

University of Oklahoma College of Law

University of Oklahoma College of Law Digital Commons

American Indian and Alaskan Native Documents in the Congressional Serial Set: 1817-1899

12-4-1879

Report : Petition of M. Cahill

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/indianserialset>



Part of the [Indigenous, Indian, and Aboriginal Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

S. Rep. No. 17, 46th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1879)

This Senate Report is brought to you for free and open access by University of Oklahoma College of Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in American Indian and Alaskan Native Documents in the Congressional Serial Set: 1817-1899 by an authorized administrator of University of Oklahoma College of Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact Law-LibraryDigitalCommons@ou.edu.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

DECEMBER 4, 1879.—Ordered to be printed.

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

REPORT:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Margaret Cahill, respectfully report:

Cahill was captain Company I, Second Regiment United States Cavalry. He was twenty-six years in military service, having been wounded severely in the Mexican war, and in battle with the Indians in 1859. He died in Dakota Territory February 6, 1868. The records of the War Office show that the cause of his death was "delirium tremens." The application of his widow for pension was rejected on the ground that the soldier did not die of disease contracted in the line of duty in the service of the United States.

To rebut the record, Mrs. Cahill presents the affidavits of Michael Flynn and M. H. Wolfe, who testify that they knew Cahill, and were with him when he died; that he was not in the habit of drinking to excess; that they gave him some whisky to stimulate him in his last illness; that the attending surgeon smelled his breath, and on this account certified that he died of delirium tremens.

Flynn signs the affidavit with his mark. Both are evidently prepared by the same person, and bear date in February, 1879.

The application does not appear to be sustained by competent evidence, and the committee therefore ask to be discharged from further consideration of the petition.