

5-20-1890

## Report : Petition of M. Blake

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



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

---

### Recommended Citation

S. Rep. No. 1044, 51st Cong., 1st Sess. (1890)

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 [darinfox@ou.edu](mailto:darinfox@ou.edu).

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

MAY 20, 1890.—Ordered to be printed.

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

REPORT:

[To accompany H. R. 4980.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill granting a pension to Margaret A. Blake, widow of George A. H. Blake, late colonel of the First Cavalry, and a brevet brigadier-general in the U. S. Army, have examined the same, and report:

After careful consideration of the bill, the committee recommend its passage, concurring in the House report appended, which they make part of their own.

HOUSE REPORT.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4980) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Blake, submit the following report:

General George A. H. Blake was born in Pennsylvania and appointed from that State first lieutenant Second Dragoons, June 11, 1836; in Florida to 1841, and engaged in actions with the Seminole Indians at Fort Welborn, Jupiter Inlet, and other engagements; captain Second Dragoons, December 3, 1839; was in the Indian Territory and Texas; in the war with Mexico, and engaged in the battles of Cerro Gordo, defense of Pueblo, battles of Contreras, Molino del Ray, Chapultepec, and City of Mexico; brevet major U. S. Army, August 17, 1847, for gallant and meritorious conduct in an affair at St. Augustine, Mexico; major First Dragoons, July 23, 1850; in Missouri, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington Territory to 1861, and engaged against the Apache and Navajo Indians; lieutenant-colonel First Cavalry, February 15, 1862; engaged in the Seven Day's fight and battles of Gaines's Mill, Virginia (in which he was slightly wounded); chief commissary of musters, Department of Virginia, to April, 1863; chief commissary of cavalry corps, Army of the Potomac, to December, 1863; was present at the actions at Aldie, Middletown, Upperville, and battle of Gettysburgh; special duty in the cavalry bureau, Washington, D. C., to April, 1864; commanding cavalry depot Giesboro' Point, Maryland, to September 1, 1864; special duty to February, 1865; member of a military commission at Washington, D. C., to March, 1866; brevet brigadier-general U. S. Army, March 15, 1865, for "gallant and efficient services during the Gettysburgh campaign;" commanding regiment and post of Fort Vancouver, Wash., and retired at his own request "for over forty years' service," December 15, 1870.

Thus it will be seen that for forty years and in three wars this faithful officer served his country in various positions of trust and responsibility, and finally retired from the service full of years and honors. The claim of his widow for pension was rejected on the ground that the "fatal disease originated subsequent to his retirement."

Strictly construed, as the law must necessarily be by the Pension Department, this was probably a correct decision for that department to make. But giving due weight to all the consequences and effects of a service continued for so many years and in

every variety of climate, from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific, and from the City of Mexico to Gettysburgh, your committee are of the opinion that it is not proven that his death did not originate from disease contracted in the service, and are disposed to give his widow the benefit of the doubt as to this point, and they are further of the opinion that, in view of the long and valuable services of General Blake, his widow, who is in impoverished circumstances, should have the pension asked for in the bill, and they therefore recommend its passage.

