

Washington City D.C.
March 10th 1857.

Sir

On the 31st of March last I received at my residence in Dayton Oregon your letter enclosing a copy of the ^{report of the} third Auditor of the Treasury upon my claim "growing out of expenses incurred by the U.S. Regiment of Mounted Rifles in Oregon in '49 & '50."

My official duties in the Indian Department at the time of its reception, and for several months subsequent precluded the possibility of devoting time to hunt up testimony. In fact the chief persons connected with that business who would be likely to know any of the facts and whose testimony would throw light upon the subject were transient persons - and have gone to parts unknown. There are three in that Territory who know the fact that I was acting as agent for Supt. Danks - and that I accompanied him on his expedition to Fort Dall. but they know nothing as to the consideration which was to have been paid for that service.

There was no written agreement between Supt. Danks and myself. - The ten horses furnished him were delivered after he had started on the expedition. The sums paid for which have ~~been~~ not taken were expenses necessarily

insured by his oral verbal direction anticipating
that the amount would be refunded me by
Sut & Perkins - and he was to account for the
same in his returns - The items for which
receipts were taken in his name - were bought
and paid for by his verbal direction and
receipts taken as in form, which he himself
furnished me. The amount of which he
was to refund me at our settlement - got it but
just, to me to say that he was much at
~~the time~~ interposed during the time of making
the cut but and very frequently after we
started on the trip - The first items
purchased by me were paid for by his
bankers Campbell & Smith who took law
from the parties - but being greatly annoyed
by not finding Sut & Perkins to obtain drafts
for the amounts, ^{for exactly 2000} I was about desirous to
send Sanger, when he gave me a check
on his bankers for a sum not now recollecting
and directed that the receipt should be taken
in Capt Ingham's name - one passage of these receipts
were handed to Sut & Perkins - and he with one
found others - My impressions have been that of

had other receipts of the same character - but
am now unable to find them, it is possible
they were handed him. at all events the
receipt more than covered the amount of money
handed me by his bankers on his order -
and my improper name on the amount
exceeded five thousand dollars. but those
purchases forms no part of the claims
for which I set up a claim - The services
rendered, the articles furnished by myself - and
the advances, were all predicated upon the
understanding that we were to settle on his
return to Oregon City. when he did return,
I had an interview with him but made
no settlement as he stated he could not
then do it ^{at that time} his sisters which soon
followed disqualified ^{him} from perfecting it.
and when the partial payment was made
he was so indisposed as to even render it,
difficult making his name to the requisition.

The amount advanced was not recorded as
specifically applicable to any one class of accounts
but was laid on an unsettled account -

I have no knowledge of the muster roll
beyond the statement of the quartermaster made
to the employees after they returned from
Fort Ball. That they could not say

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible handwriting, likely bleed-through from the reverse side. The text is too light to transcribe accurately.]

you reason that let Pauline's name was not signed to the one sent down from apt D all when Pauline remained during the minute. This explanation was also given by the let after he came to Oregon City. I may add that the amount \$3100.00 per month was really \$50.00 less than I was offered to remain at Oregon City. And that the balance due me as charged in the account is justly due me but I do not know that it is possible to obtain testimony upon the subject at this late date. All of which is respectfully

~~submitted~~ For the information of the department and benefit of let Pauline I have to say, that it is understood - Pauline's bankers - Campbell & Smith, the latter under a fictitious name original being Alcott, have in their possession vouchers belonging to let Pauline amounting to over eight thousand dollars

All of which is respectfully submitted

Very respectfully
J. W. Let

Luell Palmer

Prot. of Alkinson Exp }
Auditor }
Washington D.C. }

Letter in support of the
of claims against the
in case of Parker's
claims