

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

JULY 6, 1886.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted the following

REPORT:

[To accompany bill H. R. 2027.]

The Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2027) granting a pension to Joshua Armstrong, has carefully examined the same, and reports recommending the passage of the bill. The facts are clearly set forth in the annexed House report.

Joshua Armstrong applied for pension to the Pension Department, April 5, 1880, as the dependent father of John E. Armstrong, who enlisted April 2, 1875, in Company A, Seventh United States Cavalry, and was killed in the battle of Little Big Horn River, Montana Territory, June 25, 1876.

The Pension Bureau rejected the claim on the ground that the soldier left surviving a minor child, who is still living.

The birth of soldier's child, Ida Matilda, September 8, 1858, and child, Mary Emma, born January 26, 1861, is shown by verified copy of church record. Child Mary Emma was sixteen years of age January 26, 1877.

The facts of this case are briefly as follows: At the expiration of a previous term of service John E. Armstrong returned to his home with the intention of quitting the trade of war, and of resuming the arts of peace in the bosom of his family. But when he reached his home he found his wife living with another man and in a condition for which he disclaimed all responsibility. As soon as he realized the situation, he again left, re-enlisted April 2, 1875, and was killed as stated at the battle of Little Big Horn, June 25, 1876.

The two daughters whom he had by his wife are of age and married; the other child which his wife had he disclaimed all responsibility for.

It is in evidence that the soldier lived with his father prior to enlistment, and that he contributed to his support, sending him at one time as much as \$100 out of his pay for that purpose.

The father is old and suffering from senile affections, as described by the examining surgeon. His claim for a pension was rejected by the Pension Department because at the time of the filing of his application there was a minor child surviving. As she is now of age and married, your committee think that, as this objection no longer exists, the father should receive the asked for relief.