

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

2-7-1834

Nancy McPherson.

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



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

Recommended Citation

H.R. Rep. No. 382, 23rd Cong., 1st Sess. (1834)

This House 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.

NANCY McPHERSON.

FEBRUARY 7, 1834.

Read, and laid upon the table.

Mr. E. WHITTLESEY, from the Committee of Claims, made the following

REPORT:

The Committee of Claims, to which was referred the petition of Nancy McPherson, formerly Nancy Clark, report:

That this claim was investigated at the 1st session of the 22d Congress, and a report against allowing the claim was made on the 9th of March, 1832, which is recorded in vol. 8, page 315, of the records of the committee, to which the committee refer, and make the same a part of this report. This committee, after an examination of the papers, concur in the former report, and submit the following resolution:

Resolved, That the prayer of the petitioner ought not to be granted.

MARCH 9, 1832.

The Committee of Claims, to which was referred the petition of Nancy McPherson, having had the same under consideration, report:

That the petitioner states she was the wife of Andrew Clark, and resided with her husband on the river Huron, where he cultivated a farm during the last war; that her husband was killed by the Indians in an incursion made from Fort Malden for the purpose of intercepting the American troops on the route from Ohio to Detroit, and all their property taken away or destroyed, amounting in value to \$1,078 75, and composed of a log house, valued at \$40, improvements upon the farm, but not specified, and personal property. She also declares that General Hull encouraged her husband to continue on his farm, and to keep an account of whatever property he might lose in consequence of the war, and that the loss should be made good by the United States, assigning as a reason for this, that he was situated near the route by which the troops of the United States were accustomed to pass and repass.

The petitioner seems to rely on this encouragement, given by General Hull to her husband, as a sufficient reason for the claim she now makes upon this Government for remuneration.

The committee sincerely regret that they cannot concur with the petitioner in this opinion. Her case is a hard one, but is in nowise distin-

guishable from many more instances of individual suffering and hardship. There is no pretence that any portion of this property was impressed or taken by public authority for the use or subsistence of the army, nor was it occupied as a military deposite under the authority of an officer or agent of the United States ; there is, therefore, no law or known regulation under which such a claim can be allowed.

That the law makes no provision for such a claim, is conclusive upon this committee. They will, however, remark that this claim, so far as they can learn from the Third Auditor, never was presented before, and that the lapse of more than seventeen years (which is the date of the earliest testimony adduced after the transaction occurred) casts a shade of suspicion over the whole demand, the more particularly as General Hull is no longer living. For these reasons the committee do not think the claim should be allowed, and accordingly submit the following resolution :

Resolved, That the claim of Nancy McPherson be rejected.