

Democrats—Thayer, Lewis, Padgett, Bartlett, Thompson and Pulo.

INTERNATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE. Republicans—Heburn, Sherman, Wagner, Mann, Leving, Stevens, Burke, Esch, Cushman, Kyle and Townsend.

Democrats—Dovey, Adamson, Shackelford, Ryan, Richardson (Ala.) and Lamar (Fla.).

RIVERS AND HARBORS. Republicans—Burton, Dovenor, Bishop, Acheson, Alexander, Lawrence, Davidson, McLachlan, Lott, Jones (Wash.) and Reice.

Democrats—Lester, Bankhead, Sparkman, Randall, Burgess and Humphreys.

MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES. Republicans—Grosvenor, Minor, Greene, Stevens, Fawcett, Wadsworth, Littlefield, Humphrey, Flack, Birdsell and Wilson (Ill.).

Democrats—Slight, Small, Davis, McDermott, Lucking and Goussier.

AGRICULTURE. Republicans—Wadsworth, Henry (Conn.), Wright, Hays, Scott, Jackson, Craft, Cromes, Lorimer, Brooks and Adams (Wis.).

Democrats—Lamb, Burleson, Lever, Brewster, Cassingham and Rodey.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Republicans—Hitt, Adams (Penn.), Cousins, William A. Smith (Mich.), Charles B. Linds (Ind.), Perkins, Seider, Foster (Vt.), Otjen, Capron and Longworth.

Democrats—Dismore, Howard, Burleson, Scudder, Kehoe and Fields.

MILITARY AFFAIRS. Republicans—Hull, Ketchum, Parker, Capron, Stevens, Dick, Mondell, Esch, Prince, Holliday and Young.

Democrats—Sulzer, Hay, Slayden, Broussard, Mahoney, Denney and McGuire.

NAVAL AFFAIRS. Republicans—Foss, Dayton, Loudenslager, Butler (Penn.), Mudd, Cousins, Roberts, Vreeland, Brick, Brandegee and Loud.

Democrats—Meyer, Tate, Rixey, William W. Kitchin, Vandiver and Wade.

POSTOFFICES AND POST ROADS. Republicans—Overstreet, Gardner (N. J.), Sperry, Hays, Shuler, Smith, Goebel, Steenerson, Stafford, Darragh and Murdock.

Democrats—Moon (Tenn.), Griegs, Crawford, Wilson (N. Y.), Finley, Klutz and Kalaniana'ole.

PUBLIC LANDS. Republicans—Lacey, Mondell, Miller, Needham, Martin, Fordney, Volstead, Dixon, Knott, Shraw, and McCarthy.

Democrats—Shafroth, Griffith, Burnett, Foster (Ill.), Rucker, Glass and Rodey.

INDIAN AFFAIRS. Republicans—Sherman, Curtis, Lacey, Marshall, Brown, Burke, Knapp, Hermann, Buckman, Hinchey and Hogg.

Democrats—Stephens, Zener, Fitzgerald, Dougherty, McAndrews, Reid and Rodey.

TERRITORIES. Republicans—Hamilton, Brick, Capron, Southwick, Powers (Maine), Jackson (Md.), Spalding, Lilly and Sterling.

Democrats—Moon (Tenn.), Lloyd, Robinson (Ind.), Thayer, Russell, Reid, McGuire and Wilson (Ariz.).

INSULAR AFFAIRS. Republicans—Cooper (Wis.), Tawney, Crum, packer, Hamilton, Olmsted, Smith (Ill.), Warnock, Needham, Fuller, Lanning and Kinkaid.

Democrats—Jones (Va.), Maddox, Williams (Ill.), Patterson (Tenn.), Robinson (Ind.) and Hill (Miss.).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS. Republicans—Gillet (N. Y.), Bartholdi, Bureleigh, Howell (N. J.), Conner, Martin, Minor, Rodenberg and Norris.

Democrats—Bankhead, Brantley, Thomas (N. C.), Miers, Sheppard and Scarborough.

LABOR. Republicans—Gardner (N. J.), Bartholdi, McCall, Vreeland, Foster (Vt.), Conner, Spalding and Goussier.

Democrats—Caldwell, Gilbert, Maddox, Hearst and Hughes (N. J.).

MILITIA. Republicans—Dick, Hill, Galnes (W. Va.), Smith (Ill.), Steenerson, Ames and Smith (Penn.).

Democrats—Crowley, Ruppert, Wiley (Ala.), Bassett and Kellher.

INVALID PENSIONS. Republicans—Sullivan, Gilson, Samuel W. Smith (Mich.), Calderhead, Deemer, Holliday, Hunter, Bradley and Fuller.

Democrats—Miers, Crowley, Lindsay, Snook, Lucking and Hopkins.

PENSIONS. Republicans—Loudenslager, Patterson (Penn.), Draper, Campbell, Ames, Brown (Penn.), Hogg and Longworth.

Democrats—Richardson (Ala.), Wiley (Ala.), McLain, Houston and Croft.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. Republicans—Babcock, Samuel W. Smith (Mich.), Allen, Wadsworth, Morrill, Powers (Mass.), Moran, Kemp, Davis (Maine), Campbell and Wiley (Conn.).

Democrats—Meyer, Cowherd, Sims, McAndrews, Fou and Gooch.

IRRIGATION OF ARID LANDS. Republicans—Mondell, Reeder, Tirrell, Dwight, McCall, Conroy (Penn.) and Williams.

Democrats—Underwood, Hitchcock, Van Duzer and Bell (Cal.).

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION. Republicans—Howell (N. J.), Adams (Penn.), Sells, Douglas, Evans, Gardner (Mass.) and Williams.

Democrats—Ruppert, Robb, Benny and Livermush.

CENSUS. Republicans—Crum, packer, Bureleigh, Hughes (W. Va.), Pearce, Cassel, Dunwell, Kennedy and Ames.

Democrats—Griffith, Hay, Burleson, Patterson (N. C.) and Roubert.

LIBRARY. Republicans—McClary, McCall and Conner, Democrats—Richardson (Tenn.) and Howard.

PRINTING. Republicans—Charles B. Linds (Ind.) and Perkins, Democrat—Tate.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS AND EXHIBITIONS. Republicans—Tawney, Sherman, Gardner (Mass.), Gardner (N. J.), Bowersock, Rodenberg, Howell (Utah), Porter and Woodard.

Democrats—Bartlett, Maynard, Hamlin, Wynn, Legare and Harrison.

The following are the chairmen of other committees, all being Republicans:

Elections No. 1—Mann. Elections No. 2—Olmsted. Elections No. 3—Lindsay. Coinage, Weights and Measures—Southard. Railways and Canals—Davidson. Manufactures—Mines and Mining—Brown (Wis.). Pacific Railroads—W. A. Smith (Mich.). Rivers and Harbors—Improvements of the Mississippi River—Bartholdi. Education—Improvements of the Mississippi River—Southard. Patents—Skiles. Calumet—Graft. War Claims—Mahon. Private Land Claims—Smith (Ill.). Revision of the Laws—Warner. Reform in the Civil Service—Gilllette. Election of President, Vice-President and Representatives in Congress—Gaines (W. Va.). Nominations—Lions, Trophy, Slavery. Ventilation and Acoustics—Bishop. Expenditures in the State Department—Ketcham. Expenditures in the Treasury Department—Cousins. Expenditures in the War Department—Wernock. Expenditures in the Navy Department—Greene (Mass.). Expenditures in the Postoffice Department—Wan. Expenditures in the Interior Department—Minor. Expenditures in the Department of Justice—Crawford. Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture—Wright. Expenses on Public Lands—Hughes (W. Va.).

YOUNG GIANTS. those "Little Ads. of the People" in making business for those who use them.

WANTS MORE DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS. Washington, Dec. 5.—Representative De Armond, of Missouri, introduced a resolution to-day amending the rules so as to add another Democratic member to all the large committees of the House.

"SOHMER" HEADS THE LIST OF THE HIGHEST GRADE PIANOS. SOHMER PIANOS. Only Salesteam in Greater New York. 5th Ave., cor. 22d St.

ANTIQUE OIL PAINTINGS. A Collection of Old Oil Paintings, consisting of 46 CENTURY. Some as far back as 15TH CENTURY. which I bought while in Antwerp, Belgium, and have just received same from London House. Will arrive for sale, commencing and dealers cordially invited. ROBERT HYMAN, 231 Broadway.

NO RECESS OF CONGRESS.

CANNON BLOCKS PLAN.

Sessions Will Merge, and All Pending Nominations Will Fail.

(FROM THE TRIBUNE BUREAU.)

Washington, Dec. 5.—"A Republican President called a Republican Congress in special session to complete the approval of a treaty which a Republican Senate had ratified, subject to the approval of the House. The House passed the enabling act promptly, as requested by the President. The Senate permitted a few Democrats to hold it up by the throat and postpone action on the convention until the regular session. Then the Senate came to the House, and asked it to assume the responsibility and introduce an adjournment resolution. The House said, 'No, do it yourself!' The Senate would not, and now it finds itself in difficulties over certain appointments it has failed to confirm, and it comes to the House and asks the lower chamber to help it out. Well, the House won't do it."

Having delivered this ultimatum to an emissary from the Senate, substantially as quoted, Speaker Cannon dropped his gavel and declared the House adjourned. Under the rule it will meet again at noon on Monday, when, according to the constitutional provision, the regular session must begin, and, to borrow a now famous expression, the Senate does not know "where it is."

Even up to the eleventh hour the "better thought" of the Senate could not realize that the House would have the audacity to withstand the Senate's urging and place the upper chamber "in a hole," and consequently adjournment was taken to-day until 11:30 on Monday, when, it was assumed, the House would feel compelled to send over the usual adjournment resolution, as was done in the XLVIIth Congress. Ever since early last week the House has stood ready to adopt an adjournment resolution if one should come from the Senate, but the Speaker and his advisers have positively declined to have such a resolution introduced at their end of the Capitol.

When Mr. Keen returned to the Senate and announced the Speaker's decision there was consternation among the few Senators remaining at the Capitol. As one Senator expressed it, it was a case of "Sheridan twenty miles away"—referring to the fact that Senator Aldrich had not yet returned from Rhode Island. Mr. Aldrich arrived in Washington this evening, but he had not marshaled his forces at a late hour, his lieutenants being scattered far and wide—at the Gridiron dinner, Senator Depew's dinner and similar entertainments. After he had removed the stains of travel he came down to the almost deserted lobby of the Arlington, which was occasionally penetrated by some burst of laughter from the Gridiron guests. When asked, what the Senate would do, Mr. Aldrich smiled and murmured sadly, "There was a sound of revelry by night," and then withdrew to his rooms to think it over.

It is the intention of the Speaker to take no cognizance of the expiration of the special and the beginning of the regular session, and he holds that there are precedents for the merging of one session into another, all of which, however, occurred before 1867. Since that time it has been the custom to adjourn special sessions, announce the convening of the new, and so inform the President.

FAILURE OF NOMINATIONS.

The Senate, however, is unwilling to follow the lead of the House under the circumstances, but any other course will be attended with serious difficulties because of the peculiar status in which it will place some of the officeholders whose nominations have been sent to the Senate, they having been recess appointments, but have failed of confirmation. Among these are the nominations of General Wood, Dr. Crum, the colored Collector of the Port of Charleston, S. C., who is now serving under his second recess appointment, Mr. McClelland, member of the Board of General Appraisers of New-York, and numerous others. All recess appointees who fail of confirmation at the session of Congress following their appointment are thereby displaced, unless again selected as recess appointees by the President. According to some authorities, the failure of the special session to adjourn leaves no interim, and therefore gives the President no opportunity to send in his recess appointments, and this would leave the appointees out of office until they had been appointed again and confirmed by the Senate. This position is held by Senator Allison and other leaders of the Senate. Senator Lodge, on the other hand, maintains that there must be an interval, even though imperceptible, between the two sessions, and that, therefore, the President is empowered to reappoint those who have failed of confirmation as recess appointees. This view is also held by a number of army officers.

Still another solution of the problem is offered, and that is that the Senate, in the half hour on Monday which remains to the present session, adopt by unanimous consent a resolution making all appointments which have been confirmed continuing business. It is not certain, however, that this can be done legally, while it is more than possible that the objection of certain Senators to the confirmation of General Wood and the opposition of Senator Tillman to the confirmation of Crum might induce some one to object to such a resolution.

The present outlook is that the President will be compelled to call on the Attorney General for advice, and it is hoped that some way out of the dilemma may be found before Monday. It should be added that the contest between the House and the Senate has been friendly, although not the less determined, but the boys who bet their money on "Uncle Joe Cannon" believe that the stakes are theirs.

LAST OF EXTRA SESSION.

More Tariff Talk in House—Adjournment Until Monday.

Washington, Dec. 5.—In the House to-day Mr. Williams, the minority leader, asked and obtained unanimous consent that an hour be given to general discussion, thirty minutes to each side. Mr. Russell (Dem., Tex.) was recognized for fifteen minutes. Mr. Russell, replying to Mr. Heburn and quoting statistics, charged that the wealth of the country, in consequence of the policies of the dominant party, had been concentrated in the hands of a few people.

Mr. De Armond (Dem., Mo.), calling attention to the make up of the committees, said that on each of the sixteen most important committees the Republicans have eleven members and the Democrats six. This, he said, was unjust and unfair, and was an outrage to a minority which was entitled to a larger representation. Mr. De Armond also charged that the committees were made up for partisan purposes. He said he would propose a resolution with a view to adding one Democrat to each of the sixteen committees.

Mr. Martin (Rep., S. D.) reviewed the operation of the various Democratic and Republican tariffs, and said that the protective tariff principle had been thoroughly established in the country. If the Democrats ever wished to assume control of the government was recognized for fifteen minutes. Mr. Russell, replying to Mr. Heburn and quoting statistics, charged that the wealth of the country, in consequence of the policies of the dominant party, had been concentrated in the hands of a few people.

Mr. De Armond (Dem., Mo.), calling attention to the make up of the committees, said that on each of the sixteen most important committees the Republicans have eleven members and the Democrats six. This, he said, was unjust and unfair, and was an outrage to a minority which was entitled to a larger representation. Mr. De Armond also charged that the committees were made up for partisan purposes. He said he would propose a resolution with a view to adding one Democrat to each of the sixteen committees.

Mr. Martin (Rep., S. D.) reviewed the operation of the various Democratic and Republican tariffs, and said that the protective tariff principle had been thoroughly established in the country. If the Democrats ever wished to assume control of the government was recognized for fifteen minutes. Mr. Russell, replying to Mr. Heburn and quoting statistics, charged that the wealth of the country, in consequence of the policies of the dominant party, had been concentrated in the hands of a few people.

Mr. De Armond (Dem., Mo.), calling attention to the make up of the committees, said that on each of the sixteen most important committees the Republicans have eleven members and the Democrats six. This, he said, was unjust and unfair, and was an outrage to a minority which was entitled to a larger representation. Mr. De Armond also charged that the committees were made up for partisan purposes. He said he would propose a resolution with a view to adding one Democrat to each of the sixteen committees.

Mr. Martin (Rep., S. D.) reviewed the operation of the various Democratic and Republican tariffs, and said that the protective tariff principle had been thoroughly established in the country. If the Democrats ever wished to assume control of the government was recognized for fifteen minutes. Mr. Russell, replying to Mr. Heburn and quoting statistics, charged that the wealth of the country, in consequence of the policies of the dominant party, had been concentrated in the hands of a few people.

Mr. De Armond (Dem., Mo.), calling attention to the make up of the committees, said that on each of the sixteen most important committees the Republicans have eleven members and the Democrats six. This, he said, was unjust and unfair, and was an outrage to a minority which was entitled to a larger representation. Mr. De Armond also charged that the committees were made up for partisan purposes. He said he would propose a resolution with a view to adding one Democrat to each of the sixteen committees.

Mr. Martin (Rep., S. D.) reviewed the operation of the various Democratic and Republican tariffs, and said that the protective tariff principle had been thoroughly established in the country. If the Democrats ever wished to assume control of the government was recognized for fifteen minutes. Mr. Russell, replying to Mr. Heburn and quoting statistics, charged that the wealth of the country, in consequence of the policies of the dominant party, had been concentrated in the hands of a few people.

Mr. De Armond (Dem., Mo.), calling attention to the make up of the committees, said that on each of the sixteen most important committees the Republicans have eleven members and the Democrats six. This, he said, was unjust and unfair, and was an outrage to a minority which was entitled to a larger representation. Mr. De Armond also charged that the committees were made up for partisan purposes. He said he would propose a resolution with a view to adding one Democrat to each of the sixteen committees.

Mr. Martin (Rep., S. D.) reviewed the operation of the various Democratic and Republican tariffs, and said that the protective tariff principle had been thoroughly established in the country. If the Democrats ever wished to assume control of the government was recognized for fifteen minutes. Mr. Russell, replying to Mr. Heburn and quoting statistics, charged that the wealth of the country, in consequence of the policies of the dominant party, had been concentrated in the hands of a few people.

Mr. De Armond (Dem., Mo.), calling attention to the make up of the committees, said that on each of the sixteen most important committees the Republicans have eleven members and the Democrats six. This, he said, was unjust and unfair, and was an outrage to a minority which was entitled to a larger representation. Mr. De Armond also charged that the committees were made up for partisan purposes. He said he would propose a resolution with a view to adding one Democrat to each of the sixteen committees.

Mr. Martin (Rep., S. D.) reviewed the operation of the various Democratic and Republican tariffs, and said that the protective tariff principle had been thoroughly established in the country. If the Democrats ever wished to assume control of the government was recognized for fifteen minutes. Mr. Russell, replying to Mr. Heburn and quoting statistics, charged that the wealth of the country, in consequence of the policies of the dominant party, had been concentrated in the hands of a few people.

MILEAGE FOR CONGRESS.

Extra Session Gives Members \$190,000—Customs of the Past.

(FROM THE TRIBUNE BUREAU.)

Washington, Dec. 5.—When the Congress convenes in regular session Monday morning, one of the matters to have early consideration will be that of mileage. Probably not later than Tuesday a joint resolution will be introduced appropriating \$190,000 for payment of travelling expenses of the 476 Senators and Representatives to and from the seat of the national government.

The LVIIIth Congress, at its last session, appropriated a like amount for this purpose, covering, as was supposed, the first session of the LVIIIth Congress. On the first day of the extra session, which convened November 9, a resolution was passed making immediately available the money appropriated for the regular session. Thereupon 476 members marched up to the sergeant-at-arms' office and drew their allowance of 20 cents a mile, each way, the amounts varying from \$10 to \$2,400, aggregating \$190,000. It is an established custom in Congress that an extra session carries with it a double appropriation for mileage, and members who have been sounded on the subject have intimated that precedent would be followed in dealing with the mileage problem for the extra session of the LVIIIth Congress. Members will draw their extra mileage, whether they have gone to their homes since November 9 or not.

The question of travelling expenses for members of Congress was first formally taken up by that body at the close of the first session, September, 1789, when the following law was enacted:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That at every session of Congress and at every meeting of the Senate in recess of the Congress prior to March 4, 1795, each Senator shall be entitled to receive \$6 for every day he shall attend the Senate, and shall be allowed at the commencement and end of every session and meeting \$6 for every twenty miles of the estimated distance by the most usual route from his place of residence to the seat of Congress, and in case any member shall be detained by sickness on his journey to or from any such session or meeting, or after his arrival shall be unable to attend the Senate, he shall be entitled to the same daily allowance. Provided always, that no Senator shall be allowed a sum exceeding the rate of \$6 per day from the end of one such session or meeting to the time of his taking his seat in another.

The basis of computation was originally fixed at 30 cents a mile, each way, to cover the actual travelling expenses of the member. The horse and the stage coach were the only means of conveyance in those days, and the figure was placed at \$6 a day because from actual experience it had been found that this amount was consumed by many members, notably those residing in mountainous regions, in making the journey to the national capital. It was found that twenty miles constituted a good average day's travel, and, as a member's position determined some little display and style, for which he was compelled to pay handsomely at the hotels on the way, the \$6 a day did not more than cover actual cost.

Evidently some of the members found even this amount inadequate, for on March 4, 1795, when the first law expired, the rate for travelling expenses was increased to 35 cents a mile. The new act was retroactive for a period of six months. It is evident that the additional five cents a mile was not favorably viewed by the people at large, however, as the following year the old rate of 30 cents was again adopted. The salary, which had been raised from \$6 to \$7 a day, was also reduced to the original amount. In 1818 Congress fixed the compensation for members at \$8 a day, with 40 cents a mile for each way for travelling expenses. This rate continued in force until 1866, when a law was passed fixing the compensation of members at \$5,000 a year and mileage at 20 cents a mile each way.

In 1850, when California blossomed into Statehood and sent two Senators and two Representatives to Congress, the only practicable means of reaching Washington was by steamer around Cape Horn. The allowance for mileage at that time was 40 cents a mile each way. When the four members from the Golden Gate State presented mileage certificates aggregating nearly forty-eight thousand miles, entitling them to about \$38,000, the presiding officers hesitated before approving the vouchers, signing them, however, after investigating the law and ascertaining that such payment would be strictly within the statute. The distance was nearly twice thousand miles, and at 40 cents a mile each way each member was entitled to draw about \$9,500. As a matter of fact, the four members from California received almost as much money for mileage as the rest of the members of Congress combined.

In those days ocean transportation was primitive. The greynod of to-day had not arrived. The Flying Dutchman steamboats, plying between New-York and San Francisco, in pressed hard, were able to make the distance in ninety days—six months for the round trip. Following a short session of Congress, the members of the California delegation were able, providing they could immediately connect with the Flying Dutchman, to reach their homes and give three months to personal and political affairs before embarking upon a return steamer for Washington, to resume their seats for the long session. Then fifteen months must elapse before the California members could again sight the Golden Gate. The long sessions usually lasted until July or longer, leaving insufficient time to make the round trip before December.

The California Senators and Representatives found some compensation, however, in the allowance drawn for mileage, which in their cases amounted to more than three times the amount of salary. The latter compensation was approximately \$3,000 annually, from 1818 to 1866. After a long session, even though unable to go home, the California members drew the \$9,500 allowance of mileage, just the same. In the latter part of the fifties a railroad was constructed across the Isthmus of Panama, and the California members made use of this method of reaching Washington. Although this shortened the time of transit so they were able to return home after even a long session, they nevertheless apparently considered the Cape Horn route by way of the Flying Dutchman as the "most usual route," as prescribed in the statutes. At all events, each Californian continued to collect his \$9,500 mileage allowance, and this custom was continued even after the transcontinental railroad began operation. This was a bonanza for the Far West members, who drew nearly \$15,000 annually for a time, while the actual cost of travel could not have exceeded \$200 for the round trip.

However, this practice did not long continue after the Pacific Railroad was completed, as early in the 70's Schuyler Colfax, then President of the Senate, called a halt, and declined to approve certificates of the California delegation for \$9,500 each for mileage, and after 1866 the Californians were paid for 3,500 miles at 20 cents a mile, instead of for 12,000 miles at 40 cents a mile each way.

By the act of March 3, 1873, Congress voted to pay its members at the rate of \$7,500 annual salary, with actual travelling expenses, the mileage already paid for the XLIIth Congress to be deducted from the salary of those who had received it. The act was made retroactive, dating back two years, practically putting \$5,000 in the hands of each member. This was known as "the salary grab," and the voice of the people at the next election was so emphatic that Congress made haste to repeal the law and the salary again became \$5,000, with mileage at 20

HANSBROUGH'S LAND BILL

He Says It Will Not Injure Government Irrigation Projects.

(FROM THE TRIBUNE BUREAU.)

Washington, Dec. 5.—Senator Hansbrough, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, said to-day that there was no truth in the report that his Land bill would operate to the injury of the irrigation projects of the government by permitting land owners, under the Liebu Land Selection act, to select land which has already been reserved for irrigation purposes.

"It will be found that this charge was originally made for ulterior purposes," said the Senator. "It was intended to lead to the repeal of the act. The fact is that lands withdrawn under the irrigation act are held to be lands appropriated for a specific purpose, and under the rulings of the Interior Department forest reserve selection rights cannot be used on lands otherwise appropriated. My bill does not re-enact the Forest Reserve Land Selection law. It simply amends it, so as to provide that lands taken under it shall not be more valuable for timber than for agriculture. The rule of construction repeatedly laid down by the Supreme Court sustains the department in its decisions rejecting all applications to locate forest reserve selection rights or any kind of land scrip upon lands appropriated for a specific purpose, as in the case with lands under the irrigation law. I think the real friends of national irrigation may be depended upon to sustain the purposes of the law, even against those irresponsible persons who seek to foster private schemes under color of blatant pretences of excessive patriotism."

WOMAN HAS PENSION DISCONTINUED.

But Will Ask for It Again if Her Income Is Reduced.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Josephine E. E. Henry, a widow pensioner, of Boston, has asked the Commissioner of Pensions to discontinue her pension and the request has been granted. In submitting the request she says:

I had some money left me, sufficient for my support, and I did not feel that it was right to draw the pension under these circumstances, and I gave it up of my own free will, not desiring to swear that I was dependent upon my daily labor.

If at any time my income is reduced, so it comes within the law, I shall ask to be restored to the pension rolls.

J. S. FASSETT A CANDIDATE.

Willing to Run for Congress, and Stands for Platt and Roosevelt.

(BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.)

Almira, N. Y., Dec. 5.—J. S. Fassett formally announced to-day his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Congress in the XXXIIIrd District, composed of Steuben, Chemung, Schuyler and Seneca counties. He said:

I understand that Congressman C. W. Gillet is a candidate, although at the last Congress convention I was assured that he would not be. I do not attach much importance to assurances of this kind, but I do feel that it is perfectly fair for me to enter the field.

Regarding the situation in State politics he said: I stand for Senator Platt and for President Roosevelt.

TYNER AND BARRETT DEMUR.

They Hold That the Indictments Against Them Are Defective.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Demurors to each of the three indictments in the postoffice cases returned against Harrison J. Barrett and James N. Tyner have been filed in the District Supreme Court, counsel for the defendants giving notice to the District Attorney that they would call up the demurrers next Friday.

There is a general averment in each demurrer that the indictment to which exception is taken and each count thereof is bad in law, and various alleged weaknesses and defects are set up in the specifications. Generally, it is alleged that the offences charged are not violations of law, and that no showing is made of the manner in which the United States was to have been defrauded by the alleged conspiracy.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Joseph K. McGammon to-day instituted proceedings in the District Supreme Court against Mabel Grace McKay, Henry F. Woodward and Philip Hichborn, as executors of the will of Colonel Nathaniel McKay, to recover \$11,411, representing 5 per cent of an amount collected for Colonel McKay on the account of the construction of certain light draught monitors. The plaintiff says that Colonel McKay agreed to pay him 5 per cent of the amount recovered for the construction of the claim.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Representative Overstreet, the new chairman of the Committee on Postoffices and Postroads, introduced a resolution to-day giving the committee authority to request the Postmaster General to send to it all papers connected with the recent re-stagflation of that department.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Joseph K. McGammon to-day instituted proceedings in the District Supreme Court against Mabel Grace McKay, Henry F. Woodward and Philip Hichborn, as executors of the will of Colonel Nathaniel McKay, to recover \$11,411, representing 5 per cent of an amount collected for Colonel McKay on the account of the construction of certain light draught monitors. The plaintiff says that Colonel McKay agreed to pay him 5 per cent of the amount recovered for the construction of the claim.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Demurors to each of the three indictments in the postoffice cases returned against Harrison J. Barrett and James N. Tyner have been filed in the District Supreme Court, counsel for the defendants giving notice to the District Attorney that they would call up the demurrers next Friday.

There is a general averment in each demurrer that the indictment to which exception is taken and each count thereof is bad in law, and various alleged weaknesses and defects are set up in the specifications. Generally, it is alleged that the offences charged are not violations of law, and that no showing is made of the manner in which the United States was to have been defrauded by the alleged conspiracy.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Representative Overstreet, the new chairman of the Committee on Postoffices and Postroads, introduced a resolution to-day giving the committee authority to request the Postmaster General to send to it all papers connected with the recent re-stagflation of that department.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Joseph K. McGammon to-day instituted proceedings in the District Supreme Court against Mabel Grace McKay, Henry F. Woodward and Philip Hichborn, as executors of the will of Colonel Nathaniel McKay, to recover \$11,411, representing 5 per cent of an amount collected for Colonel McKay on the account of the construction of certain light draught monitors. The plaintiff says that Colonel McKay agreed to pay him 5 per cent of the amount recovered for the construction of the claim.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Demurors to each of the three indictments in the postoffice cases returned against Harrison J. Barrett and James N. Tyner have been filed in the District Supreme Court, counsel for the defendants giving notice to the District Attorney that they would call up the demurrers next Friday.

There is a general averment in each demurrer that the indictment to which exception is taken and each count thereof is bad in law, and various alleged weaknesses and defects are set up in the specifications. Generally, it is alleged that the offences charged are not violations of law, and that no showing is made of the manner in which the United States was to have been defrauded by the alleged conspiracy.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Representative Overstreet, the new chairman of the Committee on Postoffices and Postroads, introduced a resolution to-day giving the committee authority to request the Postmaster General to send to it all papers connected with the recent re-stagflation of that department.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Joseph K. McGammon to-day instituted proceedings in the District Supreme Court against Mabel Grace McKay, Henry F. Woodward and Philip Hichborn, as executors of the will of Colonel Nathaniel McKay, to recover \$11,411, representing 5 per cent of an amount collected for Colonel McKay on the account of the construction of certain light draught monitors. The plaintiff says that Colonel McKay agreed to pay him 5 per cent of the amount recovered for the construction of the claim.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Demurors to each of the three indictments in the postoffice cases returned against Harrison J. Barrett and James N. Tyner have been filed in the District Supreme Court, counsel for the defendants giving notice to the District Attorney that they would call up the demurrers next Friday.

There is a general averment in each demurrer that the indictment to which exception is taken and each count thereof is bad in law, and various alleged weaknesses and defects are set up in the specifications. Generally, it is alleged that the offences charged are not violations of law, and that no showing is made of the manner in which the United States was to have been defrauded by the alleged conspiracy.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Representative Overstreet, the new chairman of the Committee on Postoffices and Postroads, introduced a resolution to-day giving the committee authority to request the Postmaster General to send to it all papers connected with the recent re-stagflation of that department.

Washington, Dec. 5.—Joseph K. McGammon to-day instituted proceedings in the District Supreme Court against Mabel Grace McKay,