, late of Company A, Eighth 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 John Seler, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh 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 Severyn T. Bruyn, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-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 Eliza Wolf, widow of Abraham Wolf, late unassigned, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, First Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James C. McClay, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Gray, late of 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 Thomas Sheehan, late of Company L, Eleventh 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 William H. Fenton, late of Company G, Nineteenth 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 Pinley Branstetter, late of Company C, 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 Phoebe J. Horton, widow of Orange O. Horton, late of Company H, Third 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 Joseph McKenzie, late of Company D, Fourteenth 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 K. Cyphert, late of Company C, One hundred and fifth 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 L. Nebergall, late of Company B, Third 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 Thresia De Long, widow of Jacob De Long, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harriett Gale, widow of Rufus Gale, late first lieutenant and commissary Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Burmaster, late third class musician, band First Regiment Nebraska 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 Edward O. Williams, late of Company M, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Proctor, late of 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 Jonas Siegrist, late of Company K, Fifty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, One hundred and sixty-second 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 B. Barlow, late of Company E, Forty-sixth 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 Daniel Walter, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth 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 W. Lynch, late of Company A, 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 Joseph Lethcho, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia 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 Benjamin F. Scott, late of Company G, Twelfth 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 Amos J. Henry, late of Company G, Tenth 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 Josephine Hall, widow of Merrick Hall, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Elizabeth H. Ball, widow of John E. Ball, late of Company E, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri 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 William Frisbie, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment New York 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 Adaline Beaver, widow of Edward Beaver, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Almeda Cosberry, widow of Dudley Cosberry, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harriet A. Glasscock, former widow of John B. Trimble, late of Company I, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John H. Civits, late of Company C, Forty-fifth 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 Laura A. Fowler, former widow of Josiah L. Wellington, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Malcolm Dunning, late of Company A, 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 Elizabeth Terry, former widow of Charles E. Smith, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lydia A. Norton, widow of James I. Norton, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth 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 Clara V. Weaver, widow of James B. Weaver, late colonel Second Regiment Iowa 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 William B. Fleming, late of Company D, Fifteenth 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 Elenor McCully, widow of James McCully, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Come, late of Company K, 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 James Giddy, late of Company F, Eighth 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 James Miller, late of Company F, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, First 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 Frances D. Cadamus, former widow of Robert Phillips, late of Company D, Ninety-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William McDermott, late of Company F, Fifty-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 James A. Love, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Missouri 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 Akridge, late of Company H, 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 Emma F. Berry, widow of Charles S. Berry, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Lathrop, alias William Lapher, late of Company D, Fifty-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 Charles E. Stamm, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-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 Irene M. Gary, widow of David S. Gary, late of Company K, One hundred and fifth Regiment Ohio 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 Philo Buckley, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-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 Samuel M. Baker, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas P. Degman, late of Company H, Fifty-fourth 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 Mary Bruce, widow of Thomas H. Bruce, late engineer on transport, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Morrison Hunter, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment, and 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 William W. Potter, late of Company F, Twenty-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 William P. Underwood, late of Company B, Twenty-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 Mary A. Odell, widow of Joseph Odell, late of Company M, Seventh 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 Daniel Caswell, late of Company E, Fourth 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 John McKone, late of Company H, 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 Whitney C. Monson, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Connecticut 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 W. Hill, late of Company F, Sixty-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 John Q. Thomas, late of Company D, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Forty-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 Thomas R. Lamison, late of Company B, 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 Jacob P. Reichert, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and served in Pennsylvania Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew W. McCullough, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and Company A,

Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Nelson Holcomb, late of Battery D, First Regiment 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 Humphrey D. Gifford, late of Third Battery Iowa 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 David Sypper, late landsman on U. S. S. Clara Dolson and Great Western, 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 Jacob Jones, late of Company C, 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 William F. Whitmore, late of Company D, One hundred and 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 Charles Schroder, late of Company C, One hundred and tenth 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 Charles W. Webster, late of Company G, Forty-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 Usner, helpless and dependent child of Adam Usner, late of Company E, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alexander B. Henderson, late of Company E, Eighty-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 Peley C. Sites, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-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 John P. Harris, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Osage County Battalion Missouri Home Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Puckett, late of Company I, Fourteenth 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 Alice M. McCoy, widow of Robert J. McCoy, late of Company E, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio 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 R. Gladman, late of Company A, Ninth 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 John S. Martin, late of Company H, Fifth 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 B. Williams, late of Company M, Twenty-fourth 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 John W. Sidle, late of Company G, Ninety-seventh 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 Fannie M. Campbell, widow of Henry C. Campbell, late of Company F, Seventieth Regiment Ohio 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 De Garmo, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-seventh 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 Jennie Riggs, widow of Allen Riggs, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ophelia L. Reynolds, widow of Hezekiah J. Reynolds, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third 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 George H. 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 Fietta L. Wood, widow of Enoch Wood, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Connecticut 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 Charles A. Lee, late of Company A, First Regiment Michigan 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 Charles Logan, late of Company D, 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 Emma J. Winchell, widow of George W. Winchell, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment New York State Militia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John D. Reed, 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 W. Partlow, late of Company I, 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 Harriet G. Sangster, former widow of Charles M. Long, late of Company H, Forty-seventh 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 John W. Williams, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-eighth 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 Augustus Schoenwald, late of Company E, One hundred and Eighty-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 William J. Sutton, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-fourth 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 Elizabeth N. Brand, widow of George J. Brand, late seaman, U. S. S. Grampus and Reindeer, 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 Charles Alfred Brand, helpless and dependent son of said George J. Brand, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further,* That in the event of the death of Elizabeth N. Brand, the name of said Charles Alfred Brand 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 N. Brand.

The name of John Schroeder, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-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 Hervey A. Humphrey, late of Company A, 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 Michael Hartman, late of Company O, Sixth 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 Margaret A. Ramage, former widow of Josephus Miller, late of Company A, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lydia L. Clark, widow of Calvin W. Clark, late of Company G, Thirtieth 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 Franklin D. Green, late of Company F, Thirty-sixth 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 Lucy K. Simons, widow of Luther A. Simons, late of Company D, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Daniel J. Haynes, late of Company A, Thirty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky 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 Irving D. Hull, late of Company E, 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 Catherine Daly, widow of John M. Daly, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Twelfth 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 Albert S. Bloomer, late of Company G, 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 Julia B. Russell, widow of Albirtus Russell, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, 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 Leonard Thorton Russell, helpless and dependent child of said Albirtus Russell, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further,* That in the event of the death of Julia B. Russell the name of said Leonard Thorton Russell 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 Julia B. Russell.

The name of Daniel H. Woodruff, late of Company D, Twenty-first 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 Alpheus Danley, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Independent Company B, West Virginia 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. Strother, late of Company C, 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 Sarah M. Kinley, widow of John A. Kinley, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leora R. Maxon, helpless and dependent child of Jonathan H. Maxon, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Mary L. Merchant, widow of Silas B. Merchant, late of Company G, Forty-fourth 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 Catharine M. Schryver, widow of John R. Schryver, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-eighth 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 John M. Culver, late second-class boy, 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 A. S. Welch, late of Company G, Fifth 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 Ellen V. N. Wilson, widow of Cornelius V. N. Wilson, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twenty-second Regiment 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 Laura F. Culbertson, widow of William M. Culbertson, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sarah Ann Wamsley, widow of Lawrence Wamsley, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-second 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 Mary Elizabeth Wamsley, helpless and dependent child of said Lawrence Wamsley, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further,* That in the event of the death of Sarah Ann Wamsley, the name of said Mary Elizabeth Wamsley 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 Sarah Ann Wamsley.

The name of Augusta Batdorf, former widow of John C. Sanders, late of Company A, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Lucy A. Rose, widow of Abner W. Rose, late of Company E, Third 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 John H. Steele, late of Company E, Sixty-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 Celestia Sprague, widow of Orrin C. Sprague, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-fourth 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 Katharine A. Weyant, widow of William B. Weyant, late of Companies M and A, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria J. Stevens, widow of Charles H. Stevens, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-fourth 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 John Marx, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Asa Jenkins, late of Company D, Fifty-third 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 Franklin Bryson, late of Company I, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. McArthur, late colonel, Eighth Regiment Maine 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 William V. Walker, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment, and Company L, Second 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 Stickle, late of Troop F, Fifth Regiment United States Cavalry, and Company A, Thirty-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 Francis M. Whittecar, late of Company K, Ninety-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 Catharine Ann Bartelle, former widow of Alexander H. Edwards, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jacob Peffer, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, 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 Louisa I. Baldwin, widow of William H. Baldwin, alias William Dunlap, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Luther B. Grover, late of Company I, Thirtieth 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 Youell, alias James Moses, late of Company I, Fifth 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 H. Yarger, late of Company K and first lieutenant Company G, Forty-ninth 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 James C. Boyd, late of Company E, Thirty-third 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 Homer Hoover, helpless and dependent child of James Hoover, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harriet P. Hale, dependent mother of Edward C. Hale, late of Company K, Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Thomas P. Wentworth, late of Company H, Twenty-first 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 F. Deane, widow of Charles H. Deane, late first lieutenant and quartermaster Eighty-sixth 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 Almyra Vancil, widow of John Vancil, late of Company B, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Horatio D. Elliott, late of Company D, 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 Levi Boysel, late of Company H, Sixty-ninth 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 Alexander Fleming, late of Company A, One hundred and eightieth 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 Dorothy E. Bacon, widow of Francis H. Bacon, late acting ensign, 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 M. Jones, widow of Charles Jones, late of Company D, Fifty-seventh 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 Simon Hoafmyre, late of Company B, Forty-ninth 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 William H. Hinckley, late of Company B, 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 Frank T. Sickler, late of Company C, Fifty-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 Samuel C. Robertson, late of Company C, Third Regiment North Carolina Mounted 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 Sterrett McClellan, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-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 Austin P. Walker, late of Company B, Sixty-fifth 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 Sylvester Cary, 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 O'Brien, widow of Timothy O'Brien, late of Company H, Ninth 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 Henry B. Frey, late of Company G, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company G, First 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 Emma C. Weidhold, widow of William S. Weidhold, late of Company G, Ninetieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Fourteenth 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 Isaac Byers, late of Company G, One hundred and 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 Samuel Webb, late of Company E, Second Regiment Ohio 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 Mary Bartlett Taylor, widow of Isaac Taylor, late of Company H, Third Regiment Minnesota 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 Helen Archibald, widow of Frederick A. Archibald, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-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 Sarah A. Bland, widow of Francis M. L. Bland, late of Company D, Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alva C. Tyler, widow of Benjamin R. Tyler, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert Shay, late of Company E, Third 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 Victoria S. Hill, widow of Adoniram J. Hill, late of Company H, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana 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 Cinderella B. McClure, widow of Robert A. McClure, late of Company F, Sixteenth 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 Joseph L. Bostwick, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company M, Second 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 Dennis P. Parker, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania 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 Bateman Zoll, late of Company H, One hundred and ninety-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 Walter Mason, late of Company E, 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 Addison D. Madeira, late chaplain 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 William H. Barton, late of Company H, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Twenty-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 Fred Babcock, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois 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 Hannah M. Brewer, widow of Benjamin Brewer, late of Company C, Sixty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henry Bolner, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth 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 E. Crane, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment Missouri State Militia 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 Kate D. Linsley, widow of James H. Linsley, late of Company C, 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 Charles H. Crandall, late of Company B, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Nineteenth 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 Lizzie S. Williams, widow of Henry E. Williams, late of Company B, Thirty-first 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 Virginia W. Reed, widow of James M. Reed, late of Company C, Forty-fifth Regiment Ohio 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 Daniel W. Brown, late of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Farley, widow of John H. Farley, late of Companies K and B, Third Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Stephen G. Lindsey, late of Company B, Eighty-ninth 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 Marie Soule, former widow of Augustus Fancher, late of Companies K and A, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Jesse M. Pirkle, late of Company G, 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 Joseph L. Evans, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, One hundred and fifth 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 Benjamin M. Clark, late of Company I, Third Regiment United States Veteran Infantry, and Company F, Independent 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 Charlotte E. Crowell, widow of James H. Crowell, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-ninth 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 James N. Light, late of Company G, One hundred and fifteenth 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 James H. Langley, late of Company M, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben Brink, late of Company A, Ninth 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 Elenora B. Petty, widow of George W. Petty, late of Company L, Second 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 George P. Smiley, late assistant surgeon Forty-second 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 Annie Schott, widow of Bernard Schott, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$2 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Clara Ward, helpless and dependent child of Michael Ward, late of Company F, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nancy Walton, widow of Jacob Walton, late of Company H, Seventy-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward H. Crandall, late of Company K, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York 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 John P. Thurston, late of Company F, 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 Eli C. Lowe, late of Third Battery Kansas Light Artillery, and Company K, First Regiment Indian Home Guards Kansas 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. Swanson, late of Company H, Thirteenth 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 Bartholomew, late of Company H, 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 Jennie McMurtrie, widow of Rudolph McMurtrie, late private United States Marine Corps, and of Company C, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James B. Kellogg, late landsman on U. S. S. Ohio, Princeton, and Mohican, 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 Rachel Castell, now Robbins, widow of Hiram Castell, late of Company C, Seventh 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 George M. Rood, late of Company E, Twentieth 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 Jane L. Gettins, widow of Edwin T. Gettins, late of Company K, Sixty-fifth Regiment New York 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 Matilda Louise Gettins, helpless and dependent child of said Edwin T. Gettins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Jane L. Gettins the name of said Matilda Louise Gettins 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 Jane L. Gettins.

The name of John H. Scott, 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 Julia A. Kendall, widow of George H. Kendall, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment New York State Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edson A. Cook, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts 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 William Welch, late of Company M, 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 Mary E. Hughes, widow of Joseph A. Hughes, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth 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 Emma Frymire, widow of Jasper Frymire, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh 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 James H. Ross, late landsman, 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 Elizabeth Willett, widow of George Willett, late of Company D, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Cooper, late of Company C, Sixtieth 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 Annie M. Regan, widow of Patrick Regan, late of Battery L, Third Regiment United States Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isalah Ellwood, late of Company H, Fifteenth 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 Martha Rogers, widow of William H. Rogers, late of Company E, Sixteenth 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 Frederick Sachsenheimer, late of Company K, 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 Caroline Seib, widow of Jacob Seib, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Michael Fogarty, helpless and dependent child of Patrick Fogarty, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Smith McCallister, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana 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 Horace W. Hunt, late of Twenty-first Battery Ohio Light Artillery, and Company A, Eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Ninth 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 Lusenah Fuller, widow of Amasa Fuller, late of Company A, Sixty-third 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 Ida B. Fuller, helpless and dependent child of said Amasa Fuller, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lusenah Fuller the name of said Ida B. Fuller 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 Lusenah Fuller.

The name of Joseph W. Jeroleman, alias William Wood, late of Company A, Eighty-second Regiment, and Company E, Fifty-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 Sarah C. Gross, widow of Reuben Gross, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Michigan 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 James M. Emmons, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment, and Company H, One hundred and thirty-second 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 Frank B. Doran, late of Company I, Fifty-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 Sarah J. Benton, widow of James P. Benton, late of Company I, Sixty-third 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 Noah M. Diehl, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-ninth 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 Catharine Hayden, widow of James B. Hayden, late of Company I, Eighty-sixth 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 Hoyt Hayden, helpless and dependent child of said James B. Hayden, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Hayden, the name of said Hoyt Hayden 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 Catharine Hayden.

The name of Carrie D. Colman, widow of John T. Colman, late of Company C, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Pugh, late of Company H, Fifth 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 Jane Burton, widow of Ira Burton, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, First Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Nannie Yocum, widow of Lucian S. Yocum, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alice M. Ham, widow of Fielding B. Ham, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William L. Duncan, late of Company D, Fortieth 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 George W. Lawson, late of Company E, Fortieth 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 Woods, late of Company C, Eighty-ninth 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 Rebecca Johnson, widow of John Johnson, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth 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 Isaac Smith, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky 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 Eva Buhler, widow of John Buhler, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio 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 Mordecai F. Riley, late of Company E, Fiftieth 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 Gertrude Meloy, helpless and dependent child of John Meloy, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Hancy, late of Company I, Sixty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and nineteenth 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 F. Hubbard, late of Company G, Fifty-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 Elizabeth Hoon, widow of James Hoon, late of Company C, Seventy-second 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 Nellie J. Hoon,

helpless and dependent child of said James Hoon, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine; *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth Hoon the name of said Nellie J. Hoon 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 Hoon.

The name of Newton Ridgway, late of Company K, Fifty-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 Roxanna Starkey, dependent mother of William H. Starkey, late of Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George M. Thomas, late of Company D, Sixty-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 Gifford, late of Company F, 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 Sarah F. Meade, widow of Greenville Meade, late of Company F, One hundred and eighteenth 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 Kate S. Blodgett, widow of Morris B. Blodgett, late of Company H, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Fourth Regiment New York 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 William Smith, late of Company K, Fourteenth 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 R. Sheeler, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-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 McLeod, late of Company C, Forty-seventh 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 Merrill, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-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 William H. Thomas, late of Company D, Eighth 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 Elizabeth Whitestone, widow of John A. Whitestone, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James G. Hagamen, late of Company F, 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 John Johnson, helpless and dependent child of Joseph C. Johnson, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Wickliff Loomis, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-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 Andrew W. Cochran, late of Company I, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Sixty-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 Gray, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth 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 Nancy Stutesman, now Olmstead, widow of James Stutesman, late of Company H, One hundredth Regiment Ohio 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 Scott, late of Company L, Ninth 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 Margarita S. Salazar, widow of Tomas Salazar, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment New Mexico Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elno Hattie Abells, former widow of Charles A. Sikes, late of First Independent Battery, Connecticut Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John L. Foster, late musician, 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 Araminta Ward, widow of Isaac J. Ward, late of Company I, Fourteenth 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 Malony, late of Company B, Denver City (Colorado) Home Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rachel Stewart, widow of William Stewart, late of Companies D and H, Sixty-fifth 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 Sophia M. Davis, widow of Robert E. Davis, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, One hundred and ninetieth 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 James Russell, late of Company H, One hundred and eleventh 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 David Amos, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment West Virginia 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 Thomas Cooper, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Ayres, late of Company B, Sixty-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 Samuel Williamson, late of Company I, Eleventh 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 David R. Beavers, 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 Nellie McMillan, helpless and dependent child of Daniel McMillan, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William Ashton, late of Company D, Fifth 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 James Anderson, late of Company C, One hundred and thirteenth 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 foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 139.	Alban G. Knode.	H. R. 12067.	David J. Chinn.
H. R. 525.	David Lloyd.	H. R. 12269.	Mary E. Farrell.
H. R. 923.	Jesse A. Linn.	H. R. 12348.	Caleb Crozier.
H. R. 953.	John T. Chiles.	H. R. 12402.	George W. Peterson.
H. R. 1762.	James Taylor (2d).	H. R. 12556.	John A. Felton.
H. R. 1914.	Milton Lee.	H. R. 12574.	Maston G. Strong.
H. R. 1915.	Betsy Ann Phelps.	H. R. 12740.	William H. Bates.
H. R. 1922.	George Hobbs.	H. R. 12968.	John S. Hufford.
H. R. 2011.	Pressley R. Baldrige.	H. R. 12990.	Martin Lovett.
H. R. 2020.	John C. Martin.	H. R. 13033.	Samuel A. Gibson.
H. R. 2119.	Hugh Baker.	H. R. 13189.	Isaac N. Strickler.
H. R. 2128.	John A. Peterson.	H. R. 13266.	William Zimmerman.
H. R. 2130.	William D. Wood.	H. R. 13538.	William J. Aylsworth.
H. R. 2378.	Patrick Fitzpatrick.	H. R. 14164.	Margaret E. Pickle.
H. R. 2379.	Stephen Vogel.	H. R. 14196.	Joseph Scharborough.
H. R. 2525.	George W. Gallagher.	H. R. 14210.	Osman F. Devault.
H. R. 2549.	Ezekiel Justice.	H. R. 14345.	Edwin F. Miller.
H. R. 2626.	Solomon D. Sturtz.	H. R. 14409.	Edward M. Drohan.
H. R. 2748.	George Goodpastor.	H. R. 14447.	John Bacon.
H. R. 3047.	Ruben Driskill.	H. R. 14467.	Clementine Richards.
H. R. 3270.	Lottie Menefee.	H. R. 14469.	Margaret J. Brophy.
H. R. 3451.	John T. Bates.	H. R. 14520.	Orman P. Babb.
H. R. 3457.	Jacob Schumacher.	H. R. 14576.	John T. Ferguson.
H. R. 3463.	Charles W. Wood.	H. R. 14598.	Martin V. B. Cross.
H. R. 3566.	Frank D. Morse.	H. R. 14795.	John Y. Lambert.
H. R. 3567.	Anna M. Haysmer.	H. R. 14848.	Stephen H. Haley.
H. R. 3849.	William J. Chinn.	H. R. 14910.	George M. Enslow.
H. R. 3932.	Isaac B. Hughey.	H. R. 15016.	William Slick.
H. R. 4092.	Orlando A. Hays.	H. R. 15072.	David Stevens.
H. R. 4096.	Francis H. Turner.	H. R. 15092.	Lucy Ann Harper.
H. R. 4119.	James H. Brown.	H. R. 15099.	William M. Anderson.
H. R. 4129.	Lewis Guillen.	H. R. 15281.	James McGrade.
H. R. 4211.	John B. Whisler.	H. R. 15390.	Benjamin White.
H. R. 4250.	Henry Wilber.	H. R. 15412.	William Galligan, alias William Calligham.
H. R. 4256.	William Green.	H. R. 15443.	John C. Lewis.
H. R. 4352.	Frank Kirkey.	H. R. 15510.	Ida Newcomer.
H. R. 4557.	David Blubaugh.	H. R. 15535.	William B. Heinbach.
H. R. 4619.	Andrew B. Keith.	H. R. 15610.	Jason Johnson.
H. R. 4640.	James F. Rowley.	H. R. 15667.	John N. Conely.
H. R. 4756.	John S. Bell.	H. R. 15670.	Oliver C. Stringer.
H. R. 5105.	Samuel McQuate.	H. R. 15816.	Bradley W. Hill.
H. R. 5061.	William G. Shute.	H. R. 15936.	Asa H. Patrey.
H. R. 5715.	William Henderson.	H. R. 16010.	Samuel F. Garrett.
H. R. 5807.	John Hoffman.	H. R. 16043.	Jephtha Pierson.
H. R. 5813.	Morgan T. Williams.	H. R. 16056.	Chauncey Cronk.
H. R. 5844.	Richard H. Robertson.	H. R. 16068.	Albert Kinnear.
H. R. 5983.	Adam Lichty.	H. R. 16081.	Harrison T. Fleenor.
H. R. 6167.	Anna O. Stanton.	H. R. 16201.	James P. Farmer.
H. R. 6354.	Erwin M. Bergstresser, now Harley.	H. R. 16267.	Charles D. Jones.
H. R. 6430.	Josiah Gough.	H. R. 16396.	Michael Shuppert.
H. R. 6436.	Thomas J. Gustin.	H. R. 16404.	Steward P. Powers.
H. R. 6439.	Frank L. Dunlap.	H. R. 16520.	Lucy C. Andes.
H. R. 6563.	Josiah Ketchum.	H. R. 16589.	John M. Carson.
H. R. 6616.	Phillip Kohler.	H. R. 16573.	Calvin Musser.
H. R. 6682.	David McClintock.	H. R. 16588.	Henry C. Smith.
H. R. 6693.	Clayton P. White.	H. R. 16631.	John N. Shirley.
H. R. 6835.	John M. Hines.	H. R. 16697.	Mary A. Pfister.
H. R. 7198.	Francis Westerfield.	H. R. 16726.	Charles Parker.
H. R. 7201.	James H. Dorrance.	H. R. 16762.	Frances A. Ayers.
H. R. 7563.	Benjamin M. Curtis.	H. R. 16771.	Jesse M. Silvers.
H. R. 7621.	John J. Dillon.	H. R. 16864.	Phillip Steins.
H. R. 7638.	Gardiner Roberts, jr.	H. R. 16975.	Rosa Prentiss.
H. R. 7682.	John W. Randels.	H. R. 16913.	Elizabeth Phillips.
H. R. 7748.	Charles Torrey Phillips.	H. R. 16920.	Mary J. Chase.
H. R. 8354.	Rosaline V. Cook.	H. R. 17149.	Joseph N. Wilson.
H. R. 8548.	Jacob L. Batchelder.	H. R. 17318.	William Graham.
H. R. 8728.	Sarah Demree.	H. R. 17431.	Peter F. Dixon.
H. R. 9233.	Lafayette Cook.	H. R. 17506.	Georgiana Jonas.
H. R. 9265.	Daniel D. Murphy.	H. R. 17579.	Henry Milton Babcock.
H. R. 9311.	Thomas J. Thorp.	H. R. 17630.	Isabella H. Watson.
H. R. 9351.	John Muster.	H. R. 17650.	Isaac J. Nichols.
H. R. 9398.	Emma Schuette.	H. R. 17655.	James W. Mayfield.
H. R. 9685.	Henry Vasterling.	H. R. 17873.	Daniel Hilliard.
H. R. 10015.	William V. Fish.	H. R. 17887.	John H. Ruff.
H. R. 10025.	Alexander Tittle.	H. R. 17894.	Henry A. Grove.
H. R. 10133.	Thomas E. Smith.	H. R. 17980.	George W. Short.
H. R. 10373.	Joseph D. Fulmer.	H. R. 18080.	William H. Brown.
H. R. 10637.	Henry C. Adams.	H. R. 18121.	Jacob Row.
H. R. 10705.	Nabum A. Reed.	H. R. 18696.	Ellen G. Frame.
H. R. 10745.	Eliza Holbrook.	H. R. 18870.	Washington McCart- ney.
H. R. 10767.	Henry Selover.	H. R. 18876.	John Seller.
H. R. 10799.	Marion Rldgley.	H. R. 19021.	Severyn T. Bruyn.
H. R. 10871.	Michael Normile.	H. R. 19107.	Eliza Wolf.
H. R. 10932.	James Mansfield.	H. R. 19202.	James C. McClay.
H. R. 10923.	Thomas Kenney.	H. R. 19248.	John Gray.
H. R. 10975.	Thomas Stevenson.	H. R. 19257.	Thomas Sheehan.
H. R. 11056.	Lyman A. Babcock.	H. R. 19486.	William H. Fenton.
H. R. 11116.	James M. Abney.	H. R. 19492.	Finley Branstetter.
H. R. 11198.	Joel L. Cudworth.	H. R. 19564.	Phebe J. Horton.
H. R. 11279.	Daniel W. Bressler.	H. R. 19680.	Joseph McKenzie.
H. R. 11324.	Charles H. Webber.	H. R. 19824.	James K. Cyphert.
H. R. 11344.	John Sepin.	H. R. 19876.	John L. Nebergall.
H. R. 11497.	Perry S. Grindle.	H. R. 20009.	Theresa De Long.
H. R. 11502.	William H. Harrison.	H. R. 20121.	Harriet Gale.
H. R. 11504.	John S. Davidson.	H. R. 20246.	Charles E. Burmaster.
H. R. 11530.	Kels Risner.	H. R. 20290.	Edward O. Williams.
H. R. 11565.	William Maynard.	H. R. 20329.	George W. Proctor.
H. R. 11844.	Harvey Mahannah.	H. R. 20354.	Jonas Siegrist.
H. R. 11910.	David C. Cass.	H. R. 20383.	John B. Barlow.
H. R. 11946.	Oscar F. Maynard.	H. R. 20467.	Daniel Barlow.
H. R. 12000.	Thomas Mead.		

- H. R. 20780. John W. Lynch.  
 H. R. 20845. Joseph Lethcho.  
 H. R. 20940. Benjamin F. Scott.  
 H. R. 20960. Amos J. Henry.  
 H. R. 21348. Josephine Hall.  
 H. R. 21381. Elizabeth H. Ball.  
 H. R. 21558. William Frisbie.  
 H. R. 21691. Adaline Beaver.  
 H. R. 21724. Almada Cosberry.  
 H. R. 21830. Harriet A. Glasscock.  
 H. R. 21846. John H. Clivits.  
 H. R. 21848. Laura A. Fowler.  
 H. R. 21863. Malcolm Dunning.  
 H. R. 22121. Elizabeth Terry.  
 H. R. 22176. Lydia A. Norton.  
 H. R. 22239. Clara V. Weaver.  
 H. R. 22275. William B. Fleming.  
 H. R. 22322. Elenor McCully.  
 H. R. 22385. William Come.  
 H. R. 22428. James Giddy.  
 H. R. 22449. James Miller.  
 H. R. 22475. Frances D. Cadamus.  
 H. R. 22476. William McDermott.  
 H. R. 22485. James A. Love.  
 H. R. 22541. John Akridge.  
 H. R. 22549. Emma F. Berry.  
 H. R. 22604. William Lathrop, alias  
 William Lapher.  
 H. R. 22632. Charles E. Stamm.  
 H. R. 22633. Irene M. Gary.  
 H. R. 22806. Philo Buckley.  
 H. R. 22886. Samuel M. Baker.  
 H. R. 22923. Thomas P. Degman.  
 H. R. 23134. Mary Bruce.  
 H. R. 23269. Morrison Hunter.  
 H. R. 23361. William W. Potter.  
 H. R. 23426. William P. Under-  
 wood.  
 H. R. 23435. Mary A. Odell.  
 H. R. 23453. Daniel Caswell.  
 H. R. 23523. John McKone.  
 H. R. 23566. Whitney C. Monson.  
 H. R. 23584. John W. Hill.  
 H. R. 23870. John Q. Thomas.  
 H. R. 23916. Thomas R. Lamison.  
 H. R. 23922. Jacob P. Reichert.  
 H. R. 23923. Andrew W. McCul-  
 lough.  
 H. R. 23938. Nelson Holcomb.  
 H. R. 23944. Humphrey D. Gifford.  
 H. R. 23946. David Sypher.  
 H. R. 24053. Jacob Jones.  
 H. R. 24158. William F. Whit-  
 more.  
 H. R. 24164. Charles Schrober.  
 H. R. 24165. Charles W. Webster.  
 H. R. 24295. John Usner.  
 H. R. 24329. Alexander B. Hender-  
 son.  
 H. R. 24498. Poley C. Sites.  
 H. R. 24504. John P. Harris.  
 H. R. 24547. Benjamin Puckett.  
 H. R. 24583. Alice M. McCoy.  
 H. R. 24628. William R. Gladman.  
 H. R. 24665. John S. Martin.  
 H. R. 24733. John B. Williams.  
 H. R. 24849. John W. Sidle.  
 H. R. 24900. Fanny M. Campbell.  
 H. R. 24950. George De Garmo.  
 H. R. 24978. Jennie Riggs.  
 H. R. 25042. Ophelia L. Reynolds.  
 H. R. 25123. George H. Beckwith.  
 H. R. 25265. Finetta L. Wood.  
 H. R. 25326. Charles A. Lee.  
 H. R. 25354. Charles Logan.  
 H. R. 25358. Emma J. Winchell.  
 H. R. 25382. John D. Reed.  
 H. R. 25434. Hiram W. Partlow.  
 H. R. 25491. Harriet G. Sangster.  
 H. R. 25521. John W. Williams.  
 H. R. 25530. Augustus Schoenwald.  
 H. R. 25565. William J. Sutton.  
 H. R. 25604. Elizabeth N. Brand.  
 H. R. 25659. John Schroeder.  
 H. R. 25871. Hervey A. Humphrey.  
 H. R. 25915. Michael Hartman.  
 H. R. 25921. Margaret A. Ramage.  
 H. R. 25932. Lydia L. Clark.  
 H. R. 25953. Franklin D. Green.  
 H. R. 26090. Lucy K. Simons.  
 H. R. 26156. Daniel J. Haynes.  
 H. R. 26196. Irving D. Hull.  
 H. R. 26241. Catherine Daly.  
 H. R. 26273. Albert S. Bloomer.  
 H. R. 26274. Julia B. Russell.  
 H. R. 26322. Daniel H. Woodruff.  
 H. R. 26347. Alpheus Danley.  
 H. R. 26471. James S. Strother.  
 H. R. 26481. Sarah M. Kinley.  
 H. R. 26488. Leora R. Maxon.  
 H. R. 26489. Mary L. Merchant.  
 H. R. 26504. Catharine M. Schryver.  
 H. R. 26517. John M. Culver.  
 H. R. 26519. William A. S. Welch.  
 H. R. 26521. Ellen V. N. Wilson.  
 H. R. 26522. Laura F. Culbertson.  
 H. R. 26526. Sarah Ann Wamsley.  
 H. R. 26527. Augusta Batdorf.  
 H. R. 26572. Lucy A. Rose.  
 H. R. 26576. John H. Steele.  
 H. R. 26579. Celestia Sprague.  
 H. R. 26581. Katharine A. Weyant.  
 H. R. 26582. Maria J. Stevens.  
 H. R. 26591. John Marx.  
 H. R. 26592. Asa Jenkins.  
 H. R. 26597. Franklin Bryson.  
 H. R. 26598. William M. McArthur.  
 H. R. 26624. William U. Walker.  
 H. R. 26626. John Stickle.  
 H. R. 26633. Francis M. Whittecar.  
 H. R. 26650. Catharine Ann Bartelle.  
 H. R. 26654. Jacob Peffer.  
 H. R. 26688. Louisa I. Baldwin.  
 H. R. 26690. Luther B. Grover.  
 H. R. 26703. James Youell, alias  
 James Moses.  
 H. R. 26707. John H. Yarger.  
 H. R. 26719. James C. Boyd.  
 H. R. 26720. Homer Hoover.  
 H. R. 26762. Harriet P. Hale.  
 H. R. 26763. Thomas P. Wentworth.  
 H. R. 26764. Mary F. Dean.  
 H. R. 26767. Almyra Vancil.  
 H. R. 26770. Horatio D. Elliott.  
 H. R. 26776. Levi Boysel.  
 H. R. 26779. Alexander Fleming.  
 H. R. 26782. Dorothy E. Bacon.  
 H. R. 26783. Mary M. Jones.  
 H. R. 26784. Simon Hoafmyre.  
 H. R. 26785. William H. Hinckley.  
 H. R. 26790. Frank T. Sickler.  
 H. R. 26796. Samuel C. Robertson.  
 H. R. 26803. Sterrett McClellan.  
 H. R. 26805. Austin P. Walker.  
 H. R. 26807. Sylvester Cary.  
 H. R. 26829. Mary O'Brien.  
 H. R. 26839. Henry B. Frey.  
 H. R. 26842. Emma C. Weinhold.  
 H. R. 26858. Isaac Byers.  
 H. R. 26862. Samuel Webb.  
 H. R. 26863. Mary Bartlett Taylor.  
 H. R. 26884. Helen Archibald.  
 H. R. 26920. Sarah A. Bland.  
 H. R. 26934. Alvacinda Tyler.  
 H. R. 26935. Robert Shay.  
 H. R. 26951. Victoria S. Hill.  
 H. R. 26988. Cinderella B. McClure.  
 H. R. 26992. Joseph L. Postwick.  
 H. R. 26996. Dennis P. Barkster.  
 H. R. 26998. Bateman Zoll.  
 H. R. 26999. Walter Mason.  
 H. R. 27019. Addison D. Madeira.  
 H. R. 27026. William H. Barton.  
 H. R. 27042. Fred Babcock.  
 H. R. 27045. Hannah M. Brewer.  
 H. R. 27048. Henry Bolner.  
 H. R. 27053. James E. Crane.  
 H. R. 27061. Kate D. Linsley.  
 H. R. 27088. Charles H. Crandall.  
 H. R. 27122. Lizzie S. Williams.  
 H. R. 27126. Virginia W. Reed.  
 H. R. 27131. Daniel W. Brown.  
 H. R. 27165. Elizabeth Farley.  
 H. R. 27168. Stephen G. Lindsey.  
 H. R. 27182. Marie Soucie.  
 H. R. 27184. Jesse M. Pirkle.  
 H. R. 27188. Joseph L. Evans.  
 H. R. 27189. Benjamin M. Clark.  
 H. R. 27197. Charlotte E. Crowell.  
 H. R. 27213. James N. Light.  
 H. R. 27220. James H. Langley.  
 H. R. 27221. Reuben Brink.  
 H. R. 27227. Eleanor B. Petty.  
 H. R. 27233. George P. Smiley.  
 H. R. 27240. Annie Schott.  
 H. R. 27245. Clara Ward.  
 H. R. 27246. Nancy Walton.  
 H. R. 27247. Edward H. Crandall.  
 H. R. 27256. John P. Thurston.  
 H. R. 27269. Eli C. Lowe.  
 H. R. 27270. John W. Swanson.  
 H. R. 27274. James Bartholomew.  
 H. R. 27291. Jennie McMurtre.  
 H. R. 27293. James B. Kellogg.  
 H. R. 27299. Rachel Castell, now  
 Robbins.  
 H. R. 27302. George M. Rood.  
 H. R. 27314. Jane L. Gettins.  
 H. R. 27318. John H. Scott.  
 H. R. 27319. Julia A. Kendall.  
 H. R. 27326. Edson A. Cook.  
 H. R. 27340. William Welch.  
 H. R. 27349. Mary E. Hughes.  
 H. R. 27350. Emma Frymire.  
 H. R. 27368. James H. Ross.  
 H. R. 27385. Elizabeth Willett.  
 H. R. 27386. Henry Cooper.  
 H. R. 27393. Annie M. Regan.  
 H. R. 27403. Isalah Elwood.  
 H. R. 27414. Martha Rogers.  
 H. R. 27417. Frederick Sachsenhel-  
 mer.  
 H. R. 27423. Caroline Selb.  
 H. R. 27448. Michael Fogarty.  
 H. R. 27455. Smith McCallister.  
 H. R. 27470. Horace W. Hunt.  
 H. R. 27512. Lusenah Fuller.  
 H. R. 27518. Joseph W. Jeroleman,  
 alias William Wood.  
 H. R. 27521. Sarah C. Gross.  
 H. R. 27522. James M. Emmons.  
 H. R. 27554. Frank B. Doran.  
 H. R. 27579. Sarah J. Benton.  
 H. R. 27582. Noah M. Diehl.  
 H. R. 27585. Catharine Hayden.  
 H. R. 27587. Carrie D. Colman.  
 H. R. 27589. Lewis Pugh.  
 H. R. 27597. Jane Burton.  
 H. R. 27598. Nannie Yocum.  
 H. R. 27599. Alice M. Ham.  
 H. R. 27600. William L. Duncan.  
 H. R. 27601. George W. Lawson.  
 H. R. 27602. John Woods.  
 H. R. 27613. Rebecca Johnson.  
 H. R. 27616. Isaac Smith.  
 H. R. 27631. Eva Buhler.  
 H. R. 27643. Mordecai F. Riley.  
 H. R. 27669. Gertrude Meloy.  
 H. R. 27671. George W. Haney.  
 H. R. 27679. James F. Hubbard.  
 H. R. 27680. Elizabeth Hoon.  
 H. R. 27682. Newton Ridgway.  
 H. R. 27685. Roxanna Starkey.  
 H. R. 27696. George M. Thomas.  
 H. R. 27714. Edward Gifford.  
 H. R. 27718. Sarah F. Meade.  
 H. R. 27735. Kate S. Blodgett.  
 H. R. 27760. William Smith.  
 H. R. 27763. William R. Sheeler.  
 H. R. 27797. John McLeod.  
 H. R. 27802. George Merrill.  
 H. R. 27805. William H. Thomas.  
 H. R. 27870. Elizabeth Whitestine.  
 H. R. 27873. James G. Hagamen.  
 H. R. 27915. John Johnson.  
 H. R. 27917. Wickliff Loomis.  
 H. R. 27930. Andrew W. Cochran.  
 H. R. 27934. George Gray.  
 H. R. 27935. Nancy Stutesman (now  
 Olmstead).  
 H. R. 27978. John Scott.  
 H. R. 28003. Margarita S. Salazar.  
 H. R. 28011. Elno Hattie Abells.  
 H. R. 28029. John L. Foster.  
 H. R. 28119. Araminta Ward.  
 H. R. 28083. William Malony.  
 H. R. 28153. Rachel Stewart.  
 H. R. 28169. Sophia M. Davis.  
 H. R. 12083. James Russell.  
 H. R. 2636. David Amos.  
 H. R. 4139. Thomas Cooper.  
 H. R. 14171. Isaac Ayres.  
 H. R. 22317. Samuel Williamson.  
 H. R. 25350. David P. Beavers.  
 H. R. 26511. Nellie McMillan.  
 H. R. 27736. William Ashton.  
 H. R. 27808. James Anderson.

During the reading of the bill:

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill. Where is the full report of these cases which are mentioned in the bill?

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. The evidence that accompanies each case can be found with the secretary of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, if that is what the gentleman means by the words "full report."

Mr. TRIBBLE. That is what I mean. How many cases are presented here to-day in this bill?

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. I read the number some time ago. There are 468.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does the gentleman think that the committee has carefully investigated all of these cases?

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. As fully as was possible for us to do so, and as I stated before, the committee has been crippled since the December vacation, inasmuch as there are three or four vacancies on the committee, and inasmuch as several Members who received unpleasant news on election day have not been present. It is possible that some of these matters have crept through where it would otherwise have been prevented.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have frequently called for these full reports here on cases and have never been accorded the courtesy of the production of them. The first bill that was presented to the House at this session has been returned from the Senate and a conference has been held. I make note of two or three entries in that conference report. At the time when this bill passed the House I strenuously opposed several cases included in it. Now, I note to-day the case of Phoebe Cosgriff. The Senate fully exposed her record and refused to pass her bill, as is shown by the conference report. This woman for many years, as this report will show, had been drawing a pension on the pretense that her husband was dead. She has personated herself as the wife of James Cosgriff and secured pension as his widow, claiming he died in December, 1882. This House recently increased her pension by special act. The report I hold in my hand exposes this fraud. The soldier, James Cosgriff, is living and is in the Soldiers' Home at Leavenworth, Kans.

The dates that she gave of her husband's entry, his death, and his service are false, and the man to-day, as shown by this report, is in an old soldiers' home, alive. I don't suppose the imposter wife ever saw him. He was selected from a list of soldiers supposed to be dead, for pension purpose. The report says:

It is clearly evident that claimant was never the wife or widow of this soldier and has no status on account of the service rendered by him.

As long as the people of my district keep me in this House I expect to continue protesting against pension graft. This committee is not as careful as it should be. Such claims as this should never reach this House. In that same conference report is stricken another case; and while I protested against the passage of the bill, the evidence in the case was not accessible to me then. The full report was not here, but I have the facts to-day in this report. I read from the report:

Case of Sarah J. Kelley (H. R. 14851). In this case the House report is rather meager. From a reading of the House report it would appear that this claimant is entitled to pension through the regular channels, as the Pension Bureau, and that no necessity exists for the consideration of her case by Congress. As a matter of fact, however, it is shown that the claimant has been guilty of open and notorious adulterous cohabitation since soldier's death, and that beginning in 1882, shortly after his death, she has kept houses of ill-fame for many years in New York City, in Newark, Trenton, and Atlantic City, N. J., and Scranton, Pa. It is on this account that her applications for pension at the bureau have been denied.

Mr. Chairman, the Pension Bureau had on file this woman's record, and I contend the committee investigating this pension

should have known the facts and presented them to the House. The Pension Bureau rejected her, and this House should not put on the pension roll such characters. I do not believe that a woman who has dishonored the name of her soldier husband, as this applicant has done, should be pensioned and have more pension than those who saw service as war widows. The country will not stand for women of this class receiving more pension by special acts than pure wives of soldiers receive.

Forty-eight years have rolled over our heads since the last gun was fired at Appomattox. To-day there are 497,263 survivors of the Civil War on the pension roll. This does not include widows and children of soldiers. There are 860,294 pensioners on the roll of 1912. There were 660,000 soldiers who saw service in the Confederate Army. Think of it, Mr. Chairman, 200,000 more people drawing pensions than enlisted in that army of the South of four years' duration.

I desire to call especial attention to the fact that there are now on the pension roll 321,932 children of soldiers and widows of soldiers. Where and when will this thing end, if the children of soldiers must now be cared for? Pensions of all wars in the year 1866, two years after the Civil War, amounted to \$15,857,714.88; in the year 1886, 20 years later, \$67,336,159.51; in the year 1913, about \$185,000,000. During last Congress this House passed 9,000 special bills increasing amounts of individual pensions and placing on pension list ineligible. By this special pension method pensions were increased for favored ones to \$30, \$50, \$75, and \$100 per month. The present Congress has not passed one-half so many, although the three previous terms had increased them by thousands. By a hard contest the original Sherwood bill which was slated to pass this Congress was defeated. It gave \$30 per month without regard to age or length of service. That bill would have increased the pension roll some \$75,000,000. It has been estimated that in the year 1911 there were paid in pensions \$159,000,000 or \$1.73 per capita. At this per capita Georgia paid in the year 1911, \$4,513,779.33. Georgia received in return pension money only \$543,353.41, thereby paying an excess of \$3,970,426.92. Compare Georgia's burden to Ohio's pension harvest for the year 1911. Ohio paid \$8,247,110.33 and received from the fund \$15,638,286.83; therefore you can see that Ohio receives for her citizens \$7,391,167.50 more than she paid into the pension fund.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MURRAY). The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] has expired.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? There is no objection.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The Committee on Pensions has finally decided to cut down the number of special pensions, and I insert part of the resolution under leave to print. I also insert the general pension act. The special pensions passed by the thousands every term are increases over and above the general law, including deserters, bounty jumpers, and negroes who are not entitled to pension under the general law.

Resolution of committee.

Resolved, That it is the sense of this committee that hereafter, on account of the liberal provisions of the Sherwood bill passed by this Congress, we should only report favorably private bills for increases for those who are beneficiaries under the said law, or any other general law, where the evidence shows that the applicant needs the assistance of an attendant, and only in cases where it is shown that the applicant has little or no income.

ACT OF 1912.

This act grants pensions according to the length of service to persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and were honorably discharged, who have reached certain ages, at rates as indicated in the following table:

Length of service.

Age.	90 days.	6 months.	1 year.	1½ years.	2 years.	2½ years.	3 years.
62.....	\$13.00	\$13.50	\$14.00	\$14.50	\$15.00	\$15.50	\$16.00
66.....	15.00	15.50	16.00	16.50	17.00	18.00	19.00
70.....	18.00	19.00	20.00	21.50	23.00	24.00	25.00
75.....	21.00	22.50	24.00	27.00	30.00	30.00	30.00

It also grants pensions at the maximum rate, \$30 per month, without regard to age or length of service, to persons who served in the military or naval service during the Civil War and received honorable discharges, and who were wounded in battle or in line of duty and are now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line duty resulting in their disabilities are now unable to perform manual labor.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the presence of an error in the bill and ask that the following amendment be inserted in the description of the soldier's service.

The CHAIRMAN. At what place does the gentleman suggest that?

Mr. TAGGART. On line 19, page 67. The service as described in the original bill is in the First Battery Kansas Light Artillery. That is as it was described in the original bill introduced, which is correct. In this bill it reads "Third Battery Kansas Light Artillery."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TAGGART] moves to amend, at line 19, page 67, by striking out the word "Third" and substituting the word "First." The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 19, page 67, by striking out the word "Third" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "First."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee I move that, in line 15, page 69, in the name of Julia A. Kendall the initial "A" be stricken out and the initial "J" inserted.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 69, line 15, by striking out the initial "A" and inserting in lieu thereof the initial "J."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill, with amendments, be reported favorably and laid aside for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BURKE] moves that the bill, with the amendments, be laid aside with a favorable recommendation. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

JOHN R. FUGILL.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill H. R. 3967, Private Calendar No. 314.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3967) granting an increase of pension to John R. Fugill. *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 R. Fugill, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Mounted Volunteer Riflemen, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be read a second time for amendment.

The bill was read the second time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] moves that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

MARY MACARTHUR.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill H. R. 27806, Private Calendar No. 315, granting a pension to Mary MacArthur.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the bill will be read for amendment.

There was no objection.

The bill was read for amendment, 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 Mary MacArthur, widow of Arthur MacArthur, late lieutenant general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$2,500 per year.

The following committee amendments were read and agreed to:

Amend, line 8, by striking out the figures "\$2,500" and inserting the figures "\$100."

Amend, line 8, by striking out the word "year" and inserting the word "month."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I will state that this bill was introduced and referred to our committee, asking for \$2,500 a year. The committee reduced the amount to \$100 per month,

or \$1,200 a year. This was done in accordance with the action of the committee in similar cases heretofore.

The House passed a bill granting \$100 a month to Gen. Bragg's widow, and Gen. MacArthur was equally as distinguished a soldier. If there is any objection to this bill, I will ask its author, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], to further explain its provisions. If there is no objection, I move that it be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

Mr. ANTHONY. Why is it that you give the widow of a lieutenant general \$100 per month and decline to give the widow of a major general more than \$30 a month?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know that that is so. I do not think it has ever been done by our committee. To what case does the gentleman refer?

Mr. ANTHONY. To the case of the widow of Gen. Wint. That bill, however, was not before your committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill provides that the widow of Gen. MacArthur shall receive \$100 per month. The committee has, as a general rule, recommended that amount to widows of those who were generals during the Civil War, but not to such as were made generals since the war.

I move, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered. There was no objection.

#### INJURIES TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, I call up the bill (H. R. 23451) to pay certain employees of the Government for injuries received while in the discharge of their duties, and other claims for damages to and loss of private property. This is a House bill with Senate amendments. I ask that the Senate amendments be reported. The bill has already passed the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks that the Senate amendments be reported. If there be no objection that will be done.

The first Senate amendment was read.

Mr. POU. I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman ask unanimous consent to have all the Senate amendments reported?

Mr. POU. I ask unanimous consent that all the Senate amendments be reported, and that they all be concurred in.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection they will all be reported.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. POU. I move that all the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. POU. I move that the bill be laid aside with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. POU. I move that the committee do now rise and report these sundry bills to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills do pass, and that the Senate amendments to the bill H. R. 23451 be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, reported that that committee had had under consideration sundry bills on the Private Calendar, and had instructed him to report the same with various amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bills do pass; also that the Committee of the Whole had had under consideration the bill H. R. 23451 with Senate amendments, and had instructed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

#### BILLS PASSED.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill.

The first business was the bill (H. R. 27874) 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 of such soldiers and sailors, reported from the Committee of the Whole with sundry amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not necessary to read the amendments.

Mr. MANN. It is not customary to read the amendments unless somebody demands a separate vote on some amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is true. 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, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

The next business was the bill (S. 2666) granting an increase of pension to William P. Clark.

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

The next business was the bill (S. 8035) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The next business was the bill (H. R. 28379) 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 of such soldiers and sailors.

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

The next business was the bill (S. 7160) 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, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The next business was the bill (S. 8034) 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, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The next business was the bill (H. R. 28282) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The next business was the bill (H. R. 3967) granting an increase of pension to John R. Fugill.

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

The next business was the bill (H. R. 27806) granting a pension to Mary McArthur, reported from the Committee of the Whole with an amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, before making a request for the reading of the engrossed bill, I ask if I can make an inquiry of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] touching the action of the committee on these matters?

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent, the gentleman can propound the inquiry. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. The question I want to ask the gentleman at this juncture, purely for the information of the House, is as to what action the Committee on Invalid Pensions has taken indicative of the future policy of the committee in regard to these special pension bills?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the committee has ever since the Sherwood bill passed—realizing that it is a liberal bill—have felt that we should not amend that bill by the passing of special bills, except in cases where the applicant is shown to be so afflicted as to need an attendant, or in cases where the applicant is helpless, poor, and needy. At the last meeting of the committee we passed a resolution to that effect. With the permission of the House, I will ask to have that resolution read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this committee that hereafter, on account of the liberal provisions of the Sherwood bill passed by this Congress, we should only report favorably private bills for increases for those who are beneficiaries under the said law, or any other general law, where the evidence shows that the applicant needs the assistance of an attendant, and only in cases where it is shown that the applicant has little or no income.

We further believe that hereafter where any bill is reported for any applicant shown to have any income, the amount of pension recommended should be reduced below what would otherwise be reasonable by the amount of such income.

*And further resolved*, That where an applicant has heretofore obtained a pension by special bill, a second special bill should not be passed, unless it is clearly shown by the evidence that he has grown much worse in physical condition than when the former bill was enacted.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 23451) to pay certain employees of the Government for injuries received while in the discharge of their duty, and other claims for damages for the loss of private property, with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

#### INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

Mr. FITZGERALD, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported Senate joint resolution 145 to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1913, which was read, and with accompanying report (No. 1383) was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

#### Senate joint resolution 145.

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1913.

*Resolved, etc.*, That \$23,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and from the revenues of the District of Columbia in equal parts, is hereby appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to maintain public order and protect life and property in said District from the 28th of February to the 10th of March, 1913, both inclusive. Said commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property and fixing fares by public conveyance, and to make special regulations respecting the standing, movements, and operating of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period and fixing fares to be charged for the use of the same. Such regulations shall be in force one week prior to said inauguration, during said inauguration, and one week subsequent thereto, and shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia; and in such other manner as the commissioners may deem best to acquaint the public with the same; and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any of such regulations shall be enforced until five days after such publication. Any person violating any of such regulations shall be liable for each such offense to a fine not to exceed \$100 in the police court of said District, and in default of payment thereof to imprisonment in the workhouse of said District for not longer than 60 days. And the sum of \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby likewise appropriated, to be expended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, for the construction, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public-comfort stations and information booths during the period aforesaid.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that it is my purpose to ask the House to consider this resolution some time to-morrow.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOWARD, for one week, on account of illness.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 28180).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill, with Mr. MOON of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] if he is prepared to take up the amendments pending, or whether he would prefer to have them go over for a time. I am prepared to offer them now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we may as well go ahead with the reading of the bill for a while.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.: Continuing improvement in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 443, Sixty-second Congress, second session, \$40,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if the \$40,000 carried in this item is all that has been recommended by the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers for this project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the entire amount recommended by the chief and by the board.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have in my hand the document to which the paragraph refers, numbered 443, of the second session of the Sixty-second Congress. Of course the gentleman from Florida is familiar with that document, and he will remember that that contained a resurvey of all these three rivers by Maj. Kingman and others engaged in the work and familiar with it, in which a recommendation was made to inaugurate a different project from that which has been carried on for some years. The gentleman remembers that document and the report of Maj. Kingman, does he not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the recommendation of Maj. Kingman was not approved by the Board of Engineers, and after it was reviewed by the board of review at the instance of those who were interested in the proposed change in the project, it was adversely acted upon by them and reported to the Chief of Engineers and not approved. That is true. That happened in October, 1912. Does the gentleman consider that the \$40,000 is all that is necessary to maintain the three rivers in accordance with the project that has been carried for the past several years?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That would depend on how rapidly we may desire to go ahead with the work. Of course, if we propose to move more rapidly than we have been moving for some years past, it would require more money. The trouble with our committee, so far as the appropriation is concerned, is that the engineers have only recommended that amount of expenditure each year.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman means the Board of Engineers and not the local engineers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; the board in its recent report went over the whole situation, coming practically to the same conclusion as in the original report, namely, that the work be prosecuted with a view to obtaining eventually 4 feet of water instead of 3. It had stated the same thing before, but seemed to be a little more definite in the last report.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the report of Maj. Kingman?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the report of the board.

Mr. BARTLETT. If that is the report of the board, then this recommendation of the Chief of Engineers or the board does not carry out the suggestion made along that line by Maj. Kingman, for which this committee appropriated \$40,000 to carry out the suggestions of the report as contained in these papers which I hold in my hand.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was a project recommended upon a survey ordered by Congress itself.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; in 1909.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the parties interested, Members of Congress from that State, thinking the report did not go far enough and that it might be reexamined with profit, came to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and asked for a committee resolution requesting the reexamination of the report, which was granted, and a reexamination made with about the same result except, as I said, the recommendation is a little stronger perhaps in favor of the 4-foot project than the other was.

Mr. BARTLETT. The \$40,000 would not aid in obtaining the 4-foot project.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The engineers seem to think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In this report of the Board of Engineers containing their recommendations, the board says—the gentleman will find it on page 3 of the report, the latter part, second paragraph: "The annual expenditure of \$40,000 proposed by the board"—

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not the same report as that from which the gentleman is reading.

Mr. SPARKMAN (reading)—

As being justified is sufficient to keep these rivers clear of snags and the worse obstructions and perhaps to increase the depth some-

what over the most obstructive shoals. This will provide for light-draft navigation at a cost fairly commensurate with the commerce involved; and such navigation is all that practically could be obtained except at prohibitive expense. The board therefore adheres to its former recommendation that such an annual appropriation be made for these streams, to be expended in securing and maintaining such depth as is practicable within the proposed limit of 4 feet.

By the use of the words "within the proposed limit of 4 feet" they perhaps make the language a little bit stronger than it was before.

Mr. BARTLETT. But the present project for which money has been spent has not been for 4 feet but for 3 feet.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They go on in the report the gentleman has in his hand, the report adopted in the bill of 1912, and suggest that an expenditure of \$40,000 per year be made for the maintenance of this depth of 3 feet with the ultimate purpose of obtaining a greater depth.

Mr. BARTLETT. Now I want to say to the gentleman and the committee that the action of the Board of Engineers upon this last hearing we had in October has not been accessible to me, and I have not been able to procure it in order to present what they say in reference to it. It had not been printed on Tuesday last, when I called at the office of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I have it here, what might be called the original print of it. We have not formally printed it yet. Would the gentleman like to have it?

Mr. BARTLETT. If it is not too long to put in the RECORD—some of it at least—I would desire to have that done. I have not been able to see it for the reason it had not been printed on last Tuesday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, the gentleman will find it practically the same recommendation that was made by the board and chief engineer on the project which we adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to state I applied for it several times, and last Tuesday I went to the Chief Engineer's office and read it in manuscript, but it had not then been sent to the printer and had not been printed where it was accessible so as to be used. Would the gentleman be willing to have this put in the RECORD, or certain portions of it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is quite lengthy.

Mr. BARTLETT. I simply want to put in the RECORD the first three pages.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman include that in his remarks?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the report of the Chief of Engineers transmitting a report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on the Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga., being Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 10, be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to print the matter mentioned in the RECORD as part of his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, United States. Document No. 10, Sixty-second Congress, third session.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, December 23, 1912.

Hon. S. M. SPARKMAN,  
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,  
United States House of Representatives.

SIR: (1) Acknowledging receipt of letter dated July 19, 1912, from the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, transmitting resolution of the committee, dated July 10, 1912, relative to a reconsideration of the reports on examination and survey of Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga., printed in House Document No. 443, Sixty-second Congress, second session, there are transmitted herewith copies of reports dated October 11, 1912, by Col. Dan C. Kingman, Corps of Engineers, and December 16, 1912, by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in response thereto.

(2) I concur in the opinion expressed by the board that a change in the previous recommendation is not warranted or advisable at the present time.

Very respectfully,  
W. H. BIXBY,  
Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS,  
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1912.

From: The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.  
To: The Chief of Engineers, United States Army.  
Subject: Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.

1. The board has the honor to submit its report in response to the following resolution:

"Resolved by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors created under section 3 of the river and harbor act approved June 13,

1902, be requested to reconsider report on preliminary examination and survey of Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga., printed in House Document No. 443, Sixty-second Congress, second session."

2. To assist in determining present conditions and any changes, physical or commercial, that have taken place since the date of the report referred to in the resolution the board requested and received a report covering these matters from the district officer, which is forwarded herewith. In addition to information thus secured, a hearing was given in the office of the board October 21, 1912, which was attended by Hon. W. G. BRANTLEY, M. C., Hon. D. M. HUGHES, M. C., the district officer, and a delegation of citizens from the principal towns on the rivers. Much interest in the subject was displayed, and a recommendation was urged for a definite project of larger scope than the existing one.

3. The present project was authorized by the river and harbor act of July 25, 1912, which adopted the plan of improvement recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the House document under consideration. This project, as stated in the annual report for 1912, provides for maintenance of 3-foot depth during ordinary summer low water up to Milledgeville and Macon, and to the gradual increase of channel depths, so far as practicable, without sacrificing the maintenance work. There seems to be some misapprehension as to the method of improvement that may be followed in securing the increased depths referred to. This has been interpreted by some to require a progressive deepening at each shoal in order to secure first a slight increase of depth throughout the entire length under improvement and then successive enlargements of the depths so obtained, thus involving frequent operations and largely increased cost for providing the ultimate depth at any locality. The board understands, however, that the project imposes no such limitation, but is intended to permit the radical treatment of any shoal in one operation so as to obtain such increased depth within the 4-foot limit as may be considered practicable and most advantageous whenever funds are available in excess of what is necessary for purposes of maintenance.

4. The district officer states that a depth of 3 feet is not sufficient to enable commerce to be carried 300 or 400 miles; that a boat can not carry enough freight to pay expenses; that the work done thus far has rather tended to permit light-draft boats to act as feeders to the railroads and has not yet led to the development of a through service.

5. In years past traffic was carried on many shallow streams for long distances because there were no other means of transportation. Since the advent of railroads the tendency has been to do what the district officer cites in this case—use light-draft navigation for short distances to connect with railroads and not compete with them on long hauls. The same argument would apply with a 4-foot depth as with a 3-foot depth, only to a less degree. When a depth of 4 feet is available, the demand is for 5 or 6 feet, usually the latter, it being claimed that the increase is necessary to bring about the desired results. What is now urged has been tried elsewhere with disappointing results. No instance is known where a stream having the characteristics of these rivers has been improved by open-channel methods such as are now proposed by the district officer so as to provide a continuous 4-foot navigation, and it is not believed that such a depth would be secured with the estimated expenditure. Moreover, experience elsewhere indicates that these streams should not be expected to develop a large and important commerce on a depth of 4 feet, even if such depth were feasible within reasonable limits of cost.

6. The board fully appreciates the great resources of the section of country through which these streams flow, as was ably brought out at the hearing, and it realizes that a commodious and continuously navigable waterway would be of great value to the community.

7. It is faced, however, with certain physical data relative to slope, discharge, and character of bottom and banks that must be given consideration, and when this is done it leads to the conclusion that it is not advisable to undertake to develop within specified lines a project depth of 4 feet on these streams, as it believes the cost, even if such project were feasible, would be out of reasonable proportion to the amount of commerce that would be benefited. The annual expenditure of \$40,000 proposed by the board as being justified is sufficient to keep these rivers clear of snags and the worst obstructions and perhaps to increase the depth somewhat over the most obstructive shoals. This will provide for light-draft navigation at a cost fairly commensurate with the commerce involved, and such navigation is practically all that could be obtained except at prohibitive expense. The board therefore adheres to its former recommendation that such an annual appropriation be made for these streams, to be expended in securing and maintaining such depth as is practicable within the proposed limit of 4 feet.

For the board:

WM. T. ROSSELL,  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,  
Senior Member of the Board.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is one more question I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, if he will indulge me for a moment. That is, from the funds on hand from the unexpended balance of the last appropriation and the appropriation made in this bill of \$40,000 there will be then for the purposes of this maintenance—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. There will be on hand, according to the report of the Chief of Engineers, for the maintenance of this project, \$62,000. Am I correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not recall the figures, but there is a balance on hand—

Mr. BARTLETT. It was \$22,377.33; and so with the present appropriation—

Mr. SPARKMAN. According to the last report there will be \$102,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. That would be ample for all the present needs?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should think so; certainly,

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Coosa River, Georgia and Alabama: Completing construction of lock and dam at Mayos Bar, near Rome, Ga., \$30,000; continuing improvement and for maintenance between Rome, Ga., and Dam No. 4, Alabama, \$25,000; and completing construction of lock in Dam No. 4 and the construction of Dam No. 5, in the State of Alabama, \$81,000; in all, \$136,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] tell us whether this dam construction is for purposes of navigation or is it for purposes of water power?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a navigation proposition.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. It has nothing to do with water power; but this improvement was made for a dam, and the report was made by the engineer before the question of water power was taken up.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving St. Lucie Inlet, Fla., in accordance with the smaller project recommended by the Chief of Engineers in the report submitted in House Document No. 675, Sixty-second Congress, second session, \$100,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice there are about 25 items coming up from the State of Florida for rivers or streams which, I presume, are needing improvement. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if any of these streams are intended for purposes of drainage or to connect with the drainage system of the Everglades?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The State of Florida is taking care of the expense of the drainage system?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course, Florida is a waterways State and has a great many rivers, and I am very glad the committee has taken care of those rivers, and particularly of the inlet which we are considering at this time, but the improvement of none of these rivers contemplates any connection with the existing Florida State drainage canal system?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving St. Johns River, Fla.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance from Jacksonville to the ocean, \$550,000; completing improvement and for maintenance from Jacksonville to Palatka, \$19,600; completing improvement from Palatka to Lake Harney, \$42,200; in all, \$611,800.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Of what depth is this project—26 feet?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The one from Jacksonville to the ocean?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Thirty feet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is the commerce of Jacksonville increasing constantly?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is increasing quite rapidly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not true an inland waterway is complete now from Jacksonville via St. Augustine and all the way down to Key West, a distance of 500 miles?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Practically so; yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A small boat can traverse the entire distance inland without being in danger of storms outside?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Practically so, as I understand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is only one railroad traversing the east coast of Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Only one.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And all the commerce, from Tampa to Key West, is bound to go over that road?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; so far as railroad transportation is concerned. Tampa is, however, on the west side of Florida, while this railroad is on the east side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And there is no railway competition from Jacksonville south on the east coast of Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is none south; no.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is a continuous inland waterway that has been recently opened up between St. Augustine and Jacksonville, thus connecting with Key West, which, if improved, might furnish a means of transporting commerce?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is an improved waterway belonging to private parties for a part of the distance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. With capital put in there from the outside, some of it being foreign capital?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say further that there is a survey pending, I believe, for the entire distance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman tell me whether the city of Jacksonville extends on both sides of the St. Johns River?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The city, I believe, is entirely on one side. There is a small town on the south or east side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Ferryboats run across, do they?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Ferryboats run across from one city to the other, do they not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the two sides of the city of Jacksonville represent but one authority?—There is but one municipality?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I could not say as to that. Perhaps the gentleman is correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, the St. Johns River does bisect the city of Jacksonville?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I would not say that. It may be that the municipality of Jacksonville extends its jurisdiction to the other side, but I could not say positively, as I am not familiar with the limits of the city.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the mayor have jurisdiction on the other side?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the city limits extend there, I fancy the jurisdiction of the mayor would extend there also; but I am not sure that the city limits extend to the south side.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman understands what I am after.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala.: Completing improvement from Mobile to Sanders Shoals on the Mulberry Fork and to Nichols Shoals on the Locust Fork of Black Warrior River by the construction of locks and dams, including the 63-foot dam at Lock No. 17, authorized by act of Congress approved August 22, 1911, \$1,338,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether this 63-foot dam is to be constructed for water-power purposes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. TAYLOR] may answer that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, that improvement that is under discussion now is the one that we thrashed out so thoroughly and in which we took such a prominent and active and useful part in 1911, when we adopted the project for the 63-foot channel. It does not now contemplate water power because it was thrown out in that act. It covers only navigation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The committee brings it in purely as a matter of navigation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama. Yes; purely as a matter of navigation, except this, that under the act the engineers were required so to erect the dam that power would in time be furnished for future disposal if the Government saw proper to develop it in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving harbor at Pascagoula, Miss.: For maintenance of improvement of channel at the mouths of Pascagoula and Dog Rivers, and for continuing improvements and extending said channel through Mississippi Sound and Horn Island Pass to the Gulf of Mexico in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 682, Sixty-second Congress, second session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$110,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of comment has been indulged in in this House from time to time about Raccoon Creek, and representatives of that section have been called upon to explain the commerce there, which they can very readily do. I would like to know something about the commerce on Dog River. Here is an appropriation of \$110,000 to improve the harbor at Pascagoula, Miss., and also to fix up the mouth of the Dog River. If this is a matter of commerce and navigation, of course I have no objection to it. But I should like to know just what warrant there is for making an appropriation of \$110,000 for this purpose at this time. Is it urgent, as we are told in the report, all of these paragraphs are?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, Dog River is really a part of the harbor at Pascagoula. It simply marks the northern limits of it. But I yield to my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who represents the Pascagoula section.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I was inquiring what there is of commerce on the Dog River, present or prospective.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Well, the commerce on the Dog River, or that part of it that together with Pascagoula River form the harbor at Pascagoula, last year was six and one-half million dollars. The commerce on the Leaf and Chick-

asaway Rivers, which run into and form the Pascagoula River, was about \$1,000,000 last year. On the Dog River proper, excepting that part embodied in this project, there is no commerce except in logs, but they approximate it at about a million dollars. This proposition here is a new project which the gentleman may be attacking—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not attacking it. I am asking questions for information.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I am very glad to hear that. Have I given the gentleman the information he desires?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wanted to know about it because the appropriation is fixed at \$110,000, and it is reported as being urgent. Raccoon Creek, which is the subject of critical comment, gets in this bill \$18,000. The tonnage on Raccoon Creek was in excess of 58,000 last year. I wanted to know what the commerce of the Dog River was.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What would happen if Raccoon Creek and Dog River came into close proximity? [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am afraid Dog River would get the bulk of the appropriation. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I want to say to the gentleman, if he will permit, that this is an urgent project. It was recommended by the Army Board of Engineers some time ago. It is to increase the depth of Pascagoula Harbor, which includes part of the Dog River, from 17 feet, its present depth, to a depth of 22 feet. The original estimate of the Army Board of Engineers for a 17-foot depth at Pascagoula Harbor was for approximately the amount that the 22-foot depth is going to cost.

In this connection I might say that the Army Board of Engineers and this Rivers and Harbors Committee have placed a condition upon this project that the people of this locality shall not only furnish public wharves at Moss Point and at Pascagoula that will cost approximately \$50,000, but they are to put up \$100,000 in addition thereto, notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost of the project is only \$383,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Mississippi permit me to say that it is a great tribute to his ability as a Member of Congress and as a Representative of this district that he can take out of this bill \$110,000 for Dog River when we can get only \$13,000 for Raccoon Creek. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this \$110,000 is not for Dog River, as I have stated. It is for the harbor at Pascagoula, that goes up Dog River only a part of the way. It is for the improvement of that great harbor that we hope in the course of time to rival the magnificent harbor in the gentleman's city of Philadelphia.

Mr. DAVIDSON. This is for only a part of the Dog. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Removing the water hyacinth, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas: For the removal of the water hyacinth from the navigable waters in the States of Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, so far as it is or may become an obstruction to navigation, \$15,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Will the gentleman make it?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will make it. I was perfectly willing to reserve it in order to have the item explained. If the chairman of the committee does not care to explain the item, I will make the point of order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to make the point of order, I hope he will make it now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I hope the gentleman will reserve it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall be very glad to reserve it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I reserve the point, in order that the gentleman may explain the item.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is an item that has been carried in this bill for several years—I do not remember just how long. Some years ago it was ascertained that the water hyacinth in many of the navigable rivers of Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas had become a serious obstruction to navigation in those streams, and in one of the river and harbor bills—perhaps in that of 1902—Congress began the appropriations for the removal of this obstruction, and we have continued to carry them in the bills from that time until now. I think every bill since then has had an item for that purpose in it. I will say,

further, for the benefit of the gentleman, that while great headway has been made in relieving the rivers from this pest, there is a great deal yet to be done. In fact, I do not know that we will ever see the time when the water hyacinth will disappear entirely from these southern streams. Perhaps some more effective method of destruction will be found, but at present I can see no end to the necessity for these appropriations.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I contend that there is no law warranting this appropriation. The gentleman states that it has grown up as a matter of custom, and has been carried in this bill for years. It can not be regarded as the continuation of a work in the course of construction, on which many rulings have been made in this House. I cite for the benefit of the Chair that paragraph of the Manual to be found in section 820. It has been held frequently by chairmen since then that by public works or objects already in progress, under the Holman rule, are meant tangible matters like buildings, roads, and so forth, and not the duties of officials in executive departments, or the continuance of a work indefinite as to completion and intangible in nature, like the gauging of streams.

I think the Chair is familiar with a variety of rulings that have confirmed this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman say as to the proposition that the general law authorizes appropriations to remove obstructions to navigation?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is opposed to this on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. On that ground and on the other ground that it is not a continuation of a public work.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the rivers and harbors bill is not considered to be a general appropriation bill, and that legislation, as a matter of fact, is in order upon it. Of course, the Chair is familiar with that fact. The engineers have certified that vegetation is an obstruction to navigation, and in providing for it we are providing for the removal of obstructions to navigation, which is clearly within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. I call the attention of the Chair to this decision, that "the river and harbor bill is not one of the general appropriation bills and is not subject to their restrictions as to legislation."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not well taken, and the Chair overrules it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Bayou Teche, La.: Completing improvement and for maintenance, \$40,000.

Mr. RANSDALL of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, to be introduced as an additional paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following: "Improving Bayou Terrebonne, La.: The proviso in the river and harbor act approved July 25, 1912, for improving Bayou Terrebonne, La., be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows: 'Provided, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for acquiring any land required for the purpose of this improvement.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Brazos River, Tex.: Continuing improvement from Old Washington to Waco by the construction of locks and dams heretofore authorized and commencing the construction of two additional locks and dams, \$250,000; continuing improvement and for maintenance by open-channel work from Velasco to Old Washington, \$25,000; in all, \$275,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the sum appropriated for the improvement of the Brazos River is expected to be used within the next year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that is the expectation. In fact, I think that if the engineers were asked about it they would say that they could expend more money this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Have not they got more money there now than they can take care of in the building of the dam?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. Last June there were \$237,000 on hand, but I fancy some of that has been expended since then.

Mr. BURGESS. I will say to the gentleman that this is the estimate made by the Board of Engineers of the amount that is necessary and required before the ensuing year has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the \$25,000 for maintenance by open-channel work?

Mr. BURGESS. That is the open-channel work carried in all river and harbor bills, removal of snags, and so forth.

Mr. FOSTER. Improving the mouth of the Brazos River?

Mr. BURGESS. That is the maintenance of the harbor.  
Mr. FOSTER. How much commerce is there there now?  
Mr. BURGESS. There is not much now.  
Mr. FOSTER. Is there likely to be much when they get through?

Mr. BURGESS. I think so, undoubtedly.  
Mr. FOSTER. How much commerce passes over it in a year?

Mr. BURGESS. Very little passes over it, for the want of the completion of the locks and dams.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is in such shape that commerce can not now pass over it.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman think it ever will?  
Mr. EDWARDS. Oh, yes; there are great opportunities there.

Mr. BURGESS. Undoubtedly.  
Mr. FOSTER. Is this a better proposition than Trinity River in Texas in reference to navigation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Probably the gentleman from Texas would not like to answer that question.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will withdraw the question. But I would say that if it was not better than Trinity River it would not amount to much and would be money thrown away.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the two rivers are on a par as to importance.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I would not think much of any of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I differ with the gentleman about that. I know there has been some criticism as to these rivers and the scheme of improvement; especially is it true with regard to Trinity River. I have never concurred in those criticisms. I have studied the situation and have been somewhat impressed with the possibilities of developing a large commerce on each stream.

I should be very much deceived if the future does not bear out that opinion of mine. Both of those rivers flow through a very fertile section of country. They extend up into the interior quite a distance. I can not see myself why, when the lock and dam system is completed—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get the opinion of the gentleman from Florida whether the Brazos River, in Texas, has about the same commercial importance as the Trinity River, in Texas. I think he stated a moment ago that that was his opinion. I want to get it now, so that it will be understood that that is the case.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is that the question?  
Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon an answer?  
Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that they are of about the same commercial importance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think so. That is my judgment.  
Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe there is anyone in the House who would seriously contend that all of the money that we have expended on the Trinity River has been of any very great practical benefit to commerce, and if that is also true of the Brazos River, then what we are expending on these two rivers is so much money thrown away.

Mr. EDWARDS. But does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that the Trinity, like the Brazos, has not yet been completed; that the improvements have not gone far enough to develop whether a commerce can be developed there?  
Mr. FOSTER. I would state that the Trinity River has been under improvement for a great many years. I think it was stated at one time that we are in the process of drilling wells down there to pump water so as to make the Trinity River navigable. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I am trying to get some information about those rivers down there for which Congress is asked to appropriate money each year. If one is not of very much more importance than the other, then neither is of very great importance.

Mr. SIMS. Does the gentleman think that lack of water in a river is a detriment to its improvement?  
Mr. FOSTER. Of course I do not, but there ought to be some chance for improvement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I think I can say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], having made some investigation of this matter—and I think this will be supported by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS]—there is no commerce of any con-

sequence upon either the Brazos or the Trinity River. Each is about 500 miles long, and the project contemplates that in certain seasons of the year there will be a possible depth of 4 feet of water.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the gentleman if that is at a certain season when they have more rain than at another season that they will have a channel of 4 feet?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. At certain seasons of the year they have more water than at other seasons of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is during the flood season that they have a 4-foot channel?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think there is something in that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that the project depth of the Trinity River is 6 feet.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And of the Brazos 4?  
Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat what I have said on one or two occasions, that I think the Member of Congress who works as assiduously for his district and for the people he represents as do some of the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is entitled to very great praise on the part of those whom he represents, and I know of no man in Congress who has done so much for his people and is so much entitled to their thanks as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS]. In the matter of the Trinity and Brazos Rivers, it does not appear that we are making these improvements, running up into millions of dollars as the projects read, solely for the purposes of navigation. It does appear that we are building locks and dams to create water as we go along. We are creating pools, as it were, and thus establishing the basis for that ultimate commerce and navigation which is expected in the course of time. The projects indicate that up to the present time those who have been employed in making improvements on these streams have been engaged very largely in digging out the logs that obstruct the boats, in cutting the branches of overhanging trees, in removing snags (and that is a very large and important part of the work), and I have no objection to it, because it helps to irrigate the country, and perhaps it is important in the way of sanitation and assists in the reclaiming of the very fertile lands that border these streams. The only point I am making is this, that if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] and the other members of the committee are to receive large appropriations which their constituents demand that they shall get for the purpose of removing snags and cutting down the limbs of trees that hang over the streams that interfere with the bateaux that come and go, then when the question of commerce and navigation is really under consideration they ought to give cheerful thought to the need of commerce where it exists.

Now, I am not going to oppose the paragraph. You will see this is a very large appropriation; in the instance of the Brazos it is \$275,000 for the next year, a sum which will be used not only for the removal of the snags but to pay the storage of some materials that are needed for the construction of locks and dams when the time shall come for the construction of locks and dams. Of course, we have everything on the ground and are prepared to proceed with this work of construction. I am not opposing that, but I am drawing the attention of these influential gentlemen upon this highly influential committee to the fact that there are real live commercial projects in the country that are being held back and that commerce itself is being delayed, and that the railroad companies are continuing their monopoly upon transportation while these gentlemen are spending money in accordance with the wishes of their constituents upon these minor streams.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The Trinity River, for instance, and the Brazos both have as much commerce upon them now as the Panama Canal, have they not?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes; because the Panama Canal is not open.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Exactly, and for the same reason these rivers are not open.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is true.  
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] for the tribute he paid me for looking after the interests of my people, but I think he overdraws the picture. The Brazos and Trinity Rivers were on the books of the Rivers and Harbors Committee when I became a member of the committee 10 years ago and I have been struggling along to bring them somewhere near completion. They are not yet anywhere near completion, and at the

rate we are going it will be 15 years before they are completed. The facts about both of those rivers are these: They both extend north from the Gulf into the heart of as good a country as the United States possesses. Thousands of bales of cotton are raised on both sides of both rivers and so are other products. The railroads traverse that country. But we are in the worst state in Texas of any State in the Union on the question of rates, and the improvement of both of these rivers will do more than anything this Congress can do to relieve that situation. Now the Trinity River before I came to Congress was on the books. There was talk made and it was believed by a great many people that there was not water enough in section 1—that is, the Dallas section—to make a canalization of the river. When I came on the committee I found a serious contention about that matter. Mr. BURTON was in doubt about it. I said, "Well, we are pursuing the policy of improving rivers generally from the mouth up, and I think that is right," but I suggested with reference to the Trinity River that we ought to make an exception of that matter as we have with the improvement of the Ohio. We have spent more on the improvement of the Ohio River 23 miles below Pittsburgh than in all the 800 other miles of that river. Why? Because there is where commerce originates; there is where commerce is to be benefited; and so with the Trinity River, reaching 500 miles through a rich territory to Dallas, a great distributing center of agricultural machinery and everything of that sort. It is the greatest distributing center of agricultural machinery in the world, I will say in passing, but the freight rates are enormous, and to develop that river down to the sea will bring an immense benefit to all this country.

Mr. BURTON finally agreed to begin to improve the Trinity River in section 1. Now we have not quite got section 1 improved, but we have got enough improved to forever shut the mouths of those who talked about "wells for water." There is water enough and to spare to canalize the river. That has been demonstrated by what work has been accomplished; and I tell you now that if we go on in this work it will be one of the best investments that the River and Harbor Committee makes. I am disposed to repel the compliment the gentleman paid me; I am disposed to say I do not believe Texas has got enough money to improve these rivers; I believe other rivers have gotten more than my rivers have. There are other rivers in the country; the Brazos is not the only river, the Trinity is not the only river, but we have to do the best we can and that is what I have tried to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it was rather unkind for the gentleman from Illinois to compare the Brazos with the Trinity.

The Trinity River enjoys the unique distinction as the stream with regard to which the Army engineers reported that it would aid largely in making it navigable if a large number of artesian wells were sunk near the head of the stream. Now, no such report has been made as that of the noble Brazos, though it has been suggested, and there is no doubt but that there is much sound sense in the suggestion, that it would be infinitely cheaper to macadamize the Brazos than to canalize it, which is the term, I believe, used by the gentleman from Texas. He encourages us, however, to believe that we may some day be able to complete the work now contemplated on this stream, innocent as yet of any navigation whatever or of any seeming disposition on the part of the people in the locality to use it. He says, however, that it will require 15 years at the present rate of progress to canalize the Brazos, and, taking the gentleman's own figures, \$4,130,000 must be spent in addition to the one or two million of dollars which we have already placed on this noble stream or sunk in its infrequent pools before we have reached a point where the Brazos might have water enough in the channels between the numerous locks to float a fatboat, provided anyone desired so to do.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. EDWARDS. The gentleman seems to be so thoroughly familiar with this stream—

Mr. MONDELL. Everybody knows about the Brazos.

Mr. EDWARDS (continuing). But I would like to know something of these artesian wells to which he has referred, that have been sunk.

Mr. MONDELL. I was told yesterday the committee always followed the report of the engineers, and I want to ask the gentleman if they have followed the report and recommendation of the engineers in that matter of artesian wells for watering the noble Trinity.

Mr. EDWARDS. We considered that, as we frequently consider the gentleman from Wyoming, as somewhat of a joke on rivers and harbors matters, and did not follow it out.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, if the Army engineers are given to joking in regard to these matters, that explains many of the jokes perpetrated on the American people in appropriations like this, for the purpose of digging out snags, cutting down the overhanging cypress, felling the weeping willow that hangs over the bank, and making an earnest endeavor by the expenditure of large sums of money to bring the water from the numerous pools at intervals along in the streams, trickling across the dry stretches that intervene.

This is a noble work. It is worthy of a great committee. More than all, it is monumental of the energy and of the influence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS], a member of this committee. How unfortunate it will be for the Brazos and for the Trinity should the time ever come that those noble highways of commerce will fail to have a representative upon this committee.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. EDWARDS. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] recognizes that ex-Chairman BURTON, of Ohio, is an excellent authority on waterways, does he not?

Mr. MONDELL. I think so.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the gentleman not know that this item went on the bill when Mr. BURTON was chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, and has been voted under Republican administrations since then?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think it went on while Mr. BURTON was chairman, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] has just informed us they began to do business on the Brazos away yonder before BURTON came here. But I do know that even so great a man—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What is before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming has just received an extension of five minutes. The question before the House is the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming, to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield to one question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He does not think the business of the Brazos and Trinity originated with Mr. BURTON without the assistance of the present Representative?

Mr. MONDELL. No one would suggest that, because that would take all the credit from the gentleman who represents the district. Mr. BURTON is an honorable man and a conscientious gentleman, but, like all that have had to do with rivers and harbors appropriations, he has felt the compelling force of the aggregations of influences in and out of Congress under which a river and harbor bill is finally put together.

Mr. BURGESS. What I said was, that the present improvement of the Trinity River was under Mr. BURTON's administration when he was chairman of the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, the present improvement, the gentleman tells us—

Mr. BURGESS. And he agreed to it—

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). Went on while Mr. BURTON was there, and Mr. BURTON often confessed, and for the good of his soul, on the floor of this House that he did not approve all the items in the bill.

Mr. BURGESS. I never heard him confess that.

Mr. MONDELL. The Brazos and the Trinity are perhaps the most illuminating examples of how gentlemen, members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, may find a necessity, a compelling demand, for the expenditure of public money in the pulling of stumps, in the cutting down of overhanging trees, in the removal of dry and sun-baked sandbars, which occur along what are, in times of flood, the channels of so-called streams. Of course no one expects that up to the crack of doom there will ever be business enough to go down the Trinity and the Brazos to in any way repay any portion of the moneys which have been expended on them.

But while that is true, and while that is known to be true by all who have ever investigated the matter, I am again reminded that no such trivial and inconsequential things as facts can in any way influence any item in this carefully prepared, properly proportioned, and perfectly buttressed piece of legislation. [Laughter.]

Mr. EDWARDS. Facts apply only to irrigation and pasturage propositions in Wyoming. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. No one ever suggests the impropriety of spending millions of the people's money for the purpose of keeping some gentleman's constituents employed and happy but that some one rises up and suggests that we ought not to use money secured not by taxation but by sale of lands for the purpose of building works the cost of which is returned by the people who are ultimately to purchase and own them; and if the gentlemen can not see the difference between the two propositions, I am sorry for them. [Cries of "Read!" "Read!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. There was no objection.

[Mr. BEALL of Texas addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL] prefaced his remarks with the statement that it was very apparent that the gentleman from Wyoming could not be expected to support appropriations for rivers and harbors.

Of course, the gentleman from Texas I do not expect will keep track of my legislative activities or keep himself informed in regard to matters I have supported. I have served here nearly eight terms. During that time I have voted for every river and harbor bill save one that has passed either on a roll call or by viva voce vote, if I was here. I have often done so, however, with much mental reservation. I have done so because I believe in legitimate river and harbor work, and not because I was enamored of every item in the bills. I shall vote for this bill, but with regret as to many items.

During the time I have been a member of this House we have appropriated \$452,334,782.11 for river and harbor improvement. The good State of Texas has participated in these appropriations to the extent of \$24,302,529.60. One harbor alone in that imperial Commonwealth has had from the Treasury, of the money collected from the people, over \$10,000,000. I have voted for all the bills carrying these appropriations; yet the gentleman from Texas suggests that the gentleman from Wyoming can be depended upon to oppose river and harbor appropriations.

Because I do believe in river and harbor appropriations, because I am in favor of liberal river and harbor appropriations, because those people whom I have the honor to represent favor river and harbor appropriations, I shall expect to support river and harbor bills in the future as in the past; and yet every man who has served in this House who took the trouble to inquire knows that many appropriations for rivers and harbors in the past have had no justification whatever from any standpoint; that millions of dollars of the public money have been wasted; that many improvements have been undertaken where there was neither present nor prospective commerce. There has been an improvement in this regard in the past few years. It is not so long ago that the river and harbor bill smelled so strong, its stench so rose to heaven, that for a time there was a question as to whether the people of the country generally would not be inclined to disregard the demands that were made for appropriations of this character, except for the great seaports of the Nation. Then came something of a reform. Gentlemen all know when it came and how it came. A man was placed at the head of the committee who had knowledge and courage, and, so far as it was possible for him to do it, aided by his colleagues, he brought about a better condition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, we must make some headway. I dislike very much to object to these extensions.

Mr. MONDELL. I trust I may have as much time as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL] had.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like very much to accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman that I can get the time later, but I prefer to have it now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We must get through.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida object?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall not object now, but I give notice at this time that I am going to try to induce the Chairman to hold each gentleman down to the subject matter when he moves to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, better conditions came. Many items that had long been carried by sufferance and toleration were stricken from the bill, and many others that should

have been stricken from the bill were not so stricken. I shall not say that either the Brazos or the Trinity River should have been permanently eliminated. I do not claim that detail of information for which the genial gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL] gives me credit, but one does not have to be well informed upon this subject to know these streams. They have been discussed so much and their extraordinary character is so widely known that one who does not know about them is ignorant indeed.

The Constitution gives the Federal Government control over rivers and harbors, and the people of the United States long since embarked upon the policy of improving our great harbors and our great rivers. I am now and always have been and always expect to be in harmony with that work. I stand ready to vote at any time all the money that may be needed for the purpose of making available to the commerce of our country and the world the great rivers and harbors of the Nation; that is a national work. I go further than that. I do not object to that policy which we have inaugurated, entered upon, and pursued—though the gentlemen who are supporting this bill largely refuse to acknowledge it—of spending the money of the people for purely local purposes, for local transportation, with a view to affording water transportation for small communities; and while I doubt constitutional authority for that, we long since adopted the policy, and far be it from me to say that we shall absolutely discontinue it.

But while we are possibly justified in doing that for the benefit of local communities, I do think that this committee ought to see to it that when such expenditures are made they are so made that there is some hope that at some time there will be sufficient commerce to in some small way repay the enormous expenditure. My opinion is—and it is my opinion only, and it is no better than the opinion of any other gentleman here—that there never will come a time when there will be commerce enough on the Brazos or the Trinity Rivers to warrant the enormous expenditure heretofore made and contemplated for the future. This is a great country. In other localities of the country there are streams the improvement of which would afford local opportunities for transportation. They are largely overlooked because, perchance, we began our improvements on these streams, and, perchance, the gentlemen who happened to represent those particular districts are active, forceful, making a specialty, a profession, if you please, of securing river and harbor improvements.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEALL] talked about the high freight rates, the monopoly under which they are suffering. Mr. Chairman, I have always given the great State of Texas credit for being, of all the Commonwealths of the Union, the one which had more completely than any other solved the problem of reducing its great railway corporations to a condition of proper service of the people at reasonable rates.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. Out in the country in which I live we have some streams which might be dredged to 4 feet. Why, we have streams that have 4 feet of water without any dredging, and we might ask the Federal Government to make them navigable. We are dependent on the railroads. We must protect ourselves against high rates, and yet we do not expect that the Federal Government shall furnish us with transportation from one end of our Commonwealth to the other, and least of all would we base a request or demand for such assistance on the plea that we have not the courage or the ability to control our own railway corporations.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman understands that the shipment of cotton referred to by the gentleman from Texas is on through bills of lading from Texas points either to European points or from Texas points to the East; does the gentleman think that the railway commission of Texas has the right to fix those rates or regulate them?

Mr. MONDELL. We have an Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; but the gentleman criticizes the State of Texas for its failure to regulate these railroads. Does the gentleman believe, under the Constitution, that the State of Texas has the power?

Mr. MONDELL. That is only one small feature of this proposition; in fact, there is little commerce of any kind—

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. But that is one feature of the criticism made by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). Over the swelling bosom of the Brazos.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Is that the only answer the gentleman has to my question?

Mr. MONDELL. What?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The one the gentleman has just made to the question, that the State of Texas was a proper subject of the criticism aimed at it because the railroad commission of Texas failed to regulate interstate rates.

Mr. MONDELL. I have not criticized the State of Texas; I have defended the State of Texas against the gentleman who preceded me. I believe Texas and its people can and will and measurably do protect themselves in all these matters; and it amazes me greatly that the gentleman from Texas was pleading for the expenditure of Federal money to canalize streams that ought to be macadamized [laughter], on the theory that Texas can not protect herself from her railroads—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Cries of "Read"!]

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Trinity River, Tex.: Continuing improvement with a view to obtaining a depth of 6 feet between the mouth and Dallas by the construction of locks and dams heretofore authorized and commencing the construction of two additional locks and dams, \$255,000; continuing improvement and for maintenance by open-channel work, \$15,000; in all, \$270,000.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have always been in favor of improving every portion of the United States. I believe that every Member of this House ought to be broad enough to legislate for the entire country and be broad minded and patriotic enough to be pleased with the development of every portion of this great country. This is the first time during the four years that I have been a Member of this House that I have said a word on the river and harbor bill. But it does seem to me, in view of the colloquy between the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and these gentlemen from Texas, that it is appropriate at this time to call the attention of the gentlemen from Texas to the fact that it does appear to us of the West that their magnanimity and patriotism hardly reaches out as broadly over this country of ours as it should. When we of the West, representing the new States struggling for development, with a representation of only about 5 per cent of the membership on the floor of this House; when we are outrageously hindered and wrongfully retarded in our development by the action of this Government in withdrawing and hermetically sealing up hundreds of millions of acres of public land that ought to be open to settlement, thereby driving hundreds of thousands of our best people to Canada for homes; when Canada is pursuing a sane and common-sense public-land policy and is tremendously prosperous; and when we of the West, who can never get a dollar or any direct benefit from all these hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated out of the Treasury for alleged rivers and harbors, come before this House, as we did this morning, and ask that we be allowed merely to use, not one dollar out of the Government Treasury, but to use some of our own money toward improving the struggling municipalities established by the Government upon several of the reclamation projects, to help people get homes out there, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] leads the fight against us, and the other gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], the deputy whip on this side, as I understand, stationed himself and others at the door and warned the Democratic Members as they came in to vote against this measure, it does seem to me that it comes with ill grace when we always loyally support your measures that you should be so exceedingly hostile and almost vicious in your opposition to our efforts to secure an absolutely honest and sorely needed development in the Western States. I feel that when we assist you gentlemen of all the coast States, but especially of the South, as loyally as we do, and when we are asking nothing from Uncle Sam but merely to be allowed temporarily to use a small part of our own money and then return it back into the Treasury after we have used it for this development purpose, it does look to me as though the public spirit of some of the Members of this House does not reach very far into the interior of the country. The patriotic spirit of national development does not seem with some of you gentlemen to reach even as far north as Mason and Dixon's line, and with others it appears never to reach beyond the Missouri River. There is no portion of this grand Republic that is nearer to us of the West than you people of the South, and especially the inhabitants of Texas. We are proud of your splendid empire State. But your actions to-day certainly warrant me in calling your attention in a friendly way to your utter lack of what we believe to be fair treatment to the people we represent on the floor of this House. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Ouachita River, Ark. and La.: Continuing improvement by the construction of Lock and Dam No. 3, \$175,000; for maintenance of improvement by open-channel work up to Camden, \$25,000, and from Camden to Arkadelphia, \$2,500; in all, \$202,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors if there has been any adverse reports on this project?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I could not state just now that there never had been any adverse reports, but certainly not on this particular project, or it it would not be in here.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Arkansas River, Ark.: For maintenance of improvement, including works at Pine Bluff and the operation of dredging plant, \$48,000.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 17, page 29, by adding the words "and Oklahoma," and after the word "Arkansas" and before the colon, so that the paragraph will read, "Improving the Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla."

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope that amendment will not prevail. I am not certain that we authorized any project for that, but if there is a project for the river above there it can be taken care of under this item. I may say I believe there is a project above there. In fact, I was so informed from the office of the Chief of Engineers, as I recall, but there may be some doubt. The point I make is that it is either unnecessary, or else it ought not to be done. If there is a project covering that stretch of the river the amendment is unnecessary, because the engineers will take care of the work. In other words, they will spend a portion of this appropriation for the purpose desired by the gentleman. If there is no project for it, then it ought not to be done until there is one.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I would like to ask the gentleman what harm could result from the words being added, if he has no objections to it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, a great deal of harm can result from it if there is no project for it. We had this matter before the committee, and it was thought best to leave it for the present where it is.

The way to reach it, if there is any doubt, is to order a survey in the bill so as to remove all doubt.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will ask the gentleman from Florida if it is a fact that the Chief of Engineers in Part I of his report, on page 783, at the bottom, does not say that by the act of February 27, 1911, the project to improve the Arkansas River, as far as Fort Smith, and improve the Arkansas River to Tulsa, Okla., have not been consolidated and merged into one project?

If the gentleman had left that word "Arkansas" out, I would not have objected. As it is, the word "Arkansas" without "Oklahoma" excludes that part of the project between Fort Smith and Tulsa, Okla.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if the project, on which we are now at work, does not cover an extent of 461 miles, and does not extend into the State of Oklahoma? Is not that the project that is recognized in the books, on which we are at work?

Mr. DAVENPORT. The project is recognized, but your words are definitive, and—

Mr. LAWRENCE. I understand that, but going under the report of the engineers the improvement covers an extent of 461 miles and does cover a part of the river in Oklahoma.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I do not so understand there is anything of the kind in the engineer's report. He says there are 375 miles in Arkansas and 340 miles in Oklahoma, according to his report here, and there are 157 miles of the part that is in Oklahoma that are navigable.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The project we have, Mr. Chairman, seems to go up as high as navigation. The act of 1902 merged those two into one, which makes the general existing project in substance: "The improvement of the river from its mouth to the head of navigation by snagging operations, by dredging operations, and by contraction work, holding the improved channel by revetment when necessary."

Now, if the head of navigation carries it to the point to which the gentleman's amendment would carry it—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I would ask the Chairman not to take out of my time the time used by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, did the Chair state my time had expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; according to the record kept by the timekeeper, the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I want it to be understood that I would not have presented my amendment if the gentleman had not inserted the word "Arkansas." That is the ground upon which I rely in support of my amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I want to say again that if the project extends to the head of navigation, as the engineers say it does, there is certainly no necessity for the amendment unless it is proposed to carry the work beyond that point, and in that event it ought not to be done. I understand the gentleman does not want to go beyond the project.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will pardon me, I hope the committee will not insist upon a vote before I have presented the arguments which I desire to present in support of the amendment.

We claim that we are entitled to such phraseology in the drafting of this amendment as will secure the improvement of that portion of the Arkansas River in Oklahoma which needs improvement. All the reports that have been made in recent years provide for certain improvements in that part of the Arkansas River. The act of February 27, 1911, merged the two projects that have heretofore been prosecuted on the Arkansas River into one.

Now, if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, thinks that a provision properly drawn and placed in the bill will take charge of the entire work to the head of navigation, he could have accomplished that object by leaving out the word "Arkansas." But my contention is that that word in the paragraph as it now stands defines the scope of the work and limits it to the improvement of the Arkansas River within the State of Arkansas only.

I contend that by that language you confine it exclusively to that part of the Arkansas River that flows through the State of Arkansas. If I had not thought so, I would not have offered this amendment. But we believe we should have the desired improvements there, inasmuch as our country is rapidly developing along that part of the Arkansas River.

Now, in order to show what the engineers thought of it when they filed their report with the Speaker of the House on the 25th day of June, 1909, I want to read a part of their report. On page 7 of their report the engineers say:

With the projects and estimates just outlined this board practically agrees. Although some reduction might perhaps be made in the estimated cost of the slack-water improvement, it would not be a radical one, and for all practical purposes the cost given may be taken as approximately correct. In the opinion of the board the only way in which a radical and permanent improvement of the Arkansas River can be obtained is by constructing locks and dams from Muskogee to Little Rock and providing open-channel navigation from Little Rock to the mouth by means of dredging done in connection with extensive bank revetment. Such an improvement, however, is exceedingly expensive and would require many years to complete, even with liberal and continuous appropriations. For this reason, while the project is entirely feasible, in the opinion of the board it is not at this time desirable. Although recognizing that the construction of locks and dams offers the only means of obtaining permanent improvement between Muskogee and Little Rock, the board is of opinion that by means of hydraulic dredging it is feasible to obtain a considerably improved channel between these points as well as from Little Rock to the mouth, one that will prolong the period of navigation and possibly extend such period to include, generally, times of ordinary low water. This method of improvement has proved quite successful on the Mississippi and other rivers, and the physical characteristics of the Arkansas River are such as to lead the board to believe that equally favorable results may be obtained by adopting a similar method for its improvement.

Now, the board, going further, on page 8 of this report to Congress, says:

The country in the valley of the river, especially between Fort Smith and Muskogee, contains much coal and asphalt. Over 400,000 acres of coal and asphalt lands have been segregated and reserved from allotment. This coal has been practically untouched, except where the mines have easy access to a railroad. Such mines have been profitably producing a high-grade bituminous coal. Much of the land containing these deposits lies right on the bank of the river, and if water transportation were provided, the mining of the coal would undoubtedly develop into a very large industry, possibly sufficient in itself to justify the improvement. In addition to the coal there are valuable growths of timber and increasingly productive agricultural lands, which are being gradually extended as the timber is cleared. The chief agricultural product is cotton, and although most of this would undoubtedly move by rail, a great deal of it could certainly be more conveniently hauled by water. Even that moved by rail would necessarily benefit from the reduced freight rates which would result from water competition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is what the engineers say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I would like to have five minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman advise the committee whether any work has been done in the portion of the Arkansas River in Oklahoma during the last season from the appropriation made a year ago?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I understand no work has been done. There has been very little work done for several years.

Mr. DAVIDSON. The language in the bill of last year was identical, in the title of the paragraph, with the language contained in this bill, and the substitution of the word "Oklahoma" could not possibly affect the project, it seems to me.

Mr. DAVENPORT. That may possibly be true, that the language used in this bill is identical with the language used in the last bill, but the gentleman certainly does not think the language of the present bill would permit the improvement to be extended clear to the head of navigation in Oklahoma.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I certainly do.

Mr. DAVENPORT. This is a matter of vital importance to the people of Oklahoma, as much so as any project to the people of any State in the Union; and I join hands with every man who has an honest project and who is endeavoring to reduce freight rates for the people in his section. We are paralleled for the entire distance the Arkansas River is navigable in Oklahoma by a railroad on each side of the Arkansas River, from Fort Smith to the head of navigation, at Tulsa, Okla.; and since that has been so we have had trouble in getting recommendations from the local corps of engineers for the improvement of that part of the river which runs through Oklahoma, although they have gone this far all the time, they have recommended improvements in the way of removing snags and dredging, and we are not now asking an amendment to this bill to increase the appropriation above what is now in it. We are simply asking to be placed where we can be recognized as a part of the project of improving the Arkansas River, and not be excluded, as, in my judgment, the language of the bill now does exclude us. I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

I should like to go into details as to the advantages which would accrue to the people, but I have not the time. I do urge that the bill ought to be in such language that that part of the Arkansas River in Oklahoma will get some benefit of the improvement as the engineers insist should be done, if nothing more than snagging and dredging the stream. I trust that the members of this committee on this floor will be willing to give us that benefit. The words used certainly do not diminish the right to improve that part of the Arkansas River in Arkansas, and they do make it clear that it is intended to include the entire project and improve the Arkansas River from its mouth to the head of navigation, in the State of Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVENPORT), there were—ayes 27, noes 22.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph as amended. I do this for the purpose of keeping the promise I made last evening to call attention to the fact that this bill does contain items in regard to which there are adverse reports of the Board of Engineers, or at least of the local engineers. For instance, take the Winyah Bay improvement, which was passed a short time ago. There is a very strong report against it. There is a proposition there to dredge out a thousand acres to form a basin, in order to form an anchorage and provide terminals—I suppose for some railroad—and while it may be said that the committee have not provided for that particular improvement, I have no doubt that the appropriation of \$120,000 herein made will be so expended as to make this other improvement inevitable in the future, and that some engineer will later be found who will make a favorable report.

I also call attention to Fishing Creek, N. C., in regard to which there is an adverse report. I call attention to Alligator Creek, and other items if I had the time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Wyoming is not discussing his amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. I could call attention to many other items in regard to which there is no favorable recommendation, at least by the men on the ground, who know the most about them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of order that the gentleman from Wyoming is not discussing his amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Very well; I will discuss my amendment. It relates to the Arkansas River, one of the branches of which is the Ouachita. The Ouachita is a noble stream, on which we have already expended \$1,800,000. Besides the dam improvement, the work done has consisted chiefly of the removal of snags, stumps, and overhanging trees.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I will inform the gentleman that the Ouachita empties into the Red River, and not into the Arkansas.

Mr. MONDELL. Then these "snags, stumps, logs, wrecks, leaning and sliding trees" go into the Red and not into the Arkansas. This money is being spent for the removal of these obstructions which I have mentioned. This is the condition of this noble stream: There is a gravel bar about 20 miles above Trinity, where there is an available depth at low water of from 15 to 40 inches. The maximum draft that can be carried at mean low water is 3½ feet to Harrisonburg, La., 1½ feet to Monroe, La., and 8 inches to Camden, Ark.

This is one of the noble highways of commerce for which we are spending large sums of the people's money. It would not be so bad if these expenditures would actually provide transportation. If I felt sure they would, without regard to their local character, I would gladly support every item in the bill, but I think a perusal of the reports on many items will prove to the satisfaction of any reasonable person that many of these streams can never be permanently improved; that it will be a never-ending work of placing in wing dams and having them washed out, pulling out snags, cutting down overhanging trees, dredging sand bars, and after the entire population of the vicinity has engaged for years in this work for the alleged improvement of commerce there will be no commerce to be carried and no opportunity to carry it, because it will be impossible to maintain conditions under which commerce could be carried successfully or profitably.

These funds are to be expended in many instances, in my opinion, on works that can never be of permanent value, and the only good purpose they serve is to distribute the Federal cash in the community and to keep some of our colleagues' constituents at work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming to strike out the paragraph as amended. The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving mouth of Brazos River, Tex.: For maintenance, \$25,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I notice the bill carries no appropriation or authorization for work upon either the upper or lower Cumberland River. I want to ask if in the gentleman's opinion and in the opinion of the committee the amount of money heretofore appropriated and now subject to the use of the local engineer is considered entirely sufficient to carry on the work on Locks B, C, and D in the lower Cumberland River without delay?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that together with the amount carried in the sundry civil bill, which, I think, is \$200,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have observed in the report of the Chief of Engineers that while he makes no specific recommendation that additional funds will be necessary during the ensuing fiscal year, he does make a suggestion that if Congress would make a contract or authorization for the completion of these three locks and dams in their entirety, the work could probably be carried on much more economically and advantageously. Has the committee considered that phase of the suggestion made by the Chief of Engineers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We did consider that phase of it. I have not any doubt myself but that a great many of the works could be more economically carried on and prosecuted if larger sums of money were appropriated. But, as the gentleman understands, this is a big country; we have many projects to take care of, and it would be impracticable to take care of all of them at once. In other words, the committee thought it would be impracticable to carry out the suggestions of the engineer in regard to this entire contract. The authorizations are not necessary in some instances, because we are having annual bills, and hence it is not so necessary with annual bills to provide authorizations in a river and harbor bill as when the bills only came along once in two or three years. We are now morally certain that in a year, or perhaps a little more, additional

amounts will be furnished in river and harbor bills, the bills now being annual instead of triennial.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say that, of course, the statement made by the gentleman from Florida must be entirely satisfactory, in so far as the necessity for any additional appropriation or authorization is concerned for the ensuing fiscal year, but I do regret that this bill does not carry either for the lower or the upper Cumberland River something by the way of authorization or appropriation.

That great river, according to a recent investigation, carries annually a commerce of more than 600,000 tons, valued at approximately \$16,000,000. When you consider the amount of commerce carried, when you consider the section of the country through which it flows, when you consider the resources at the head of the river and all along the Cumberland Valley, and the fact that a portion of it is not contiguous to a railroad, I do not hesitate to say that there is not a project of river improvement in the bill that is more meritorious than the improvement of the Cumberland River. For some years my colleague, Judge HULL, has been earnestly and energetically trying to secure the restoration of the scheme of improvement for the upper Cumberland River which was in existence before he became a Member of Congress. The district which I have the honor to represent, and particularly the city of Nashville, where I live, is also directly interested in the improvement of the upper as well as the lower section of the river, and I have been rendering him all the assistance in my power.

Only recently facts have been submitted to the Board of Engineers which have caused them to come to the conclusion that an injustice has been done to the upper Cumberland River by recent reports as to the amount of commerce carried. In saying this I intend no reflection on Maj. Burgess, our local engineer. He is admittedly one of the most capable and efficient engineers in the service and is exceedingly fair, and is certainly disposed to do his duty not only by the Government but also by the people of our section, but he must depend for the facts stated in his report upon others, and in some way these mistakes have occurred and incorrect information has been furnished him without the least fault on his part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on account of the facts shown by these investigations the Board of Engineers has called for detailed estimates and plans with a view to determining whether or not the upper Cumberland River shall be restored to its former plan of improvement. These facts were called for so recently that they have not been received in time for the consideration of the board and this committee, but they will be received in ample time for consideration by the committee in the preparation of its next bill, and I merely call attention to this fact for the purpose of expressing the hope to the distinguished chairman and his most capable committee that when they come to prepare their next bill they will prove liberal to the lower and upper Cumberland River, in view of the fact that this bill carries nothing for either section. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving harbor at Cleveland, Ohio: For maintenance, \$25,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 31, line 2, after the figures "\$25,000," by adding the following as a separate paragraph:  
"Improving Saline River, Ill., \$50,000."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what attention was given to the improvements of this river by the committee in its recent investigations. Last session of Congress the bill carried a provision for the purpose of making a survey thereof. During the interim between the last session and this session I tried very hard to find out what the War Department was doing with reference to making a bona fide survey of this river. I was unable to learn through the engineer that any real effort had been made for the purpose of investigating the feasibility of improving this river for the benefit of navigation.

I want to say to the committee that this river passes through one of the richest countries that ever fell from the plastic hand of nature. It is walled by the foothills of the Ozarks, hills laden with iron ore, zinc, lead, silver, and fluor spar. It taps at Equality a coal field the like of which has never before been known to man, the richest in the world. [Applause.] I dare say, Mr. Chairman, if this committee, through the engineering

force of the War Department, would take the pains to make an investigation, it would find that a few thousand dollars expended in its improvement would give Illinois an opportunity to feed the furnaces of the South with the finest coal and coke in the world.

I do not know whether there is a disposition on the part of the War Department to make that character of investigation which I sought during the last session of Congress. It is idle to talk about an investigation unless it be bona fide and for the purpose of determining the feasibility of improvement; and I say, Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for the investigation of this river for the purpose of any notoriety for my district, but for the relief of the people, who are among the most industrious and deserving of any in the world. [Applause.]

I desire to say that if this river were improved it would give a competing line with railroads, which now charge a greater rate for a short haul than they do for a long haul. It would give an opportunity to bring to the people that character of relief which is so necessary in these unjust discriminating times.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail, because there is no project for the work which is proposed in the amendment. We ordered a survey in the last river and harbor bill for that river, but no report has been as yet received by Congress. Whether it will be a favorable one I do not know.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the committee if he is willing to allow that survey to be made bona fide?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, if I understand what the gentleman means, I would say yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the gentleman willing, then, to allow the continuance of this survey by a provision in this bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no; it will be unnecessary, because in due time the survey will undoubtedly be made, if it is not already made, and we will receive the report in Congress from the engineers.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I am not able up to this good hour to learn whether there ever was an engineer who set foot nearer the banks of that river than the city of Washington.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, that may be true, but I can assure the gentleman that in my opinion the engineers will make that survey expeditiously. I do not think they will unduly delay it, indeed I have no idea they will. The gentleman must remember that a large number was ordered in the last river and harbor bill—

Mr. FOWLER. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Which became a law July of last year. The engineers have not had time to make them all, in fact they have made very few up to this time, but they are constantly reporting them to this House, many of them adversely, some of them favorably. I have no doubt in a very short time the gentleman's survey will be here, whether favorably reported or unfavorably of course we can not say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving harbor at Conneaut, Ohio: Continuing improvement, \$200,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 31, line 4, after the figures \$200,000, by adding the following as a separate paragraph: "Improving levee and harbor at Shawneetown, Ill., \$15,000."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that does not seem to apply at that portion of the bill, but seems to apply, if at all, on page 36 of the bill. Rivers relating to Illinois are on page 36.

Mr. FOWLER. This is on page 31, that is true, but we have reached the point indicated in the bill for this amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Page 31 relates to rivers in Ohio; rivers in Illinois are on page 36.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that to be immaterial if the amendment is in order, and the Chair thinks it is.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, there is a pressing necessity for this appropriation. I received a communication from the people of Shawneetown requesting that a strong and successful effort be made for the purpose of getting enough money to secure their levee against the high water that is now in that section of the country. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, there is no more needed legislation in this country. It is one of the richest pieces of territory in the Ohio Valley. The people at

that place have been almost destroyed heretofore by virtue of the breaking of the levee. At one time a few years ago the levee broke and came through the town with such force that it carried with it the business houses, the dwelling houses with the people therein, and many of them were drowned. Mr. Chairman, this is the oldest town in the State of Illinois, and it ought to be preserved. It is one of the best towns in that State. It has been the policy of Congress to appropriate money for the purpose of building and strengthening levees and repairing the same when breaches therein have been made.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been such a universal rain within the last 36 hours in the Ohio Valley that the Ohio River will undoubtedly receive such an impetus and force and accumulation of water that it will not only put this town in great jeopardy of loss of life and property, but some of the other towns along in my State, and I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the people of this town are extremely anxious that this appropriation should be made. I understand from the communication that they are working there day and night, without sleep, except like soldiers sleeping on their arms, for the purpose of preserving life and property. I trust, Mr. Chairman, in the wisdom of the Members of this Congress, for the good of the people of this town, that this appropriation will be made. It will do me no good personally. I will derive no benefit from it either directly or indirectly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an extension of my time for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, during the high water of last winter there was a considerable damage done to the levee at that place which has not yet been repaired. If there is any provision anywhere in this bill for the purpose of making such repairs I have not been able to discover it, and for this reason, Mr. Chairman, I have seen fit to offer the amendment for the purpose which this amendment carries.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, and I beg all the gentlemen here, in their wisdom and in their magnanimity, to give to the people, who are in such great danger, as I have depicted, and more, this relief. My words are inadequate, my vocabulary too small, to properly describe the magnitude of the situation of danger at this place. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will support this amendment and give these people what I have asked, namely, the small sum of \$15,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. There is no project for it and no recommendation before the engineers for it at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving harbor at Toledo, Ohio: Completing improvement, \$105,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if we could not go on for 15 minutes more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think there will have to be discussion on this next item.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest that we pass over this item, and then go on.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask that this item be passed over, and that we return to it later.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman wants to pass over this item, and adjourn in 15 minutes, I will have no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this item be passed over.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum has been made. Is it withdrawn?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will withdraw it for 15 minutes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving harbor at Saugatuck, and Kalamazoo River, Mich.: For maintenance, \$3,000.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 22, strike out "\$3,000" and insert: "\$10,000, of which so much as may be necessary shall be allotted for revetment of the north bank of said river eastward from the east end of the said river connecting Lake Michigan."

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I approach this committee in the most respectful and conciliatory attitude. I have heard other gentlemen criticize this committee. I would not think of doing it. I have not a word to say about the Brazos, or the Trinity, or the Albemarle Canal, or the Ouachita, or the Arkansas, or anything else. All I am interested in just at this moment is Saugatuck, Mich. I appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and I never was treated more courteously in my life than when I was there, and after presenting my case to the committee I went out under the impression that everybody except the chairman was for my amendment, and I thought it likely he would yield to his better impulses. But I discovered that appearances were deceptive. A good many members of the committee expressed themselves openly in favor of this improvement, and then Col. Taylor was called in, and after advising with him the committee concluded that they would postpone this improvement until after they could have a survey, which would take a year.

I have here a map, which I prepared myself, and I want to show the situation to you. This [indicating] is the Kalamazoo River. It flows northward parallel with Lake Michigan, and then doubles back upon itself and flows into Lake Michigan, or did until the construction of this cut which you see up here. That was constructed some four or five years ago. A lady by the name of Margaret Cook, who lives in Elgin, Ill.—and I hope I shall have the support of every Illinois Member for this improvement—contributed to the Government the land through which this cut is made. After the cut was constructed, it was found that by reason of the conflict between the current of the river and the waves of the lake, an erosion of the north bank of the river was caused which is washing away the land owned by Mrs. Cook and has compelled her to go to the expense of moving some of her buildings back. Not only that but it has washed part of the highway into the river. Mrs. Cook has already paid out more than \$4,000 for the construction of a revetment there to protect her property, but the revetment must be extended to be effectual.

In the construction of this revetment she found it necessary to acquire an adjoining piece of ground, so that she has so far been obliged to pay out over \$8,000 for the protection of that property.

Now, I am not permitted to ask this improvement primarily to protect a private owner, but I am insisting that the commerce at Saugatuck ought to be protected against the possibility of this lady's buildings being rolled into the river from time to time and having to be scooped out by the Government. [Laughter.] The highway has been carried into the river; the buildings have been almost carried into the river; and this lady has been compelled to squander large sums of money to protect her property, but I am told that I am not permitted to ask the Government to protect private owners from the effects of public improvements. I doubt that, but I have no time to discuss it now. After conference with the engineers' office, gentlemen of the committee assured me that they regarded this as a very meritorious case, but they said, "We think there ought to be a survey." Every man on the committee knows what is going on there.

The engineers' office knows what is going on. Everybody knows that this highway has been washed away and that this lady's buildings are in danger of being washed into the river, but still you want a survey and a report, which will postpone action a year. It appears that I am not permitted to ask action on account of the private interests involved here, but I am permitted to ask action on account of the public interests involved, and I ask you, gentlemen, not to insist upon a survey to find out something that you know all about now.

What is the use of it? It is like the celebrated case of the man who applied for an injunction concerning a cargo of ice, and long before the case was decided the ice melted. This whole property may be washed into the Kalamazoo River before you can get a survey and a report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] stated, he did come before our committee and presented very earnestly the proposition that he has presented here, but upon examination we found that there was no project for it; the engineers had not investigated it so as to be able to tell us what it was going to cost; and we know nothing about it except from hearsay. So, of course, the proper, the business-like thing to do was and is to have a survey and let the engineers tell us whether the work is advisable, whether it is in the interest of navigation, and what it is going to cost.

Now, we have inserted in the bill a provision for a survey, and if the bill passes and becomes a law the survey will be made

in due time, and we will obtain a report upon which action may be taken, likely at the next session of Congress.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman how long that will be?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Congress will meet in December next. I should have said, perhaps, that we can act upon it at the next regular session.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman means by that that possibly nearly a year from now we might get action?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not take quite a year to get a report. It will not be quite a year until we shall have assembled here again in regular session, at which time I hope we will begin the preparation of another bill. But whether it is 2 months or 12 months or 14 months, Mr. Chairman, we can not afford to treat this project differently from what we treat others. We must treat them all alike.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I wish you would.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman says he wishes we would. But if the gentleman will call to my attention any case where the present committee or any other Committee on Rivers and Harbors has in recent years unjustly discriminated, I will be obliged to him. We have not done so in any case.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have one minute in which to say a word to my friend.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] says there is no project. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and he knows that the project under which that cut was made calls for revetments on the banks of that river, and that work has not yet been finished.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. On the contrary, I know, as well as I can know anything from reading the reports and talking with the engineers, that there is no project whatever for this work. The only way to get one is to have the engineers pass upon it, as we have provided in this bill that they shall do. If the bill becomes a law, they will do it; and when we have that before us we will know whether we ought to make the improvement or not. I do not know what it is going to cost. The gentleman can not tell us what it is going to cost. No one else can tell us in advance of an investigation.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just a word in answer to the gentleman. He says I can not tell how much this will cost. I can tell him how much it will cost. I have submitted the figures to the gentleman's committee, to the effect that the 400 feet of revetment which this lady has already constructed cost her \$4,000. I have submitted figures to the effect that 700 feet will be needed, and that it will cost somewhere near \$7,000, possibly a little less. The Corps of Engineers have informed themselves fully and have been able to tell you how much it would cost and just how many feet of revetment are needed there. The Engineer's Office knows all about it. They have had reports from the Grand Rapids corps of engineers. They are fully informed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, only a few words more. If any engineer has stated to the River and Harbor Committee what that work would cost, I have no knowledge of it. But even if he had done so, his estimate would have been made outside of and independent of any action by Congress; and, as I said a moment ago, we are not accustomed to make such improvements or to authorize them until a report has been made by the engineers and a project recommended by them.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why not break over your custom occasionally?

Mr. SPARKMAN. When you break over a custom like that you get on very dangerous ground.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why not authorize improvements that are so obviously necessary?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are importuned very often to do that very thing, to violate the rules under which we frame our river and harbor bills, but the House committee has not done it in recent years. Nor has this House done so in many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan) there were—ayes 12, noes 21.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of no quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOON of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 28180) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, if we meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, Saturday, will it not be practicable to adjourn by half past 5 or 6 o'clock?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection, so far as I am concerned, if we can get through with this bill, as I hope we will be able to do.

Mr. MANN. Whether we get through with the bill or not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 25, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of the court in the case of Emmetta Humphreys, administratrix de bonis non of John Sevier, sr., and John Sevier, jr., v. The United States (H. Doc. No. 1302); to the Committee on the Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the counsel of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting the annual report of said company (H. Doc. No. 1303); to the Committee on the District of Columbia 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:

Mr. SLAYDEN, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 156) to appoint George Gray a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1381), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWEET, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1589) to authorize the exchange of conveyances between the Florida East Coast Railway Co. and the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1382), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FITZGERALD, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1913, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1383), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 28406) to increase the limit of cost for increased quarantine facilities at the port of Portland, Me.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 28407) to amend an act entitled "An act to encourage the development of coal deposits in the Territory of Alaska," approved May 28, 1908, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 28408) authorizing the payment of damages to persons for injuries inflicted by

Mexican Federal or insurgent troops within the United States during the insurrection in Mexico in 1911, making appropriation therefor, and authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to proceed in conformity with diplomatic usage and international law to secure reimbursement therefor from Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 28409) to empower the United States district court for the district of Minnesota to establish the status of the allottees on the White Earth Indian Reservation in said State; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 389) authorizing the Secretary of War to use tents and rations for the relief of destitute persons in the district overflowed by the Ohio River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 390) to provide for the appointment of a commission to investigate and report upon the advisability, feasibility, and cost of transportation from Panama to Alaska of parts of the plant, machinery, and equipment now in use at the Isthmus of Panama in the construction of the Isthmian Canal, and its use in Alaska in building a railroad from the coast to United States coal lands and the mining of coal and transporting same to the seaboard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) providing for the printing of Report No. 98, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. POU: Resolution (H. Res. 789) to amend section 6 of Rule XXIV, Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 28410) granting a pension to Eva A. Winder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 28411) for the relief of Thomas B. Lawrence; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28412) for the relief of Oldham County, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 28413) granting a pension to Josephine C. Nixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 28414) for the relief of heirs of Emanuel Aycock; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 28415) granting a pension to W. T. Mobley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 28416) granting a pension to John F. De Wire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOWLER: A bill (H. R. 28417) granting a pension to William F. McRill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28418) granting an increase of pension to John I. Keel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 28419) granting an increase of pension to Susan H. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 28420) to promote on the retired list of the United States Army Brig. Gen. David S. Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 28421) granting a pension to Elvira Fuller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 28422) granting a pension to Charles W. James; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 28423) granting a pension to Frederick A. Spring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28424) granting a pension to Nora H. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 28425) granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Banister; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KORBLY: A bill (H. R. 28426) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 28427) granting a pension to William E. Fidler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 28428) granting an increase of pension to Marshall C. Conroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28429) granting an increase of pension to James T. Herrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 28430) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Zora B. Custer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES: A bill (H. R. 28431) granting a pension to Louisa Hicklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 28432) granting an increase of pension to Mary Rebecca Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 28433) for the relief of William Flinn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 28434) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 28435) for the relief of the legal representatives or heirs of Paul Noyes, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEELEY: A bill (H. R. 28436) granting an increase of pension to James M. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES: Petition of the Ministerial Body of Erie, Pa., Rev. Robert Clements, president; Rev. E. M. Vickers, secretary, favoring the passage of the Kenyon "red-light" bill, Kenyon-Webb interstate liquor bill, and the Lea-Sims anti-gambling bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Retail Merchants' Association, A. M. Howes, secretary; and the Business Men's Exchange, A. M. Howes, secretary, of Erie, Pa., favoring passage of the Weeks bill (H. R. 27567), providing universal 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Edward Jones, Albert Jones, and the Maple Grove Stock Farm, Frank Jones, manager, of Centerville, Pa., favoring the passage of the Haugen oleomargarine bill, to prevent the sale of colored imitation of butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of the United States Live Stock Sanitary Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring an increase of the Federal appropriation for tick eradication; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the International Stationery Co., New York, favoring the passage of House bill 27567, for a 1-cent postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Eastern Talking Machine Co., New York, protesting against the passage of section 2 of the Oldfield patent bill preventing the fixing of prices by the manufacturers of patent goods; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Eva A. Winter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Thomas B. Lawrence, Winchester, Ky.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the National Civic Federation, New York, favoring the passage of legislation granting pension to employees of the Government incapacitated by old age; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Optenberg Iron Works, Sheboygan, Wis., favoring the passage of House bill 27567, for a 1-cent postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Bernhard Stern & Co., Milwaukee, Wis., favoring the passage of Senate bill 7208, for amending the Harter Act so that the foreign shipowners can not exempt themselves from merchandise lost through carelessness; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Moisant International Aviators, New York, favoring the passage of legislation for appropriating sufficient funds for the proper equipment and maintenance of aerial vessels or for the abolishment of same in the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Association of Outlying Waters Fishermen, Two Rivers, Wis., favoring the passage of legislation for the protection of the fish industry by having a closed season, beginning October 15 and lasting from four to six weeks; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of William T. Glynn and numerous other citizens of Florida, protesting against any reduction of tariff on citrus fruits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation for Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petition of teachers and pupils of West Webster, N. Y., and of No. 16 School of Rochester, N. Y., favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the F. A. Smith Manufacturing Co., Rochester, N. Y., protesting against any change of tariff on thorium and gas mantles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Petition of the State Butter and Cheese Association of Minnesota, favoring the passage of the Haugen bill and protesting against the passage of the Lever oleomargarine bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Federation of Women's Clubs of Minnesota, favoring the passage of House bill 25685, providing for the tagging and labeling of all fabrics and goods to sell under interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the National Association of Railroad Commissioners, favoring the passage of Senate bill 6099, for a uniform freight classification and rate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOCHT: Petition of citizens of McConnellsburg, Pa., favoring the passage of the Kenyon "red-light" injunction bill for the cleaning up of Washington for the inauguration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOSS: Petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Waukegan, Ill., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill preventing the shipment of liquor into dry territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Henry Ford, president of the Ford Motor Co., favoring the passage of Senate bill 6497, to protect migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of the Miehle Printing Press & Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting against the reduction of the present tariff on printing presses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, protesting against the passage of any legislation to transfer the national forests to the control and ownership of the individual States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of Maine State Grange, Kenduskeag, Me., favoring the passage of Senate bill 3, for Federal aid for vocational education; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINDS: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Frederick A. Spring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Brainerd Manufacturing Co., East Rochester, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 27567, for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Association of Railway Commissioners, favoring the passage of Senate bill 6099, for the establishment of a uniform classification of freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Thomas A. Morrison, Smethport, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 1339, granting an increase of pension to the veterans of the Civil War who lost an arm or leg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of the agricultural-development committee of the Nebraska Bankers' Association, favoring the passage of the Lever agriculture-extension bill for the betterment of agricultural works; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the North Platte Valley Water Users' Association, protesting against the canceling of homestead entries for the nonpayment of charges under reclamation projects, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the Lincoln (Nebr.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of House bill 25106, granting a Federal charter to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the System of Federation of the Harriman Lines, asking that Congress see to it that the inspection of railroad equipment is enforced; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring the passage of Senate bill 122, known as the Newlands regulation bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of legislation making an appropriation for the erection of a new customhouse at Philadelphia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. NEELEY: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Medicine Lodge, Kans., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill preventing the shipment of liquor into dry territory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Kansas Academy of Science, favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New Haven Post, Grand Army of the Republic, protesting against the use of the Pension Building for an inaugural ball; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REILLY: Petition of the Board of Agriculture of the State of Connecticut, favoring the passage of the Lever agriculture-extension bill for the advancement of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Association of Railway Commissioners, favoring the passage of Senate bill 6099, for the establishment of a uniform classification of freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, Trenton, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation to transfer the national forests to the control and ownership of the individual States within which they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Petition of citizens of Somerville, Mass., favoring the passage of the McLean bill, for granting Federal protection to migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the New Jersey Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, favoring the adoption of the Mall site and design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for the memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Association of Eastern Foresters, Trenton, N. J., protesting against the passage of legislation transferring the ownership of national forests to the States within which they lie; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of citizens of New York State, favoring the passage of the McLean bill granting Federal protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Brooklyn Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the American Group of the Société des Architectes Diplômés par le Gouvernement Français, New York, favoring the adoption of the Mall site and the design, as approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, for the memorial to Abraham Lincoln; to the Committee on the Library.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 25, 1913.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, for the precepts enunciated and exemplified in the life of Thy servants, especially for those great precepts enunciated by the Jesus of Nazareth and exemplified in His incomparable life and character, the earnest for all who strive for the mastery of self in perfected manhood which fits us for the here and the there, the now and the then. And we most fervently pray for the victory for ourselves and all men, that we may satisfy the longings of our better self and reflect Thy glory in an unblemished character. This we ask in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Stuart, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 8183. An act for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker.

### SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following title were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 8183. An act for the relief of Capt. Frank Parker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States on March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### NEW JERSEY-NEW YORK JOINT HARBOR LINE COMMISSION.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House joint resolution 210, authorizing the President to appoint a member of the New York-New Jersey Joint Harbor Line Commission, with the Senate amendment thereto, and consider the same at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR SUNDAY, JANUARY 26, 1913.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. FITZGERALD to preside as Speaker pro tempore at the memorial exercises to be held Sunday, January 26, 1913.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TAGGART to attend the memorial exercises in honor of the late Representative W. W. WEDEMAYER.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alken, S. C.	Gardner, N. J.	Lafean	Prouty
Ames	George	Lamb	Pujo
Ansberry	Gill	Langley	Rainey
Ayres	Gillett	Legare	Randell, Tex.
Barchfeld	Glass	Levy	Redfield
Bates	Goeke	Lindsay	Reyburn
Berger	Green, Iowa	Linthicum	Rodenberg
Bradley	Greene, Mass.	Littleton	Rucker, Colo.
Brantley	Griest	Longworth	Sabath
Brown	Gudger	Loud	Scully
Browning	Guernsey	McCall	Sells
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	McGuire, Okla.	Sheppard
Candler	Hardwick	McKinley	Sherley
Cantrill	Harris	McLaughlin	Slemp
Carter	Harrison, Miss.	Martin, Colo.	Small
Clark, Fla.	Harrison, N. Y.	Martin, S. Dak.	Smith, J. M. C.
Cline	Hartman	Matthews	Smith, Cal.
Conry	Hayes	Merritt	Smith, N. Y.
Cooper	Heald	Moon, Pa.	Speer
Copley	Higgins	Moore, Tex.	Stack
Crago	Hill	Mott	Stephens, Nebr.
Cravens	Hinds	Murdock	Sulloway
Crumpacker	Hobson	Needham	Talbot, Md.
Cullopp	Howard	Nelson	Taylor, Colo.
Curry	Howell	Oldfield	Tilson
Danforth	Hull	Olmsted	Underwood
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Davis, W. Va.	Jackson	Palmer	Vreeland
De Forest	James	Patten, N. Y.	Watkins
Dickson, Miss.	Johnson, Ky.	Patton, Pa.	Weeks
Difenderfer	Jones	Payne	Whitacre
Dixon, Ind.	Kennedy	Peters	Wilder
Doremus	Kent	Plumley	Wilson, N. Y.
Fields	Kindred	Porter	Wood, N. J.
Focht	Kitchin	Pou	Woods, Iowa
Fordney	Konig	Pray	

The SPEAKER. On this call 240 gentlemen have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. RIORDAN was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Henrietta Sherman, Fifty-eighth Congress, third session, no adverse report having been made thereon.

### IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the conference report on the bill S. 3175, the immigration bill, and move the adoption of the report, and on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that until the report is read the gentleman is a little previous.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] calls up the conference report on the immigration bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk began the reading of the report.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Alabama whether, if the