

University of Oklahoma College of Law

## University of Oklahoma College of Law Digital Commons

---

American Indian and Alaskan Native Documents in the Congressional Serial Set: 1817-1899

---

6-3-1870

**A. J. Campbell**

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ou.edu/indianserialset>



Part of the [Indigenous, Indian, and Aboriginal Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

S. Rep. No. 203, 41st Cong., 2nd Sess. (1870)

This Senate Report is brought to you for free and open access by University of Oklahoma College of Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in American Indian and Alaskan Native Documents in the Congressional Serial Set: 1817-1899 by an authorized administrator of University of Oklahoma College of Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Law-LibraryDigitalCommons@ou.edu](mailto:Law-LibraryDigitalCommons@ou.edu).

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

JUNE 3, 1870.—Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS made the following

REPORT.

[To accompany joint resolution S. R. No. 211.]

In the year 1837 a treaty was negotiated in Washington City between the United States and Sioux nation of Indians, which contains these provisions:

The United States shall pay to Scott Campbell, the interpreter accompanying the delegation, in consideration of valuable services rendered by him to the Sioux, the sum of \$450 annually for twenty years.

It is further stipulated and agreed that the said Scott Campbell shall be secured in the quiet possession of the tract of land on the west side of the Mississippi River, about one mile and a half below Fort Snelling, supposed to contain five hundred acres, and upon which he now resides.

This project of a treaty was sent by the President to the Senate for action; the provisions here quoted were stricken from it by that body, and, as thus reformed, it was ratified and went into operation.

In 1858 another treaty was made between the United States and the Sioux Indians, and an article incorporated in it requesting, in the name of the Indians, the payment of the \$10,000 and the confirmation of the five hundred acres of land to A. J. Campbell, son of said Scott Campbell, and the interpreter accompanying the Indian delegation to Washington City, where that treaty also was negotiated, in conformity to the rejected provisions of the previous treaty.

This petition is signed thus: Geo. L. Becker, attorney for claimant, A. J. Campbell. It recites that Scott Campbell had been in the service of this tribe of Indians from his boyhood; that his whole life had been spent in their service; that he possessed, and *he alone* possessed, their confidence.

The last-named fact may be true, but the previous one must be stated with much exaggeration. How had he been serving those Indians so long and so devotedly? Was there any other service by him than as interpreter? If so, what was it? For any other service to the Indians his claim was against them alone; there was no justice or propriety in requiring the United States to pay for it. As interpreter he was not in the service of the Indians; that place was established by the United States, and by them he was designated to fill it, and paid for the performance of its duties. He occupied a place of trust and confidence both toward the United States and the Indians, and its duties and purpose required him to render to each party faithfully, truly, and impartially the communications of the other; and, if by such performance of them, and kind and humane offices rendered to the Indians, he had so won their confidence and friendship that they desired to make him a testimonial, and he had suggested some characteristic Indian souvenir, it

would have been very proper. But when he used his great influence to bring them to give their gratitude the form of \$9,000 from the United States Treasury and a tract of five hundred acres of choice land for his own enrichment, it justly subjects him to the charge of selfishness and cupidity. In form there were but two parties to this treaty—the United States and the Indian nation; but in reality there was a third one—Scott Campbell, the interpreter.

If he had any valid and fair claim against those Indians for services rendered them, why did he not frankly and directly present it, and ask its payment by them? Why did he cover up the nature, extent, and value and the amount of his charge for them by such provisions in a treaty, and obtain the assent of the Indians to them by requiring the United States to foot his bill. If what he was to get belonged properly to the Indians, and he chose to attempt the exercise of any influence, it should have been to have had it secured to them; if it belonged to the United States, he should have taken no part in a device to deprive them of it. He was receiving a sufficient salary from them as interpreter. If his services had been very valuable to them only, or to the Indians also, he should have submitted to the justice and liberality of the government the direct question of his additional compensation. The indirect manner and large amount of compensation put him upon a dilemma of three horns—a deliberate purpose to plunder the Indians or the United States, or both, for his own enrichment.

The present petitioner is a son, and was the successor, of the former interpreter. All the culpability of Scott Campbell in this transaction seems to have devolved upon him by family inheritance and official succession, augmented by the emphatic reprobation by the Senate of these schemes of giving a subsidy of land and money to the former interpreter, in having purged and purified the treaty of it.

Such provisions in Indian treaties, for the benefit of individuals officially connected with the tribe, have been occasionally made, but should never have been tolerated by the President or the Senate; they are intrinsically vicious and immoral, and debauching in their influence. A former Senate did well in rejecting the one under consideration; it has, nevertheless, since been repeatedly pressed upon Congress. To dispose of it absolutely and finally, the committee report herewith a joint resolution, and recommend its adoption by the Senaté.