

CLAIM OF H. N. ALEXANDER AND L. H. CHALMERS.

LETTER

FROM

THE ACTING SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

TRANSMITTING

An estimate from the Attorney-General of appropriation to pay the accounts of H. N. Alexander and L. H. Chalmers for services in defending certain Arizona Indians.

JUNE 29, 1888.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *June 28, 1888.*

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, copy of letter of the Attorney-General of the 26th instant, submitting for an appropriation the account of H. N. Alexander and L. H. Chalmers for legal services in defending certain Indians in the Territory of Arizona charged with murder, \$2,000, there being no appropriation available for payment of the same.

Respectfully, yours,

HUGH S. THOMPSON,
Acting Secretary.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, June 26, 1888.

SIR: Herewith inclosed is a copy of a letter of the 19th instant, presenting a claim of H. N. Alexander and L. H. Chalmers for legal services in defending certain Indians in the Territory of Arizona charged with murder, being fifteen in number, together with the statement of the judge approving the account in the sum of \$2,000, forwarded to you for presentation to Congress, as the services were not authorized by the Department of Justice and do not fall within any appropriation at its command.

Very respectfully,

G. A. JENKS,
Acting Attorney-General.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., June 19, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a claim for services in defending certain Indians, as herein specified, and would respectfully ask a favorable consideration of the same.

Very respectfully,

H. N. ALEXANDER.

HON. A. H. GARLAND,
Attorney-General of the United States, Washington, D. C.

The United States of America to H. N. Alexander and L. H. Chalmers, Dr.

For legal services in defending, under the appointment by the court, the following-named cases, viz:

1. United States vs. Captain Jack—Apache Indian. Charge, murder; convicted; appealed; and petition for writ of habeas corpus.
2. United States vs. Zis-in teeth—Apache. Charge, murder; convicted; appealed.
3. United States vs. La-con—Apache. Charge, murder; convicted; appealed.
4. United States vs. Ilth-can—Apache. Charge, murder; convicted; appealed.
5. United States vs. Has-tiu-tu-day—Apache. Charge, murder; convicted; appealed.
6. United States vs. Tille-che-lay—Apache. Charge, murder; acquitted on first indictment.
7. United States vs. Tille-che-lay—Apache. Charge, murder; convicted on second indictment; appealed.
8. United States vs. Has-kin-ga-gah-lah—Apache. Jury disagreed first trial.
9. United States vs. Has-kin-ga-gah-lah. Charge, murder; convicted second trial; appealed.
10. United States vs. Gon-she-ee—Apache. Charge, murder; convicted; appealed; petition for writ of habeas corpus.
11. United States vs. Say-es—Apache. Charge, assault, intent to murder; convicted and appealed.
12. United States vs. Miguel—Apache. Charge, assault, intent to murder; convicted; appealed.
13. United States vs. Bronco Jim—Apache. Charge, murder; acquitted.
14. United States vs. Va-ca-she-viejo and another Apache. Appeared and plead nolle prosequi for witnesses.
15. United States vs. Whoma-a-ya and Minim-Curley-Maricopa Indians. Charge, murder; plead; trial postponed until November term, 1888.

The first ten cases are appealed and must be prepared for the supreme court. The two cases on writ of habeas corpus are prepared for the Supreme Court of the United States and are to be briefed; the attorneys claim that a reasonable fee for all the work is \$2,000, and that the Government should pay for the defending these people. We thus make our claim.

H. N. ALEXANDER.
L. H. CHALMERS.

I do hereby certify that the above services were performed. Judge Alexander proposes to present two of the cases to the United States Supreme Court, by habeas corpus; one on jurisdiction of the court for crime committed without, and for crime committed within the reservation.

I deem it of importance that the act of March, 1885, should be acted upon and finally settled by United States Supreme Court. There is great diversity of opinion by the bar of the Territory, and in view of this I think the above fee of \$2,000 is reasonable.

WM. W. PORTER,
District Judge.