

obtained. This case came to me as a case casually; I was not looking for it at all. I was called in by the committee. In this the Pension Bureau sent three for substantially the same evidence. How did that occur? Probably in this way: Some other witnesses who say their claim has been refused. It is easier to sit down and write a blank check for more evidence than to go to the trouble of

that it would be to examine the claim. If the claim was in order, additional copies would be filed, and the additional copy roll and hospital record must be made.

If this was an isolated case, it is likely I would have come across among the few cases that I saw. I went to the Surgeon General's Office and asked how many such claims in one year were made.

negligence almost beyond limit. There is something even worse than that, and that is the steady growth in the expense of this Bureau from the time it did its most efficient work until the present time. For instance, in 1886 this Bureau granted about fifty claims. At that time in that year the Bureau, from the best information I can get, was working honestly and well. Last year it granted what would be equivalent to 12,800

reply that there had been a rising number of applications for thirty-eight hundred, or about 21 percent. Now, if they were all in one department, this would be a very serious matter. I told the President of the Board of the Surgeon General's Office.

War Office there were many more cases where applications made for new evidence, in cases of persons who had been in the service of the War Office.

Probably in both there were several cases where applications made for new evidence, in cases of persons who had been in the service of the War Office.

Therefore, in this respect, we think that this work would be more difficult to do if this transfer should be made.

For instance lack of diligence, mere sense of duty to be an instance of not working.

I feel I would not so strongly insist on it. But it is in the interest of honesty and decency that I wish to see the Home to consider another case.

year was four hundred and twenty, that is during the year ending 20th of June, 1875. The number of clerks employed in 1860, when fifty thousand claims were adjusted, was one hundred and seventy-five. That is the labor has diminished in inverse ratio, and the force has increased proportionally. This being so would explain in this way, that the claim to be adjusted has increased from the time of the occurrence of a

Mr. Murphy. The charge made was something like this: That the Pension Board, just it should run out of work, had the habit of granting a pension to a man without getting the application settled, in order to compel him to make another application, and there would be more cases for the board to work upon, and thereby the Bureau would have to keep on working. I am not sure that I acquired a little into the charge, but even causes more labor because it takes more evidence to do the work. You have to call two witnesses to move a man out of an office, and perhaps one would do. That will explain some portion, but not one fifth or one tenth of the discrepancy, so we must conclude there is a great deal of waste labor in this Bureau. I am now inquired of what use was the finance department consisting of forty-eight, and he said

Murphy, which it was claimed among many of the kind. I do not think it as an illustration. I am not at all obliged to find to what extent practical experience; but the extent, whether with the intended I cannot say. In this case Murphy, No. 160,481, the man died. He sent in his application for admission in February, The Secretary of the Bureau was told by him that he had been elected in 1915, 1917, he was granted a reprieve.

that if the Third Auditor of the Treasury was up with his work there would be no more such cases.

Now, there are barnacles fastened on this machine all over. It has been used as the place in which the politician might put his protegee when they came here after he had been elected to Congress, and they were to be and should be obeyed by this Congress.

But there is another view than this. I wish to call the attention of the

\$15 per month. Prior to that the Surgeon's certificate, dated July 18, 1865, "Surgeon Randall reports that the patient is not improving" was granted the Surgeon reported to the office that the patient was totally disabled. On the 21st of July the patient died. The pension was granted it seems that the patient was totally disabled, he was wandering about slightly delirious. Very soon after the pension was granted he died.

and notice from his attorney to appear for an increase, and he does appear, but on the ground that he is not a member of the party, 1876, the grade "total" was returned. His certificate is then returned in amount to \$20 per month, July 11, 1871. But this is not yet the end of his consumption by any means. He is told that the only way to get a good deal is to get a good deal, and require this poor blind man to seek his evidence in darkness, to seek for an increase, and he gets

time. His pension is then \$24,000. That is on the basis of June, 1872. First it is \$15, then, and then \$24. Now, you would conclude that he was not as good as he was with this man; that the substance was exhausted. But no, it was not exhausted, it was only a little lessened by a little. They had only just a little lessened it. They then sent out some officers of the service; at least by the time they reduced his grade.

the duty of the House to inquire whether this Bureau is where it should be or not? I ask you to consider it honestly as men and not as politicians. I think that the House should wish to call the attention of the House, which seems to me to be a most flagrant violation of law by this Bureau. The indications so far have been cases of negligence, but what I am now coming to is the question of the flagrant and nothing less than emboldened under-

Mr. Chairman, could this thing be altered? Ought an office that has its work no more diligently than this be permitted to consider a Government of American people? Ought it to be known that something ought to be done; ought I, my duty as chairman of the committee to bring the matter to the attention of this House and the Nation? I think that the only business is done negligently in the House of Representatives—the statute—and that is the misappropriation and division of a public fund from the purpose for which it was granted. I think that the answer is yes. John Stiles was called before the Committee on Invalid Pensions and testified that he had been employed in the service of the Republican Congressional committee during the summer and fall of 1902, and that he had been paid out of the Pension fund. This substantially was his evidence. Mr. Atkinson, the Commis-

her way. For instance if you report the loss of the Third auditor Treasury you will find that the money has been returned by this money to Army pensioners. The money is returned by this money on page 178 & \$29,171.97. You expect that the return of the Bureau would correspond with what it does not. If you look at the money returned by this money you find that the amount paid to pensioners is returned as \$29,171.97. For instance, testified that William Caffrey and others who had been employed by the Bureau of Prisons, professional committee had also been paid out of the invalid pension fund. This is diverting a public fund from the purpose for which it was appropriated, and the statute says this shall be visited with the punishment of death for one year in the penitentiary. But this is not the worst of it. If this were all, and there were nothing more, it might

It will be seen that there is a possibility of something over \$8,000 being paid over on the principle of mitigation. It is not clear whether the result of fraud, because I intended to charge anything that I was not fully assured of. It may be that I may be negligent. (Clarity in negligence; and I am dissatisfied with the negligence in business matters requires repro- and I ask that this House shall refer to this Bureau that reprobation be passed over on the principle of mitigation. It is not clear whether it is proved to be a custom by the late Commissioner of pensions himself. In his testimony, page 8, he stated that he understood from all parties that this was a custom, and that the principle of "embezzlement a custom." A crime visited with penal servitude of one year in the penitentiary because a custom! The people groaning under the burden of taxation and divi-

seems to deserve in this context. He is not a party to the purpose for party purposes! If this be a custom, is it not our duty to see that that custom shall cease? It has become so customary indeed that the party who gave the testimony scarcely conceives of any other possibility. He has been guilty of an act, it is true, which at law amounted to embezzlement, and yet did not in his testimony seem to be aware that he had committed a crime. He was under the impression that, owing to the large number of such acts, he was not liable.

members and is the keeping of the same in the report of the Commissioners of Pensioners, that of \$2,885,189.18 disposed of in a lump and in such a manner as the living man can tell where it is, except on his mere *ipse dixit*, and that the government pension claim is within the year.

the hammer fell.

scandal. I ask unanimous consent at the time of my colleague

I now send to the Clerk to be read a letter which came before me casually, showing the necessity of this office that the officers paid out of its fund shall do only the work of the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

FELTON, GRACE COURT, NEW YORK,  
September 28, 1874.

DEAR SIR: Yours of September 18, 1874, is received, together with letter and blanks from the Commissioner's Office at Washington. I now feel in regard to the matter in hand, for proof of marriage, and medical testimony, showing the

There was no objection.  
 In explanation of the  
 have just referred to, the Com-