

HEIRS OF MICHAEL CRYDER.

—
APRIL 12, 1842.

Laid upon the table.
—

Mr. HALL, from the Committee on Revolutionary Claims, made the following

REPORT:

The Committee on Revolutionary Claims, to which was referred the petition of the heirs of Michael Cryder, submit the following report:

The heirs of Michael Cryder claim pay for services rendered, and supplies furnished, certain Pennsylvania militia, employed in 1777, '78, '79, and 1780, to guard the frontiers of that State against the Indians, to the amount of £1,462, 17s. 6d.

The only evidence produced to sustain the claim, is an account of charges for rations, corn, oats, and services, sworn by Israel Cryder, on the 26th of November, 1841, to be in the hand-writing of his father, Michael Cryder; and the affidavit of David McMurtrie, taken in February, 1841, who says he was well acquainted with Michael Cryder, and boarded in his family in 1779 and 1780; and knows that, in 1780 or 1781, said Cryder furnished the militia, at a place now called Hollidaysburg, with flour, meat, and other provisions; and that he acted as a commissary, and was reputed to be an agent of the United States for the purpose of supplying the militia of the United States. There is also a paper filed, which has the appearance of a genuine original paper, by which it appears that, on the 1st of June, 1781, in pursuance of an order drawn by "Joseph Brady, quartermaster," Michael Cryder delivered to "Andrew Alworth, sergeant," twenty-five half pints of whiskey. This is all the evidence.

Only three insuperable objections to the allowance of this claim occur to the committee at present. The first is, that no sufficient proof is made that Michael Cryder rendered service, or furnished supplies to any body, except twenty-five half pints of whiskey to Andrew Alworth; the second is, that if Michael Cryder rendered service, or furnished supplies, as claimed, his account for the same must be supposed to have been settled and paid at the time; and the third is, that the claim, if there were any, would doubtless be against the State of Pennsylvania, and not against the United States.

Wherefore, the committee recommend that the claim be rejected.