IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

July 28, 1846.

Submitted, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Ashley made the following

# REPORT:

[To accompany bill S. No. 242.]

*The Committee on the Judiciary, who were instructed, by a resolution of the Senate, to inquire into the expediency of extending the criminal laws of the United States over the Indian territories, report:*

That the subject is one of great interest and importance, and calls for the serious consideration of the government. The act of June 30, 1834, to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, and to preserve peace on the frontiers, is the only law under which offences committed in the Indian territory can be punished; and the frequency with which crimes of the most shocking character are committed, both upon the persons and property of the inhabitants of that country—whites as well as Indians—proves its entire inefficiency, and the necessity for some law more rigorous in its operation in reaching offenders.

The committee, desirous of procuring the best information to guide them in their decision, requested the views of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and other gentlemen, whose great experience in all matters touching our Indian relations entitles their opinions to the highest consideration.

To the communications from the Hon. Wm. Medill, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Hon. T. Hartley Crawford, and William Armstrong, hereto annexed and made a part of this report, the committee beg leave to refer, for the reasons which have rendered it proper, in their judgment, to report a bill.

War Department,
*Office of Indian Affairs, July* 21, 1846.

Sir: Your letter of the 10th instant was duly received, and I regret that severe indisposition and consequent absence from the office, together with the press of other important business, have prevented my answering it more promptly.

Referring to the resolution of the Senate, instructing the Committee on

Ritchie & Heiss, print.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the Judiciary to inquire into the expediency of extending the criminal laws of the United States over the Indian territories, you request the views of this office at length upon the subject. The question is one of much importance, and probably requires more consideration than, under the pressure of my present official engagements, I am able to bestow upon it.

Of the original power and right of the United States to subject the Indian tribes within the limits of their sovereignty to any system of laws having for their object the prevention or punishment of crime, or the melioration of the condition and improvement of the red race, there cannot be a doubt. The correct doctrine on this point is laid down in the decision of the Supreme Court, at its recent term, in the case of the United States *vs.* William S. Rogers. The Court say, that "the native tribes who were found on this continent at the time of its discovery have never been acknowledged or treated as independent nations by the European governments, nor regarded as the owners of the territories they respectively occupied. On the contrary, the whole country was parcelled out, and granted by the governments of Europe, as if it had been vacant and unoccupied lands, and the Indians continually held to be treated as subject to their dominion and control;" and that it is "too firmly and clearly established to admit of dispute, that the Indian tribes residing within the territorial limits of the United States are subject to their authority; and when the country occupied by them is not within the limits of one of the States, Congress may, by law, punish any offence committed there, no matter whether the offender be a white man or an Indian." These views of the highest judicial tribunal of the land must be deemed to be conclusive. How far has this original and ample power been yielded up or restricted?

The civilization of the Indians, and the improvement of their moral and intellectual condition, have always been leading and earnest objects, not only of the government, but of all Christian associations. Every proper consideration likely to operate upon their minds, and to induce them to change from the precarious habits of the chase, and from their rude and savage forms of government, to the peaceful and more comfortable pursuits of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and to more civilized, equitable, and regular forms of government, have been held out to them. As they have become sufficiently advanced in intelligence to understand the advantages of a regular government and fixed and impartial laws, the United States, in order to excite their self-respect and an ambition to elevate themselves in the scale of civilization, have conceded to them the right to make and to enforce laws for the regulation of their own internal concerns. But, as the guardian of the Indians, and responsible for their welfare and happiness, so far as the exercise of a guardian care can secure them, the United States have not, in any case, wholly divested itself of the power to interfere, when the laws of a tribe have been oppressive and unjust, or have been so enforced as to excite domestic strife and bloodshed. Their original and unlimited sovereignty and right of control remains unimpaired; and when a tribe to whom the right of making and enforcing their own laws has been conceded make such as are inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the United States, or that are unsuited to their condition, or such as are tyrannical and oppressive, or when they are not impartially executed, or so executed as to produce intestine troubles, strife, and bloodshed, the government is called upon, by the highest

obligations of justice and humanity, to interpose its sovereign and guardian power, and to prescribe whatever course of policy may be deemed best adapted to cure any such evils. Even were it formally and specifically stipulated in a treaty with a tribe that they should have the right to make and enforce their own laws, without any express reservation, it would still be on the implied condition that such laws should not be inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the United States; should be consonant to the principles of morality; and that, as far as possible, they should be impartially administered. In the present condition of some of the tribes, the retention of this power, and occasionally its exercise, is necessary to secure the ends of justice and humanity. Many of the Indians are in a state of transition from their original condition of ignorance, and from a wild and roaming hunter's life to a state of intelligence and civilization. A portion have made great advances, while many are only but just emerging from their original state; and it would be difficult, even for the most impartial, to frame a system of laws and government which would be suitable to all. The more intelligent and wealthy shape the laws and wield the power, and they are naturally liable so to be swayed by their own interests as to make and administer such laws as will best secure those interests, and perpetuate their power; even at the expense and to the oppression of their less favored brethren, who can be made to see no other alternative or means of redress than the murder of the authors of their wrongs. The United States is a proper and impartial umpire between the antagonist parties. It should restrain the one from the commission of oppression and wrong, and counsel the other to peace and a proper obedience to such laws as are just and salutary.

In my judgment, if this power had been called into exercise at the commencement of the difficulties among the Cherokees, those difficulties would long since have been terminated, and most of the numerous murders among those people have been prevented. But the government never anticipated that the animosities among the Cherokees, who had become distinguished for their advancement in intelligence and civilization, were so deeply rooted, and would be carried to such fearful lengths as they have been. It was hoped that their misunderstandings were but temporary; and, unwilling to disturb the privilege of self-government, which they had so long been permitted to exercise, the government, relying upon their sense of justice and right, was disposed to leave them to settle the difficulties among themselves. It became evident, however, that this could not be the case. The occurrences of and since last November, and the continued unhappy state of things among them, have destroyed all hope of such a result. The necessity for the interference of the government becoming clearly evident and urgent, this department, on the 31st of March last, recommended to Congress, through the President, such measures as were believed best calculated to put an end to the difficulties, and stop the further effusion of blood; one of which was the extension of the criminal laws of the United States over them, which can be done by merely repealing the proviso in the 25th section of the act of June 30th, 1834, "to regulate trade and intercourse with the Indian tribes, and to preserve peace on the frontiers." Since that report, the situation of things among these people has, if possible, become even worse. Murders and outrages of almost every description have continued to be committed.

The Ross party, including those who have been induced to go over to

it from the others, hold the offices, and wield the power of the nation. The execution of the laws, if not the making of them, has been characterized by a constant and most shameful partiality for the members of that party, and a determined and unceasing vindictiveness towards its opponents. The party thus in power have sustained an armed body of light-horse "police," for the avowed purpose of preventing disturbances and preserving the peace of the nation, but which, according to all the evidence, have been among the most reckless disturbers of the peace, and violators of private rights. In regard to this body of irresponsible men, the agent for the Cherokees, in a report of the 28th of May last, says that, in his "opinion, much of the excitement and disturbance which have agitated the nation for the last seven months was occasioned by these armed parties patrolling the country, under color of the national authority, exercising powers perhaps prompted by malice or caprice. Some of these outrages were, to be sure, disavowed by the authorities, but then it is well known that no step was taken to inquire into why or wherefore they were committed. Besides, the Cherokee Advocate, the government organ, either excused or justified these high-handed acts."

Referring to an outrageous attack, by a party of mounted men, on a lad of the name of Alberty, General Arbuckle, in a despatch of the 27th of February last, says: "This outrage was doubtless committed by a party of light-horse, (police,) and goes to show that the authorities of the nation have not changed their policy towards the weaker party, but are ready at all times to shoot them down, on mere suspicion of acts which the dominant party allege to be criminal, which suspicion may very conveniently be made to attach to any person or persons whom they may think proper to put out of the way." In another communication, speaking of the refugees who were obliged to fly their country, he says that they dared not return, as armed parties of the dominant party were on the watch for them. Even the contractor for furnishing rations to these unfortunate persons was fired on by a party of the light-horse, and was kept prisoner for several days, without any charges being made against him. On the 27th of June, he reports that this same party of light horse attacked the residence of Mrs. Rider, a Cherokee woman, within the State of Arkansas, and severely wounded her son. He says: "In this instance, the State line has been disregarded, and its territory invaded by the authorized official agents of the Cherokee authorities; that the people over the line are much excited by these repeated outrages; and although no whites have yet suffered violence at the hands of either party, their families live in a constant state of alarm." He states, that, stimulated by revenge, parties of the refugees in Arkansas have gone into the nation, and committed murder, and that the opposite party have crossed into Arkansas, killing and wounding refugees, waylaying the roads by which their intended victims are expected to pass; that these occurrences have produced great exasperation of feeling among the parties, which, in his opinion, has been, and is still, kept up by the policy of the dominant party, in persevering in supporting, in all parts of the nation, armed and irresponsible bodies of police, which are ever in motion, keeping the country in a constant state of alarm, and not unfrequently committing acts of the most violent and arbitrary character, of which no notice is ever taken by the authorities; that the course pursued by the Cherokee Advocate tends to influence the minds of the people, and stir them up to acts of violence towards the weaker party.

He reports the execution of two persons charged with the murder of individuals of the dominant party, but that no measures have been taken to bring to justice the murderers of James Starr and his son, and Rider and others of the treaty party, seven or eight in number, in November last. So vindictively are those of the weaker parties pursued, who are only suspected of crime, he has felt it to be his duty to take such as are in most danger into custody. Reporting the case of two thus arrested, he says that the crimes with which they are charged are only the natural result of barbarous acts of the dominant party towards the weaker; that he was induced to pursue this course, and to refuse to give those persons up on the demand of the Cherokee authorities, in consequence of their course towards criminals of their own party, they having thought proper to suspend their criminal laws in respect to the murderers of James Starr and others; that, however guilty the persons arrested may be, he cannot reconcile it to his sense of right that punishment (and *that* certain death) should fall only on one of the parties, when against the guilty of the dominant party there seems to be no remedy. He says that he has, time and again, expostulated with the authorities, through the agent, and advised them of the measures which he thought ought to be pursued, and that the good of the Cherokees demanded, but all in vain; that his advice has been disregarded, if not treated with disdain, until he has ceased to look to that quarter for the least aid towards restoring comparative quiet. Not only have the lives of the weaker party, on the merest suspicion, and the most groundless pretexts, been sacrificed, but their suffering and afflicted families have been robbed and outraged. The house of the widow of Ezekiel Starr, deceased, a man of the most estimable character, who was one of the delegation of the treaty party now here, was not long since attacked and robbed of almost every thing the widow had. The agent, speaking of this occurrence, says that this system of predatory operations of the stronger upon the weaker party—of seizing and consuming articles of subsistence, and confiscating property to private uses, has been pretty much practised for some months past.

The dominant party in the nation, he states, are violently opposed to the government taking any measure calculated in the least degree to restrain their power or abridge their authority; that he has no doubt they would greatly prefer that no military post, military corps, or United States agent, were within a thousand miles of the nation; and that it appears to him that, from the unbridled excesses and bitter animosity practised by those people towards each other, it will be necessary to interpose the strong arm of the government, in some efficient form, to put a stop to such outrages as have marked the history of the Cherokee people for the last seven months. This department knows of no one measure which, in its opinion, would prove so efficient to accomplish this end as that of extending the criminal laws of the United States over those people; and it is strange that this should be objected to from any quarter, or be regarded as an abridgment of the privilege of self-government, while the necessity of keeping up a large military force upon the border to prevent "domestic strife" among them, and to preserve public order, is everywhere acknowledged.

It is proper here to apprize you that the President, desirous of affording the Cherokees every opportunity of settling their difficulties in a manner most satisfactory to themselves, has, in compliance with the wishes of the

delegations now in this city, from the three different parties into which the tribe is divided, appointed a commission, to which have been referred for investigation, and, if possible, settlement, the whole subject of the difficulties among the Cherokees, and their claims upon and affairs with the government. But whatever may be the determination at which the commissioners may arrive in relation to the cause and final arrangement of the difficulties among these people, I am well satisfied that their general happiness and individual security can best be promoted by extending over them the benign influence of our laws, and substituting, to some extent, the civil for the military authority of the government.

Very respectfully, your most obedient servant,

W. MEDILL.

Hon. C. ASHLEY,
*Chairman of Committee on Judiciary, Senate.*

---

ALEXANDRIA, *July* 17, 1846.

SIR: I received by the mail of yesterday your communication of the 15th instant, informing me that your committee were instructed by the Senate "to inquire into the expediency of extending the criminal laws of the United States over the Indian territories," and requesting my "opinion in extenso upon the propriety and expediency of thus extending the criminal laws," &c.

The existing law applies only to crimes committed by white men against Indians, or by the latter on the persons or property of the former, within what may properly be termed Indian territory, which is defined in the 1st section of the act of 30th June, 1834, entitled "An act to regulate trade and intercourse with Indian tribes, and to preserve peace on the frontiers." The 19th section of this law provides generally for "the arrest and trial of all Indians accused of committing any crime, offence, or misdemeanor, and all other persons who may have committed crimes or offences within any State or Territory, and have fled into the Indian country;" but the broadness of expression here used is restrained by the 24th and 25th sections, so as to confine its effective operation within the limits stated above. In an experience of seven years as head of the Indian office, I do not recollect (having no reference to documents here) a single instance of a white man having been tried and punished, under the law mentioned, for a crime against the person or property of an Indian, and only two instances of Indians having been tried and convicted for the murder of whites.

The crimes committed by white men on Indians are doubtless very numerous. The escape of the offenders (where vengeance is not immediately resorted to) is easily accounted for. The chances of eluding arrest are many. The 23d section of the law authorizes the employment of the military force to apprehend offenders, and to deliver them to the civil authority, by "the nearest convenient and safe route" from the Indian country, to be proceeded against according to law; but it forbids the detention of the person apprehended "longer than five days after the arrest, and before removal," enjoins upon the officers and soldiers to treat him with all humanity, and for maltreating him while in custody subjects them to "such punishment as a court-martial shall direct." If to the effect of this provision, imbodied in the law itself, is added the fact that in (all, I be-

lieve, of) the districts where the law can operate Indians are not competent witnesses, and, if they were, are incapable of detailing their injuries, it is not matter of wonder that the crimes perpetrated against them go unpunished. The provisions should be modified; the five days' limitation should be repealed, as well as the provision for punishment, leaving the party to the usual legal remedy for maltreatment.

The offences committed by Indians against the persons and property of whites are by no means, I think, so numerous. When they do occur, it is almost invariably in remote and secluded places. When they are tried and convicted, the evidence against them is generally furnished by their own lips. Their offences against each other are more frequent, and these are punished according to their own laws or usages.

I have long thought the laws for the punishment of crime among the Indians ought to be amended, including some other modifications of the act of 30th June, 1834. There have been, however, and there are difficulties, that are not insuperable certainly, but which will not perhaps be very easily obviated. The utter inefficiency of the present system requires the substitution of a better one, or the best that circumstances and legal competency will allow. Section 24 of the law it is now necessary to alter, so as to annex to the State of Texas all the Indian country which it does not give to Missouri and Arkansas. There should be special provision against the introduction into the Indian country of spirituous liquors, their sale and manufacture therein. The forfeiture of them, their destruction, or the destruction of distilleries, or the imposition of fines, (which is all that by the law, as it now stands, you can inflict,) do not protect the Indians from this, the greatest of all their misfortunes. The chances of escape and the escapes are so numerous in proportion to the detections, that the law and its penalties are not feared. Fines upon the class of people who generally infest the Indian frontiers are laughed at by those whose lack of principle or property, or both, prevents any recovery. If you will add the penalty of imprisonment at the discretion of the court, according to the enormity of the offence, it may be some restraint upon this most wicked traffic. With these, the additional suggestions I shall have the honor to submit, and perhaps other changes that will occur to the better observation and judgment of the committee, the extension of "the criminal laws of the United States over the Indian territories" is, I believe, at present the most judicious step that can be adopted.

If the committee decide to recommend this measure to the acceptance of the Senate, it will be necessary, it seems to me, to enlarge the provision of the 25th section of the law of 30th June, 1834, which enacts "that so much of the laws of the United States as provides for the punishment of crimes committed within the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States shall be in force in the Indian country," so as to extend *all* the criminal laws of the United States over the Indian country. Some of these laws are general; those relating to treason and the coin, and the post office, for instance, reaching to every part of the country: others apply only to those districts or places within the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. The purpose of the inquiry of your committee, I venture to presume, will not be answered unless you look to the operation of *all* the criminal laws of the United States. For your convenience I refer you to Gordon's Digest of the Laws of the United States, (edition of 1844, tit. Criminal Code, p. 910, &c.,) where you will find the laws col-

lected under their appropriate heads, except such as relate to the District of Columbia.* The proviso of the 25th section must, of course, be repealed.

It struck me, on reading your letter, that the most effective plan would be to extend the laws of the States, respectively, over the Indian territories which are or shall be annexed to them severally for juridical purposes. But a little reflection resulted in the conviction that this could not be done without a violation of treaty stipulations in regard of some of the tribes. The unfortunate events that have occurred, and are occurring, in one of which, I suppose, suggested to the Senate the propriety of the inquiry imposed on your committee.

Most of the treaties that have been made place the Indians under the protection, and acknowledge the general authority, of the United States. That of Hopewell, concluded by the Cherokees with the United States in 1785, art. 9, concedes to the United States the right of "managing all their affairs in such manner as they think proper." Concessions in the same words will be found in the treaty made with the Chickasaws in 1786, art. 8, and in the treaty of 1786 made with the Choctaws, art. 8—both signed at Hopewell. The treaty of 1828, art. 6, made with the Cherokees at Washington, D. C., stipulates that when the Indians desire it, the United States shall "give them a set of plain laws suited to their condition;" but this engagement was cancelled at the special request of the Cherokees, in the 3d article of the treaty concluded at Fort Gibson in 1833; and by the treaty of New Echota, 1835, with this tribe, art. 5, the right is secured to the Cherokee nation, "by their national councils, to make and carry into effect all such laws as they may deem necessary for the government and protection of the persons and property within their own country belonging to their people, or such persons as have connected themselves with them," consistent with the constitution and laws of the United States. This treaty likewise engages that their lands shall at no future time be included, without their consent, "within the territorial limits or jurisdiction of any State or Territory."

By the treaty of 1834, article 2, made with the Chickasaws, at Washington, the United States stipulate "to keep them without the limits of any State or Territory." And in the treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek, concluded with the Choctaws in 1830, article 4, is this stipulation: "The government and people of the United States are hereby obliged to secure to the said Choctaw nation of red people the jurisdiction and government of all the persons and property that may be within their limits west; so that no Territory or State shall ever have a right to pass laws for the government of the Choctaw nation of red people and their descendants; and that no part of the land granted to them shall ever be embraced in any Territory or State, but the United States shall forever secure said Choctaw nation from and against all laws, except such as, from time to time, may be enacted in their own national councils, not inconsistent with the constitution, treaties, and laws of the United States, and except such as may, and which have been enacted by Congress, to the extent that Congress, under the constitution, are required to exercise a legislation over Indian affairs."

---

* These laws are local—suited to the District, and the state of things in it, and would not, consequently, be appropriate out of it.

The treaty made with the Creeks, at Washington, in 1832, article 14, provides that "the Creek country west of the Mississippi shall be solemnly guarantied to the Creek Indians; nor shall any State or Territory ever have a right to pass laws for the government of such Indians, but they shall be allowed to govern themselves, so far as may be compatible with the general jurisdiction which Congress may think proper to exercise over them."

In the 5th article of the treaty with the Choctaws made in 1830, the United States undertake to protect them from "domestic strife and foreign enemies," &c. And by the 6th article of the treaty of 1835 with the Cherokees, the United States stipulate "to protect the Cherokee nation from domestic strife and foreign enemies, and against intestine wars between the several tribes."

The treaties concluded with the Cherokees and Chickasaws, and perhaps more strongly those with the Choctaws and the Creeks, seem to exclude the right of extending State laws, by even United States legislation, over them, except by a change of treaty stipulations. How far the treaties with the Cherokees, Choctaws, and Creeks may interfere with the right of Congress to extend the laws of the United States over them, so as to punish crimes generally, whether committed by Indians against the persons or property of Indians, or otherwise, is submitted to the more mature judgment and better information of yourself and the other members of the Judiciary Committee, in reflecting upon which it has occurred to me that the constitutional power of Congress over the Indian tribes deserves consideration.

If you and the Judiciary Committee shall be of opinion that there is no constitutional or treaty obstacle in the way, (there can be no other, for the sovereignty of the United States, represented by the legislative power, has no other restraints,) I repeat that I am decidedly of opinion that it would be a wise and humane measure to spread the criminal laws and jurisdiction of the United States "over the Indian territories." Events of late years, and of very recent occurrence, call for whatever may be done to arrest the execution of private vengeance and the perpetration of deeds of blood hitherto without a parallel as to frequency, and not exceeded in atrocity.

I have thrown these remarks together more hastily (but unavoidably so) than I could have wished: perhaps, crude as they are, they may aid your examination of the important inquiry you are pursuing.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

T. HARTLEY CRAWFORD.

Hon. CHESTER ASHLEY,
*Chairman of the Judiciary Committee*
*of the Senate of the United States.*

---

WASHINGTON, *July* 24, 1846.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 21st inst., in which you request my opinion "as to the propriety or expediency of extending the criminal laws of the United States over the Indian territories, and so modifying the intercourse law as to subject the

Indians to trial and punishment before the United States courts for criminal offences."

The object proposed to be accomplished is certainly not free from difficulties, and must be managed cautiously, to avoid creating discontent among the Indians, by what would seem to be an encroachment upon the rights and privileges secured to them by treaties with the United States. But, that a law may be so framed as to accomplish the object desired, and at the same time not be offensive to the Indians, I do not doubt; and I am satisfied that, should it be done, it will go further to heal and quiet the difficulties which have for a long time existed among one of the most important of the tribes of my superintendency than any other measure that could be devised. The hope of its effecting this renders it worthy of the trial; and if it should fail in producing the effect anticipated, or should it excite dissatisfaction and discontent among the Indian tribes over whom it is to operate, it can easily be repealed.

The Indian tribes within my superintendency are most of them very considerably advanced in civilization, and I hesitate not to say that a more orderly, law-respecting population exists nowhere than among the Choctaws and Chickasaws. The murder of a white man is a crime altogether unknown to either of these tribes, and but few of their own people have been the victims of violence. The same remarks are in a great degree true in regard to the Creeks, and the law modified as I propose to have it done will have but little bearing, either for good or for evil, on either of these tribes. The disturbances, however, which have for such a length of time existed in the Cherokee nation, and which have been the cause of so much bloodshed among that people, (though I hope they are now about to be quelled,) calls loudly for the adoption of some measure by the government, which shall save the lives of the people and secure the peace of the country. There is at present no law by which an Indian who commits a crime in his own country, and takes refuge in another, can be arrested and brought to trial. This is an evil which, in my opinion, ought to be at once remedied.

Having thus briefly expressed my opinion as to the expediency of the proposed measure, I would most respectfully suggest, with all due deference to the better judgment of the honorable committee of the Senate, that a law be passed vesting criminal jurisdiction in the United States court for the district of Arkansas over the various Indian tribes within that superintendency; that the court for the trial of Indian offenders be held at Van Buren, which is within five miles of the boundary line; and that the judge be directed to hold the same number of terms at that place as are now held at Little Rock.

I do not, however, deem it necessary or advisable to trouble the court with every petty criminal offence with which an Indian may be charged, and which was not of a character to endanger the peace of the country. I would therefore most respectfully suggest that the jurisdiction of the court be limited to *such cases as were brought to its notice on a report of the different agents, endorsed by the superintendent.* Such a modification would not, in the slightest degree, affect the power of the court in all important cases, which the well being of the tribe required should be brought before it, and it would have at the same time the effect to remove from the minds of the Indians any jealousy which they might be disposed to entertain, that the United States were inclined to interfere with their national

rights and their internal police. I would also further suggest for the consideration of the honorable committee, that, to remove all fear and opposition, the accused should be allowed at least one-half the jury appointed to try him from among his own tribe. Provision, as before observed, ought to be made for the arrest of fugitives from one tribe to another.

A law containing the provisions which I have suggested would, I doubt not, as soon as it was fairly understood, become popular with the Indians of all the tribes, and would give the authorities of the United States sufficient power to prevent the further commission of crime, with impunity, in any of the tribes.

Hoping that the views herein expressed may meet the favor of the honorable committee, I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM ARMSTRONG,
*Superintendent, &c.*

Hon. CHESTER ASHLEY,
*Chairman Judiciary Committee, U. S. Senate.*