

Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts with Mr. RAINY.
 Mr. PRINCE with Mr. SHULL.
 Mr. ROBERTS with Mr. SOUTHALL.
 Mr. SHIRAS with Mr. SPARKMAN.
 Mr. WILEY of New Jersey with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. WILSON of New York.
 Mr. THOMAS of Iowa with Mr. MAYNARD.
 Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.
 Mr. FRENCH with Mr. WALLACE.
 Mr. WANGER with Mr. GILBERT.
 On this vote:
 Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.
 Mr. AMES with Mr. BELL of California.
 Mr. MCCARTHY with Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey.
 Mr. MAYNARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.
 The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in his seat and listening at the time his name should have been called?
 Mr. MAYNARD. I was at my desk trying to pay attention, and two Members came up and talked to me, and I missed my name.
 The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that the gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.
 Mr. MAYNARD. If permitted to do so, I should like to vote "present."
 Mr. FLOOD. I should like to inquire if the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] is recorded?
 The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.
 Mr. FLOOD. I am paired with him.
 The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman vote?
 Mr. FLOOD. No; I did not vote because I was paired with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP].
 Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.
 The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in his seat and listening at the time his name should have been called?
 Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I was not. I was in the corridor.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I desire to know how the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLACK] is recorded?
 The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I am paired with the gentleman and desire to be marked "present."
 The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman vote?
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I did not. I am paired with the gentleman.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.
 Mr. GILBERT. I was paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WANGER], but I find that our pair expired yesterday. It seems that the gentleman is perhaps laboring under the impression that the pair was still in force. Therefore, for fear that I might mislead him, I desire to change my vote.
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.
 The Clerk called the name of Mr. GILBERT, and he answered "present."
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment.
 The amendment was agreed to.
 The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.
 On motion of Mr. GROSVENOR, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEWIS AND CLARK EXPOSITION.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on Rules.
 The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution of the House No. 233, have had the same under consideration and ask leave to report in lieu thereof the following:

"Resolved, That upon the adoption hereof the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall be discharged from consideration of the bill (S. 276) to provide for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the exploration of the Oregon country by Capt. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806, and for other purposes, and the House shall proceed to the consideration of the same."

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the effect of this resolution, if adopted, is to bring before the House for immediate consideration the Senate resolution providing for the Lewis and Clark Exposition, as amended by the House committee.

I want to say, in justice to myself, that I am opposed to this legislation. I voted against the bill when it was before the House some days ago, but the vote on that occasion was 134 yeas to 72 nays, which indicated a desire upon the part of the House to consider this legislation; and the Committee on Rules thought, there-

fore, that the House ought to be allowed to pass upon the proposition either one way or the other.

I now ask the previous question.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman, this is a rule to give to the bill providing for a Government exhibit at the Lewis and Clark Exposition the simple right to be privileged. Is that it?

Mr. DALZELL. The right to be considered immediately, if this rule is adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has said something to the effect that this legislation ought to be considered. Did the gentleman make the statement that if the House does not consider it there is some probability that we shall have to consider the proposition on a conference report, where the House will not have the freedom of action that it will have now?

In other words, the Senate has been in the habit of putting upon appropriation bills this sort of legislation, and unless the House acts in some way so as to consider the measure separately, we may get this measure brought before the House in such a way as we are liable to vote upon the proposition in a way where the House can not have the proper action that it might have now. Is that the suggestion that the gentleman makes?

Mr. DALZELL. This rule simply allows this bill to come up now without any limitation or debate, under the rules of the House, subject to the call of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves the previous question.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think we had better have twenty minutes on a side.

Mr. DALZELL. The previous question has not been ordered. As the matter has been debated, should the previous question be ordered there would be no opportunity for debate. I will withhold the motion for the previous question. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I only wish to have about five minutes, but I wish to have twenty minutes on this side.

Mr. DALZELL. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Speaker, my only object at this time is to call the attention of the House to the fact that by this device of "the rules," by favor of the Committee on Rules, much of favoritism and partiality is shown. The effect of picking out such measures as may have the favor of the Committee on Rules and bringing them directly before the House, or putting them in the position of matters of privilege, while hundreds of other measures, more urgent and of greater public value, but lacking the favorable consideration of that committee, perish upon the Calendar without any chance whatever for consideration, is not wholesome. My own notion is that a proper exercise of the powers of this committee would be to select for special consideration the more important of the public measures pending in the House (in view of the fact that all can not be considered), that those most important, the consideration of which would be of the greatest interest, and the passage of which would give the greatest benefit to the whole people of the country, ought to be the measures by preference brought before the House.

As things go—and I am not complaining about it, but merely calling attention to it—it is determined by a very small coterie of the House—determined really by three men; determined really by one man, the Speaker of the House—what matters, outside of those that are absolutely privileged, may be considered, and what matters outside of that small class shall not have consideration in the House. I do not believe that this discretion—if it be called discretion—is wisely exercised. I do not believe that the original policy of the Committee on Rules looked to this use of it.

Now, if we are going into a matter of comparison of the measures upon the Calendar to-day, I would say that in the judgment of the Members of the House, if they could have an opportunity to express it, and the judgment of the people of the country, of the relative importance of the measures pending, this session would have to be held a good long while, would have to be protracted far beyond the time when an adjournment will be reached, if a good many measures which should be brought before us for action by the Committee on Rules be permitted to come before the House at all. In other words, if they come up on their merits, by the selection of measures according to their merits, a great many measures that come up by reason of this favor and political partiality would not come up at all.

It is true that upon the vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill the majority of the House expressed themselves in favor of the passage of the measure which this rule would make privileged.

But while that is true, it is also true that if the House could have had an opportunity to express its preference and judgment, the House, by even a greater preponderating favorable vote, would have expressed itself in favor of the passage of many other bills, reposing serenely upon the Calendar, and to repose there until the 4th day of next March sees this Congress expire.

We all know that this matter of moving to suspend the rules, where a two-thirds vote is required to pass a measure, like all other things relating to our action here, is a matter of partiality and of favor. One cannot, except at the pleasure of the Speaker, have an opportunity to move here to suspend the rules and pass a bill, however many people may be in favor of it. However certain it may be that two-thirds would support the motion, it is necessary to submit the request for that permission to submit that motion—a permission which ought to be, and is, the right of a Member of the House—to the Speaker, and if the Speaker sees fit to recognize him, then the judgment of the House may be taken upon the proposition of suspending the rules and passing the measure, and if two-thirds vote for it, the rules being suspended, the measure is passed.

But first, before it can be ascertained whether two-thirds or a majority or any other proportion of the House really desire a measure to pass, or even to be considered, it is imperatively necessary that the permission of the Speaker be obtained to take the sense of the House. Now, I submit—and I know perfectly well when I do submit it that it is perfectly idle to do so—that a proper regard for the public welfare, a proper disposition to consider measures according to their merit, in the judgment of those who have them to deal with, would lead to the bringing forward, and especially would prevent the keeping back, of many measures which will not be considered in this House or this Congress at all beyond the consideration they may receive in committee.

This measure is one of importance, perhaps, to the people in a particular locality. It is not a matter of great, sweeping importance to the people of this whole country. In comparison with it, there are dozens and scores of measures now pending in this House which are of an hundredfold more importance to the people of this country, and each of which, if put to a vote, would secure a very much larger vote in favor of passage than will be cast for this measure.

The Speaker and the Committee on Rules in the course they have taken are merely treading, I suppose, in the footsteps of their illustrious predecessors. They are merely using the power which is lodged in them for wiser and better and broader purposes, I think, to make such discrimination and evince such partiality as may be pleasing to them or in their judgment may be beneficial to the party in power, without any reference whatever to the merit of the propositions involved, and really without much reference—often without any reference—to the desire of a majority of the Members of the House, even to the desire of a majority upon the other side; because when a matter of this kind comes up it is a species of party treason to vote against that which this august committee recommends to the House. A Member upon the majority side who would vote against a rule when submitted is a Member who is not exactly following the course marked out for him, and he certainly does not commend himself to the favor of the majority here, that majority being the Speaker and his two associates on the Committee on Rules, whatever the judgment of his constituents at home may be.

I merely submit these observations of a very general character, and having reference not especially to this bill, but to the course of proceeding in this and other matters, quite conscious at the time I do submit them that they will be void of effect, as such remarks usually are void of effect here. And in regard to the rule reported and adopted yesterday with reference to the Philippine shipping bill just disposed of, I will add that but for the power of the Committee on Rules thrown in favor of the passage of that bill, but for the power of the House evinced in the desire of the Speaker to have it passed, the judgment of this House would have been to devote a longer time to its consideration, to look into it more carefully, to amend it in important particulars, and practically and essentially to change it if passed at all. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the speech delivered by the gentleman from Missouri has long been a favorite theme and the oftener I hear him the better I like it. Mr. Speaker, I now demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania demands the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken on agreeing to the resolution, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DALZELL. Division, Mr. Speaker. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The House divided; and there were—ayes 156, yeas 89.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate bill 276, referred to in the resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER. The bill has already been read in the House. Does the gentleman desire to have it read again?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the further reading of the bill will be dispensed with. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to occupy the time of the House in any further discussion of the bill and amendments proposed by the committee. But for the information of gentlemen who may not have been here on Monday and heard the bill explained, I will say that the Senate bill which passed that body and came to the House and was referred to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions authorized the holding of this exposition in 1905. It authorized the President of the United States to invite foreign nations to participate in the exposition. It also created a national commission to have supervision jointly with the State of Oregon and a local corporation over the exposition. It appropriated \$1,775,000 and authorized a Government exhibit which would have cost at least \$200,000, making approximately an appropriation of \$2,000,000.

The committee of the House reports the bill back with an amendment striking out all after the enacting clause. The amendment eliminates the Federal authorization for the exposition; it eliminates all authority for invitations to be extended to foreign nations; it makes no provision whatever for a national commission. It simply provides for a Government exhibit and the erection of necessary buildings for the purpose of housing and caring for that exhibit while at the exposition, and authorizes the appointment of a Government board charged only with the duty of selecting, installing, and caring for the exhibit of the Government, and for that purpose appropriates \$450,000 instead of \$1,775,000.

In addition to that it carries an appropriation of \$25,000 for an Alaskan exhibit. The necessity for making this last appropriation has been fully explained in a previous debate, namely, that the Territory of Alaska, has no means whatever of appropriating money for the purpose of defraying the expense of making this exhibit. It was the judgment of your committee that because of the close proximity of the district of Alaska to Oregon, where this exhibition will be held, Congress would be justified in making this small appropriation for that purpose.

Now, there is one feature in connection with this bill that has been brought to my attention since the debate a few days ago that has not been discussed. It is in regard to the Sunday closing of this exposition. A certain gentleman residing here in the city of Washington, Mr. Crafts, was before the committee and asked for a hearing on the subject of closing this exposition on Sunday. The gentleman was informed that a hearing would be given on the bill, and at that time the committee would hear him. He could not appear, but sent another gentleman to represent him. Subsequently Mr. Crafts inquired if opportunity would be given to him to be heard, and I informed him that an opportunity would be given if the committee decided to report a bill authorizing this exposition.

On the contrary, the committee did not agree to anything of that kind. It was the judgment of the committee that the Federal Government be entirely divorced from any supervision or control over the exposition. It is given under State authority, and we therefore have no power, we have no right to say whether that exposition shall be open on Sunday or shall be closed on Sunday. If we assumed to exercise arbitrary power in the matter and there was a deficit, it would simply give them an opportunity to come back to Congress and say, "Had you not required the closing of our exposition on Sunday the receipts would have been ample to pay the expenses." For these reasons there is no provision in the bill in respect to the closing of the exposition on Sunday or any provision whatever for Federal supervision of any kind. That is a matter that addresses itself entirely to the authorities that will have control and supervision of the exposition in the exercise of their authority under the law of the State of Oregon which authorizes, and which alone authorizes, the exposition.

There is one other provision in the bill that I have not before referred to, and that is the provision authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin 250,000 gold dollars as souvenir coins of the Lewis and Clark Exposition, the design to be provided by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the exposition company can not obtain one or any of these gold dollars without paying par value for them.

It is the belief of the people on the Pacific coast interested in the success of the exposition that they will be able to dispose of these gold dollars by a premium of a dollar, and if they can do so it will give them, without any expense to the Government at all, the equivalent of an appropriation of \$250,000. The ordinary gold dollar heretofore coined by the Government is, I am informed, at

a premium. In the judgment of the committee there is no reason why, if the people on the Pacific coast are interested in this exposition, as they seem to be, why the 250,000 gold dollars which they pay \$250,000 for can not be sold at a premium of a dollar, thus giving them a net profit of \$250,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is no desire on the part of gentlemen for debate, I am ready to move the previous question on the amendment and bill to its final passage.

Mr. BARTLETT rose.

Mr. TAWNEY. I withhold the motion for the previous question. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire any time?

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like a few minutes.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, this proposition was up on Monday last. I undertook at that time to give the reasons that influenced me and controlled my judgment and vote. I do not desire, nor is it necessary, to repeat those reasons, because they are known, not only because uttered when this bill was up for consideration a few days ago, but they are known to Members of this Congress and known to all men who know me and know my record since I have been a Member of Congress. I realize that this bill has sufficient votes behind it to pass it. I realize that no suggestion I may make, no reason I may offer against it, will control anyone who has made up his mind upon the question, and I apprehend that everyone present has determined for himself whether he will vote for or against the bill. For myself I can not vote for it, and shall not, for the reasons that I have given heretofore. Those reasons are satisfactory to myself, and I shall not repeat them now.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the policy of encouragement of expositions has grown up in late years and is growing. It seems that every locality that can present a historical event, a historical character, comes to Congress and asks to have an exposition to glorify that event or that character. When a locality has no historical event of a public character, then it wants the exposition with a large and extravagant appropriation, and it seems Congress is inclined to grant it, because it happens to be on the Pacific, or on the Atlantic, or on the Gulf, or on the Great Lakes; and if neither of these conditions exists, if it happens to be midway, that seems to be sufficient. The reason we have had this encouragement of expositions and these extravagant appropriations for them heretofore was due in large measure to the condition that existed in the United States Treasury. With a large United States surplus deposited in national banks, this system offers an expedient to dissipate it and is availed of. Upon this subject I desire to give some suggestions to my Republican friends from a Republican President, as taken from President Harrison's annual message to Congress on the subject of United States surpluses and bank holdings thereof without interest, which is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 4, 1889, which I will send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The existence of so large an actual and anticipated surplus should have the immediate attention of Congress, with a view to reducing the receipts of the Treasury to the needs of the Government as closely as may be. The collection of moneys not needed for public uses imposes an unnecessary burden upon our people, and the presence of so large a surplus in the public vaults is a disturbing element in the conduct of private business. It has called into use expedients for putting it into circulation of very questionable propriety. We should not collect revenue for the purpose of anticipating our bonds, beyond the requirements of the sinking fund, but any unappropriated surplus in the Treasury should be so used, as there is no other lawful way of returning the money to circulation, and the profit realized by the Government offers a substantial advantage.

The loaning of public funds to the banks without interest, upon the security of Government bonds, I regard as an unauthorized and dangerous expedient. It results in a temporary and unnatural increase of the banking capital of favored localities, and compels a cautious and gradual recall of the deposits to avoid injury to the commercial interests. It is not to be expected that the banks having these deposits will sell their bonds to the Treasury so long as the present highly beneficial arrangement is continued. They now practically get interest both upon the bonds and their proceeds. No further use should be made of this method of getting the surplus into circulation, and the deposits now outstanding should be gradually withdrawn and applied to the purchase of bonds. It is fortunate that such a use can be made of the existing surplus, and for some time to come of any casual surplus that may exist after Congress has taken the necessary steps for a reduction of the revenue. Such legislation should be promptly, but very considerably, enacted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this shows a method of relieving the surplus in the Treasury by these extravagant appropriations made in the line of expositions. Why not give this money to county fairs or State fairs? Why not make appropriations out of the United States Treasury for everything everywhere? This leads to that logical conclusion.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman whether he will be in favor of the exposition at Jamestown?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No; I am opposed to the exposition at Jamestown and have repeatedly so stated, and am opposed

to the general plan and policy of expositions, which creates an abuse and whereby a certain locality comes and joins with other localities that have had expositions and other localities that anticipate expositions, and, joining local interests and considerations, come with force and numbers to carry these appropriations. If each stood upon its own merits, few would be appropriated for and those on a large and national scale.

I believe that two-thirds of the Members of this House who vote for this proposition have said before this that some other that they favored was the last they would favor with an appropriation for an exposition. Therefore they are placed in an unpleasant attitude. Members should be the power to stand between the people's Treasury, for the people, and against this exposition policy run mad. Hearing from but one side, the agents of these expositions, they are compelled to stand, some Members, in the position of rushing against their own sentiments. Who spoke against this proposition before the committee? Not one. Who speaks against any of them before the committees? No one. All who come favor it. The people away back at home expect us to stand up against lavish appropriations. Members of Congress are expected to do this, and some of us shirk our duty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LIVERNASH].

Mr. LIVERNASH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that any opposition to the pending bill exists on this side of the Chamber. It comes with ill grace, I think, for Democrats who have been urging liberal appropriations for expositions in the East and South, and whose pleas have been effective, now to seek to strike down a bill granting to the West a moderate allowance to the same end. Such opposition as rests on convictions as to the Constitution, of course, I must respect in the matter of motive, but other opposition I should be glad to see abandoned. The gentlemen who have stood for appropriations for the various expositions held and to be held in the States east of the Rocky Mountains should not be grudging toward the great territory fronting the Pacific.

The world has declared in favor of national and international fairs as valuable aids to art, commerce, and good-fellowship; and our country has taken a lead among the nations in promoting expositions. The West is seeking modest participation in the benefits of this enlightened policy. She reminds gentlemen that of the \$20,000,000 thus far given by the Federal Government in aid of expositions in the United States the States and Territories west of the Rockies have received nothing; and, without complaining as to the liberality shown the East and the South, she finds in the figures something which should be convincing to the Members of this assembly when she comes here asking an appropriation of the very moderate sum carried by the bill now under discussion.

I have nothing to say, by way of persuasion, to my colleagues who decline to support the bill because they regard such legislation as unconstitutional; but to all others I say that I hope the vote will show a withdrawal of opposition. To the latter I submit the plea of the West for fair treatment here. We have a wondrous region, destined to support a mighty population. To bring it quickly to the favor of the world we embrace the opportunity afforded by the Lewis and Clark centenary. Let the vote indicate a general gladness for the coming of a time when friendliness toward the Pacific slope may be directly shown. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen seem to have the impression that the amendment to the Senate bill contemplates voting direct aid to this exposition. It does nothing of the kind. It simply authorizes, as I have repeatedly said, a Government exhibit. I believe it is the duty of the Government of the United States to aid expositions of this character by making an exhibit of those things which will illustrate the function and administrative facilities of the Government in times of peace and its resources as a war power. I know that at the Buffalo exposition many men who had served in this House have said to me that they saw more of the workings of the Government in that Government exhibit than they had ever witnessed here in the city of Washington while serving as Members of Congress. If this is true of Members of Congress, how much more is it to the advantage of our people who never have an opportunity to come to Washington if they are given an opportunity to see such articles and things as illustrate the administrative features and power of the Government? A Government exhibit is all that is contemplated here, and the expense incident to that exhibit as here proposed is less than it was even at Buffalo—\$450,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call for the previous question on the amendment and on the bill to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is an amendment substituting a new preamble for that which comes to us in the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The question on amending the preamble

comes up after the third reading. The question is now on ordering the bill to be engrossed and read the third time.

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment to the preamble will be agreed to. The Chair hears no objection.

The question then being on the passage of the bill, it was passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment to the title, as proposed by the House committee, will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

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

PENSION BUSINESS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, pension bills on the Calendar are in order to-day under the rules. I ask unanimous consent that they be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to considering private pension bills in the House as in the Committee of the Whole? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The House accordingly proceeded (Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey in the chair) to the consideration of private pension bills.

EBEN FULLER.

The first business was the bill (H. R. 3829) to increase the pension of Eben Fuller.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eben Fuller, late of the Fifth Independent Battery Ohio Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, after the word "Ohio," insert the word "Volunteer."
In line 7 strike out the word "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."
Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Eben Fuller."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

LUTHER F. PALMER.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 6697) granting an increase of pension to Luther F. Palmer.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Luther F. Palmer, late of Company F, Twentieth 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 amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 8 strike out the word "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty-six."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ISABELLA M'DOWELL.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 13728) granting a pension to Isabella McDowell.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isabella McDowell, widow of James McDowell, late of Company A, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, after the word "late," strike out the word "of."
In line 7 strike out the words "Company A" and insert in lieu thereof the word "unassigned."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

ELLA C. BAKER.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 4583) granting a pension to Ella C. Baker.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ella C. Baker, widow of Robert B. N. Baker, second lieutenant, late of Company A, Fifty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, before the word "second," insert the word "late."

In line 7 strike out the words "late of."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

HENRY E. W. CAMPBELL.

The next business was the bill (H. R. 13666) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. W. Campbell.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry E. W. Campbell, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment, and Company H, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6 strike out the words "of Company D, Twentieth."

In line 7 strike out the words "Regiment and" and insert in lieu thereof the word "captain."

In line 9 strike out the word "sixty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

DANIEL M. GRAVES.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 14510) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Graves.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Daniel M. Graves, late of Company K, 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 amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 6, before the word "Company," strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the word "captain."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

CHARLES H. LAKEY.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 12966) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Lakey.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles H. Lakey, late of Company A, Seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

HENRY FORD.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 12526) granting an increase of pension to Henry Ford.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry Ford, late private, Company E, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6 strike out the word "private" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

In line 8 strike out the word "twenty-four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

BYRON BOWERS.

The next pension business was the bill (H. R. 14278) granting an increase of pension to Byron Bowers.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Byron Bowers, late of Company A, One hundred and eighteenth 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 amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

In line 6, before the word "Company," strike out the word "of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "second lieutenant."