

IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

MARCH 26, 1850.

Submitted, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ATCHISON made the following

REPORT:

[To accompany bill S. No. 171]

*The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom were referred the papers in relation to the claims of H. J. McClintock, Harrison Gill, and Mansfield Carter, after an examination of the papers referred, and all the information that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs could furnish, find the following facts:*

In the year 1846, H. J. McClintock was employed by the sub-agent at the Grand Nemahaw sub-agency as farmer for the Sac and Fox Indians. He entered upon the discharge of his duties on the 12th of February of said year, and continued to discharge his duties as farmer until the 14th day of April, same year, when he was discharged by the superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis—not for any neglect of duty or offence, but for an alleged irregularity in his appointment. By his contract he was to receive fifty dollars per month. The claimant, McClintock, also employed two laborers, to assist in the labors on the farm, which he was authorized to do, for which he paid the sum of thirty-seven dollars and twenty cents.

Mansfield Carter was employed by the same sub-agent as assistant blacksmith for the Sac and Fox Indians, and was engaged in such employment from the 1st day of December, 1845, to the 14th of April, 1846, at twenty dollars per month, when he was discharged by the superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis, (Major Thomas Harvey.)

Harrison Gill was employed, by said sub-agent, as assistant farmer for said Indians, and was engaged in that business from the 17th of January, 1846, until the 14th of April thereafter, when he was discharged by the superintendent of Indian affairs at St. Louis. By his contract he was entitled to twenty dollars per month.

The proof is, that the claimants faithfully discharged their respective duties during the time they were employed, and that they were discharged from some alleged irregularity in their appointments; and that they were promised, at the time of their discharge, full payment by the superintendent, according to contract, for the time they were engaged. This has not been done.

The committee are of opinion that they are entitled to receive the amount they respectively claim, and report a bill accordingly.