1-31-1898

Argument for free homes.

55TH CONGRESS, 2d Session. } SENATE. { DOCUMENT No. 106.

ARGUMENT FOR FREE HOMES.

JANUARY 31, 1898.—Referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented the following

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN H. KING BEFORE THE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON THE FREE-HOMESTEAD BILL.

Last week Col. J. H. King, who is in Washington as South Dakota agent before the Court of Claims, appeared before the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives and made the following able argument for the free-homes bill now pending. Prior to 1890 the Government lands were given in blocks of 160 acres to anyone who cared to settle on them and live five years. In that year was passed the bill opening the great Sioux Reservation, and later bills opening the Yankton and Sisseton reservations in South Dakota. In this bill it was provided for the first time that the homesteaders should pay $1.25 per acre for their land. The present bill repeals that provision and reestablishes the old free-homestead system. The bill has passed the Senate and is pending in the House. The following is Colonel King's argument verbatim:

This free-homestead bill presents questions that I do not believe are fully understood or its equity and justice fully appreciated.

A very brief history or statement of the previous policies, laws, and precedents of the Government, together with the facts connected therewith and the equity and justice of the cause, will, I think, be interesting and instructive.

THE FREE-HOMESTEAD LAW.

The free-homestead law of the United States is one of the boasted achievements of the legislation of our Government for the good of the common people. Beneficent in its purposes and results, it became a law May 24, 1862. The names of the men who fostered it are revered in a million homes in the public-land States.

From 1862, when Galusha A. Grow and his compeers saw their free-homestead bill go to the immortal Lincoln for signature, until 1890, when the Dawes Sioux bill took effect, every poor man aspiring to have a home of 160 acres for himself and family could go anywhere upon the public domain open to settlement and take a homestead free (except the land office fees) of any of the choicest lands, and by living on it and cultivating it for five years it was his, without money and without price. It matters not whether it touched a great river, where a steamboat made him a market or a railroad run close to it, or if there was a

splendid spring or good timber and prairie adjoining, all was free to the American citizen and his family, and to him who had declared his intentions to be such, notwithstanding he was fresh from foreign shore.

Your committee have already found and traced the history of the purchase of Florida and the magnificent domain west of the Mississippi, amounting to 1,182,489,680 acres at a total cost of $88,157,390, and up to 1880 the Government had realized over $200,000,000 from the public domain, a profit of $120,000,000.

Your committee have enumerated and described the magnificent commonwealths carved out of this domain, twenty-three great States and four Territories. You have also enumerated their wealth to the Government of over $23,000,000,000. You have given due credit to the men who have passed and approved the old homestead law, and due credit to the magnificent results of the measure as it stood on the statute book for nearly thirty years.

WHY WAS IT CHANGED?

But why the change? Who brought it about, and what was the motive? What is the history of our new law? What munificent reward is it giving to the people, and does it build up the nation? Is it fair and just to her people, and should it remain upon the statute books in its changed condition? Has an injustice been done to a worthy class of people? Has a wrong been done or committed? Has a mistake been made? Has the policy of the Government been cunningly, unfairly, or irregularly changed without the full knowledge or consent of the people? Has the homestead law been substantially repealed as to a large part of the public domain without its ever having been submitted to the Public Lands Committee of either the House or Senate? Have any long-time policies or laws of the Government been changed without a full and fair hearing? Have the homestead settlers been misled, or have they misunderstood the situation? Have they a just reason or just cause to complain because of the change?

First. This change in the law, now affecting 28,911,630 acres of the public domain, was first brought about, substantially repealing the homestead law in all of its real merit and inducements as understood by the people, without its ever having been submitted to the Public Lands Committee of either House of Congress. Repealed or changed in an Indian treaty or agreement, and disposed of entirely by the Indian Committee as a subordinate question, incident to the agreement. Mark what I say, the Sioux bill—known as the Dawes bill—first planned, talked of, agreed to in conference with the Indians, and finally incorporated in the bill of March 2 of 1889, and never submitted to the Public Lands Committee of either House, was the first change made in the land laws.

Second. Who brought the change about, and what were the motives? Holman, of Indiana, and Dawes, of Massachusetts, are the fathers of the measure. They more than all others are responsible for the change in the law; ingrafted in the law and agreement at their suggestion, and retained by their persistence, in the bill of 1889, in the agreement with the Sioux Indians of Dakota Territory, pressed through the Indian committee of the Senate by Senator Dawes against and over our feeble protest; pressed through the Indian committee of the House by Mr. Holman and passed through Congress at a time when Dakota Territory had no vote in either the House or the Senate, and affecting no lands outside of Dakota Territory, excepting a small tract of land taken from

Dakota and given to Nebraska, north to the Kapaha River, which Nebraska was so anxious to get that they did not care to be particular about how it was opened. And thus, for the first time since the homestead bill became a law, it was changed so far as this part of the public domain was concerned that was opened under the Sioux bill, and each settler, each homesteader, seeking a home on this public domain found for the first time in the history of the homestead law a mortgage on the land for more than it was worth.

WHO DID IT?

Why was this done? Mr. Holman was especially opposed to the passage of the Sioux bill, unless some arrangements were made by which the Government would be reimbursed, and he insisted also on some plan for a smaller appropriation than would be required for the release of the Indian claim; and Senator Dawes, to meet these objections, proposed the plan of fixing a price for the land and creating a trust fund for the Indians, and the idea was given to the Indians that they would receive in the end even a larger sum than if the Government had paid an ordinary price for the surrender of their rights, and thus an immediate large appropriation was avoided and the pay to the Indians due from the Government settled on the homestead settler and Holman's objection overcome, and the poor homestead settler finds, to his sorrow, that the policies of the Government for a hundred years, that the Indian was a ward of the nation and his support a charge upon the whole Government, have been reversed and changed.

The homestead settler found himself charged with the support of the Indians. The poor homesteader now realized that he was not taxed as other people, for the support of the Government in a general way, but had to contribute to the support of the other Indians, and that there was a mortgage placed directly on his particular homestead to support these particular Indians, which he must pay before he could get the land. The homesteader could now see his dusky neighbor, with triple the amount of land, housed, fed, clothed, and schooled, and the expenses be paid by the homesteader instead of the Government. He could see the Indians without taxation, and yet this homesteader settler must face failure of crops, suffer the privations and hardships of frontier life, support his own family, be taxed for his own children to go to school, and then pay the mortgage on his own home to support these particular wards of the nation, the Sioux Indian.

Do you wonder the homesteader complains?

THE HOMESTEADER'S SORROW.

Following close upon the negotiations of the Sioux bill came the opening of the Oklahoma Territory, with its thousands of eager watchers and land seekers, in that supposed delectable paradise. And this land fell a prey to substantially the same kind of a policy largely under the influence of the same men. Be this policy good or bad, Senator Dawes and Judge Holman are fairly entitled to the credit or responsibility of it. Before the people were aware of it or had considered the results of it or had the experience of crop failures and the setbacks incident to a new country or knew by actual experience the hardships of frontier life, they were caught and the burden was upon them—pay day came and they had no money. They had listened to the glowing stories of the boomer and rushed wildly into, they knew not what; they had not

before understood by actual toil that a homestead no longer meant free land. They now for the first time began to realize that the Government had reversed its long-time politics of supporting its own wards, the Indians, and that the burden of millions on millions of dollars heretofore resting on the General Government and on the whole people was now saddled upon their own individual shoulders.

Later on the new theory was adopted with other reservations, and before the real results were known, even by Congress, pay day came to these poor people, and by this time the rule or ruin policy had become quite generally adopted; and North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon and Oklahoma all found themselves burdened with the new law, and a few of their people charged with the burden of paying the enormous sum certified by the Secretary of the Interior, to over $35,000,000, which must be eventually paid by these people on these particular lands, remain untaken and untaxable, practicably remaining a wilderness, or, if taken, possibly go into the hands of loan companies, or by them transferred to innocent holders that can illy afford to take them, and be really a detriment to the country for them to have them.

OUR TRADITIONAL POLICY.

If a bill had been introduced in Congress in 1888 proposing to repeal the free-homestead law to a larger portion of the public domain, and proposing to tax these poor homestead settlers $35,000,000 to pay the honest debts of the Government (and if not honest then they ought not to be paid at all), it would not have received one single vote nor have been indorsed by a single member of this committee.

The policies, laws, and pledges of the Government, for over one hundred years unbroken, had been that the support and control of the Indians was derived from and rested in the nation as a whole.

From Lake Mohonk, in the Catskill Mountains, to the Cascade Range, the name "the wards of the nation" had been given the Indians, and with zealous care the Government had accepted, kept, and adopted them, by and through the nation as a whole, brooking all interference, the policy, the principle, the law, was adopted in the Constitution, laws, treaties, compacts, and agreements, sustained by our courts everywhere, and all the time, that they were the nation's wards.

PASSED IN THE DARK.

No State even was allowed jurisdiction over them or allowed to tax their property or try them for crime unless they became civilized, self-supporting, and renounced their tribal relations.

The Constitution of the United States, in the third clause, section 8, reserves the right to Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and between the States, and with the Indian tribes.

As early as 1795 the United States in their treaty with Spain even undertook to be responsible for the conduct of our Indians. (See article 5 thereof.)

The Government early established an Indian Bureau, with an Indian Commissioner, and provided relative to their management, education, and support. (See secs. 463 and 468, Rev. Stat.)

The jurisdiction of all civil and criminal matters of and for the Indians was reserved to and executed by the United States. (See chapter 4, title 28, as to the government of the Indian country.)

No State, corporation, or individual can bargain, trade, or do any business with any Indian or Indian tribe except through, under, or by the authority of the United States. (See title 3, chapter 28.)

Section 2149 provides even for the Indian Commissioner to remove any white person not authorized to be upon the reservation, and the power of the whole Army may be invoked to execute the order of removal.

Time will not allow me to detail all the laws, treaties, precedents, and policies, but there is one I must not pass over.

PRECEDENTS CITED.

In 1855 the State of Alabama having a large amount of Indian lands within her borders which the State could not tax, and with the well-established policy of the Government that the Indians were to be supported by the nation as a whole, came to Congress with the claim that these Indian lands could not be taxed or sold so as to get the 5 per cent, and that therefore the State was made to indirectly contribute to their support, and the State demanded compensation therefor, and Congress, after canvassing the question, conceded the demand was just, and authorized the Commissioner of the General Land Office to ascertain the number of acres of Indian or reservation lands and figure them at $1.25 an acre, and pay the State 5 per cent thereon. (See Io. U. S. Stat. L., p. 630.)

This same claim was made for Mississippi in 1857, and the same law passed, and by section 2 extended to all the States of the Union. (See II U. S. Stat. L., p. 200, March 3, 1857.) And under this law the following sums were paid:

Alabama	$128,336.42
Mississippi	167,686.17
Wisconsin	41,647.13
Michigan	19,829.10

While Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Ohio were paid smaller sums.

So thoroughly has this principle of complete control by the General Government become established and engrafted in our Constitution, policies, and laws, that Congress has gone so far as to incorporate it into all the enabling acts of the newer public lands States as they have been admitted into the Union, and before either of the Dakotas, Montana, Idaho, Washington, Wyoming, or Utah could be admitted into the Union they had to practically forever renounce any claim to control or tax the Indians as long as the Government exercised jurisdiction over them. (See the enabling act.)

WE CAN NOT TAX OUR MASTERS.

And we have in South Dakota the remarkable and peculiar facts never before seen in the annals of a free government, that of the Indians on the allotted portion of the Yankton and Sisseton reservations, full-fledged American citizens, with the right of elective franchise equal to any of us, yet we can not tax them on one dollar of their real estate.

The Indian vote to-day controls the balance of power between the political parties of South Dakota. The Indian vote can decide who shall be our Congressmen, governor, judges, and officers, and in choosing between the parties decide as to our policies, but we are powerless under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the enabling acts for our admission, to tax them a dollar.

The homesteader stands before your committee to-day in the remarkable position of being the servant of these Indians, toiling for their support, compelled to pay them millions, and while the homesteader toils the Indian is practically the homesteader's ruler. This is contrary to all precedent, and which never received the sanction of the Public Lands Committee of either House.

To undertake to say that considering the principles, policies, and laws of the American Government and considering the generally accepted rights of an American citizen in the ordinary sense, this change of our homestead law and this direct burden forced upon the homestead claimant to pay a debt of the Government which is the debt of the whole people, is one of the most unjust, unfair, and unrighteous laws that has ever crept into our statute books.

A MOST UNJUST CLAIM.

When we contemplate the past and figure up the expensive Indian wars wherein we obtained cessions of territory at such large expense, then follow up the expenditures of the Government under its more peaceable policy of treating or agreeing with the Indians for the amount we should pay them for their lands, and look the record over and see that up to 1880 we had paid the Indians in the United States the enormous sum of $187,000,000 for their relinquishment of the Indian title to the public domain (see Public Domain and its History, etc., p. 20), and that since that time we had averaged from about five to seven millions a year, and yet up to the Sioux bill of 1890 no thought was ever entertained of imposing a law for a direct tax upon an individual class to pay on any part of this great sum, we are struck with amazement at this new demand.

RAILROADS HELPED PEOPLE NOT.

Up to 1880 the Government had granted to the several States below named and to railroad corporations the following amounts:

	Acres.
Iowa	4,181,929
Wisconsin	3,553,865
Minnesota	9,820,450
Kansas	8,820,450
Nebraska	6,409,376
Dakota Territory	8,000,000
Total	40,191,082

Granted in the now seven States over 40,000,000 acres, mostly to railroads. But when we talk about giving 160 acres to a poor man for a home we are met with the suggestion that he must pay the debt of the Government to the Indian or he cannot have it for a home. Shame on such a proposition in the light of such facts!

Even if you tear up every platform of every party pledged to it, there remains such a strong ground of equity and good governmental policy behind this bill that there ought to be no question about your action in favor of it.

OUR INDIAN LANDS PURCHASED.

All these seven States were purchased from the Indians, and the price paid therefor is interesting, especially in view of the fact that all the land so purchased was open to free homestead settlement from and after the homestead bill was passed, and no exception was made until the

innovation was made on particular tracts in order to make an economical record for ambitious statesmen at the expense of the poor homesteader, who was the best friend the Government ever had; for he made it possible for the Government to grow great and the railroads to become rich. Four of the greatest railroads in the world have become rich and famous practically on homesteaders; so much so that they are called the Granger roads. Every man knows what roads I mean by that term—the Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul, the Chicago and Northwestern, the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific, and the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy. But in 1889 Dawes and Holman struck this class a fearful blow, and I think without provocation and without justification.

Iowa was ceded by a number of treaties. The Sacs and Foxes, the Osages, the Iowas, the different bands of the Sioux, all claimed portions of it.

Wisconsin by the Chippewas, Menominees, the Winnebagoos, the Wisconsins, and others.

Minnesota by the Sioux of many different tribes and the Chippewas and Minnesota Indians and other tribes.

The Dakotas were controlled by the Sioux and the Crows and a few Chippewas.

Nebraska by the Sioux, the Pawnees, the Omahas, Ponchas, and some of the Kansas Indians.

Kansas by the Osages, Shawnees, Miamies, Kansas Indians, and several other tribes.

The Arapahoes claim a portion of western Kansas and Nebraska, but I have not counted the amounts paid them.

Although I have made as careful an examination as my limited time and the means at my command for this purpose would allow, it is impossible, of course, to give exact figures. These figures, however, are taken from the receipts and expenditures of the Treasury Department, figuring rapidly in even hundreds and upward, and are of sufficient correctness to illustrate my position on the points involved.

WHAT WAS PAID.

I find that the United States Government has paid to the different bands of Indians for the territory composing the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and the two Dakotas, viz, over $100,000,000, divided as follows, covering the space of from 1853 to 1886 inclusive:

The Great Sioux Indians, including the Black Hills purchase, the sum of.	$37, 180, 000
The Sisseton, Medawakanton, and Wapkoota bands (which includes the Santee Sioux)	6, 000, 000
The Yankton Sioux	1, 500, 000
The Devils Lake Sioux and other Dakota Indians	2, 814, 000
The Winnebago Indians of Wisconsin and Minnesota	2, 393, 000
The Chippewas and affiliated bands	12, 000, 000
The Minnesota and Wisconsin Indians, including Memominees and White Earth	4, 228, 000
The Iowa Indians—Otoes and Missourias	3, 000, 000
The Sacs and Foxes	3, 000, 000
Other Iowa Indians	2, 700, 000
The Pawnees, Omaha, and other Nebraska Indians not including the Sioux	6, 700, 000
The Osages	8, 898, 000
The Shawnees, Miamis, and Kansas Indians	11, 450, 000

Making a grand total of figures correctly of $103,643,000. I feel morally certain that from my investigation of the books of the Treasury Department that this amount will fall below what was paid the Indians for lands in the States named.

I have found it difficult to apportion the amounts paid between the States, for the treaties or agreements paid no attention to State lines.

Making the best estimates I can as to the States considered, the lands ceded, and their areas, etc., I divided it as follows:

For Minnesota	$18,000,000
For Wisconsin	15,000,000
For Iowa	11,000,000
For Kansas	12,000,000
For Nebraska	11,000,000
For the two Dakotas	29,000,000

I, of course, do not pretend that this division is authentic, but it is the best I can make, and all this land that was not taken by 1862 was open to free homestead, for this $103,000,000 does not include any land affected by this bill; and no law was proposed that any homestead settler on any of this free homestead land should ever pay one dollar to reimburse this Government for all these millions so paid for lands in these several States.

INDIAN LANDS IN DAKOTA.

To give you an idea of the scope of the Indian lands in our two Dakotas I have to state that Dakota Territory, now North and South Dakota, in 1880 had a total of 57,713 square miles of Indian reservations—a total of 36,537,000 acres. The extent of this territory can be better realized in comparison with Iowa. Iowa only has 55,000 square miles, so it was a larger territory than the whole State.

According to the Secretary's report there have been ceded since 1880 from the great Sioux, Sisseton, and other reservations in North and South Dakota 11,114,540 acres, leaving a balance of over 25,000,000 acres in the two States, from 18,000,000 to 20,000,000 of which are in South Dakota. Indiana has only 21,000,000 acres, so the Government is asking a great deal of South Dakota.

How shall this wrong be righted?

If the principle is wrong, if it is an injustice to the homestead settler that he should be taxed to pay the debt of the Government to the Indians, if the Government of the United States as a whole should pay these obligations, it matters not, so far as righting the wrong is concerned, whether the Government assumed the obligations of payment to the Indians directly or indirectly, whether the Government in its agreement with the Indians undertook and promised to pay a sum certain whether the lands were taken or not, and then agreed, also, that the homesteaders who did take the land should pay a certain sum, intending thereby to reimburse the Government for an amount paid out, as in the case of the Yankton and Sisseton reservations, or, as in the case of the Sioux Reservation, when the Government agreed on a partial payment and then agreed that the lands taken should be for a certain sum, which should go into a trust fund for the benefit of the Indians, and then also provided that all lands not sold or taken within ten years should be paid for by the Government at 50 cents an acre, the principle is all the same, and the Public Lands Committee should not undertake to rectify one mistake by making another. The way to right the wrong is to go back to the starting point where the first mistake was made; that was in the case of the Sioux Reservation.

The time is nearly up for payment now by the Government, and the time has now also arrived for the payment to be only 50 cents an acre by the settlers, so the Government is committed to the payment of this sum, and the land not taken will amount to seven-eighths of the whole on the Sioux.

THE POOR HOMESTEADER.

So that the argument that when there is a trust fund it should be excluded from the bill does not apply with any equity to the Sioux Reservation, and I do not think it justly applies to any case. Besides, another thing, so far as South Dakota is concerned, the lands on the Yankton Reservation are very much more valuable than those on the Sioux. All are entirely too high for their real value as a general proposition. The lands are only good for grazing purposes, while those especially on the Sisseton are fair farming lands, reasonably well watered and very much better than the lands on the Yankton Reservation, while the lands on the Yankton Reservation, where water is much scarcer and fuel much higher, the Government charges $200 a quarter more to the homesteader.

Neither of these is a trust-fund reservation; the whole arrangement is inequitable and unfair.

Besides, it is well known that the former free homestead lands in Minnesota, Iowa, southeastern South Dakota, eastern Nebraska, and Kansas are much better lands. Timber and water are comparatively plenty. The soil and surface make this portion of the land, which was largely settled under the free-homestead law, the finest agricultural section in the world. It has plenty of rainfall to mature crops bountifully, while the lands in question now subject to these high prices are either in or close to the arid belt, where the want of rainfall often causes a failure of crops. These lands are subject to waves of hot winds that blight and wither the bountiful crops, so promising just before harvest, sometimes ruining in a single day the labor of the poor homesteader for the entire year, leaving him and his family in a most destitute condition.

AN UNJUST CHANGE.

It is remarkable that a paternal government should open its good lands for over a quarter of a century to free-homestead settlement, and point with such pride to the great and glorious results of the free-homesteader law, and boast of its accomplishments for good, and when all the good lands are taken, and the people roughly imbued with the favorable opportunity for getting a home, so they are willing to leave all the comforts and pleasures as well as the benefits of an old civilization, and go out on the frontier and do as their fathers had done, and then, when only the poorer lands are left, change the law and take away practically all the inducements, all the real benefits, leaving not only more adverse circumstances, but adding new burdens that can not and ought not to be borne, saddling this great debt upon their shoulders—it is a positive wrong.

In many cases these people living on these lands left their homes knowing only that these lands were open to homestead settlement, not understanding the balance of the long, hard story of the long, hard payments, at such a price.

It is true that they are bound to know the law, yet it is true that in hundreds of cases they did not until they had landed with their families upon the ground with just enough money to pay the filing fees and get a shack built to live in, depending on the labor and natural resources to secure a living. And once there they could not return; and hence they have undertaken this long struggle only to find in many casess that they must fail. Hence this appeal for justice, equity, and fair play, asking to be treated as others have been. What I have said I

know applies to South Dakota, and I have no doubt applies with equal force to other States and Territories.

Understanding the facts and the history of this question as I do, I can only see injustice in the law as it now stands.

Having lived for years close to these people, seen them in their struggles and hardships, seen them in their disappointments as the hot winds would again and again spoil their crops, poorly clad, poorly fed, poorly housed, again and again they have started to make their fight for a home, you will not wonder that I appeal with great earnestness to you.

THE GOVERNMENT MUST PAY.

As I have explained in the case of the Sioux Reservation, although this is a trust-fund reservation, yet the liability of the Government is already practically fixed, the Government agreed to pay 50 cents an acre for all the lands not taken in ten years, and that time is about up and not much more than 1.10 of the land is taken, so that the Government will soon have to pay this sum; and, as a matter of fact, it makes less difference, financially, to the Government whether this Sioux bill becomes a law or not than in any other case.

And when you come to compare the loss to the Government and the amounts involved to do justice in comparison to the amounts heretofore paid, they are trifling, and to say the least, for the Government to thus try to avoid its honest debts and make these poor people pay them it is positively small.

And without in the least reflecting on the honesty of any man, yet to me it is so manifestly wrong that Congress should not hesitate to unanimously undo it.

Let the Government stand by its former precedents, laws, and policies; but more than this, let Congress do right, do equity, do justice.

SAVE IN OTHER WAYS.

The people of my country had better forego the appropriation for the Missouri River, upon which there is so little traffic, and do right by the settlers on its banks. They had better stop work for a time on the dams of the Upper Missouri, and do justice by the poor homestead settlers on its head waters.

A Government can no more afford to be unjust to its citizens than one of its citizens can afford to be unjust to a neighbor, and it seems to me this case calls very loudly for immediate action and relief, and that the prayer of these people should be granted without stint and without delay.

The Government, whether wisely or not, granted millions of acres to rich corporations in these same States, but when these poor men want 160 acres for a home they are told they must pay a big price for it. They must assume the debt of the Government to the Indians. It is but little short of an outrage, and I hope the report of your committee will be unanimous in favor of the proposed bill.

The poorer the man the more he needs the home, and, as the law now is, the more likely he is to lose it if he has to mortgage it, and the poorer he is the more likely he is to mortgage it, and if he loses it it will finally get or go into the hands of rich men, the very place the Government does not want it to go.

The tree-claim law and the preemption law have both been repealed, and the only right left is the homestead. Preserve it in all its equity and power.

Give the homesteaders a chance. The railroads have had theirs; the rich land speculators have had theirs. Now, let the honest actual settlers have theirs, and they will make the desert, the arid, and the semi-arid region blossom as the rose. If need be, help him with irrigation, but do not load him down with more burdens than he can bear and ought not to bear.

On behalf of the homestead settlers on the Sioux, Sisseton, and Yankton reservations in South Dakota.

JOHN H. KING, *Their Attorney.*

O