

having failed in that defense, cannot, upon the second trial, abandon that defense and insist that the Act of May 11, 1912, repealed the Act of 1882."

The proposition has a relevant and conclusive application when a judgment of a former action is pleaded but limited application when urged in the same suit, it expresses a practice only and useful as such, but not a limitation of power. *Messenger v. Anderson*, 225 U. S. 436.

The District Court and the Circuit Court of Appeals, having the power and exercising it, entertained the defense of the Act of 1912, estimated it and decided it conclusive against appellant's right to an allotment. As we have seen there was no error in that ruling, and the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals is

Affirmed.

GILPIN, A MINOR, ETC. *v.* UNITED STATES.

APPEAL FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
EIGHTH CIRCUIT.

No. 243. Argued March 21, 22, 1921.—Decided April 11, 1921.

Decided on the authority of *Chase, Jr. v. United States*, *ante*, 1.
261 Fed. Rep. 841, affirmed.

THE case is stated in the opinion.

Mr. John Lee Webster, with whom *Mr. Hiram Chase* was on the briefs, for appellant.

Mr. Assistant Attorney General Garnett, with whom *Mr. H. L. Underwood*, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, was on the brief, for the United States.

10. Syllabus.

Mr. Oscar C. Anderson, with whom Mr. Charles J. Kappler was on the brief, for the Omaha Tribe of Indians, by special leave of court.

MR. JUSTICE MCKENNA delivered the opinion of the court.

This case was argued and submitted with the *Chase Case*, No. 242, *ante*, 1. It is a suit by Mary Gilpin by her next friend to have adjudged to her a right to an allotment of lands in the Omaha Reservation, she being an Omaha Indian. The right is based on the same treaties and acts of Congress as those passed upon in the *Chase Case*, and the effect of the Act of May 11, 1912, repealing the acts—that of 1882 and that of 1893.

The decree of the District Court was adverse to her right, and this decree was affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals. 261 Fed. Rep. 841.

For the reasons stated in the opinion in the *Chase Case*, the decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals is

Affirmed.

UNITED STATES *v.* L. P. & J. A. SMITH.

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

No. 253. Argued March 22, 23, 1921.—Decided April 11, 1921.

1. In the performance of a contract with the United States for the excavation of a channel to specified depths, under attached specifications describing the materials to be removed as clay, sand, gravel, and boulders in unknown proportions, deposits consisting largely of limestone were encountered, the removal of which entailed an expense per cubic yard much exceeding the price fixed by the con-