

The Alaskan

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR.

SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1886.

ALASKA IN THE SENATE. We present in this issue a few extracts from the debate in the Senate on the educational bill, selecting first some of the concluding sentences of Senator Conger's impassioned arraignment of the government for its cruel neglect of the territory and its people. Mr. Conger said:

"I desire to favor this amendment, either in the form it is now or in some other which shall secure its application to Alaska. I do not care whether the people live in a state, or in a territory, or in a district, or whatever region it may be. Wherever the flag of my country floats over citizens and inhabitants of the country, there remains the same need for their intelligence and for their advancement and for their education. These people are citizens of a common country, whether they will be brought from the domination of a Russian monarchy, or a Russian despotism, as we call it, to become inhabitants of the territory of the United States and citizens of this great Republic. Wherever they may be, wherever the flag floats, let it float over an educated people; give them the same advantages of and the same chance for education that you give to the frontiersmen of the west, to the citizens of the south, to the illiterate of the north. God knows they need the help. Neglected as they have been, the wonder is that during these twenty years these educated and partially civilized and enlightened people have not gone back into vice, have not become savages, have not forgotten to dwell in houses, have not burned up their school houses for fuel and torn down the crosses from their church to mock it in public. The marvel is that the instincts of the people, or the religious convictions which they have, have kept them free from vice comparatively, and still civilized. If this amendment needs further amendment to make it accomplish the purpose, let it be so amended; but give to these people some little assistance while you are pouring out this \$77,000,000 in more favored parts of the country, give them some portion of this magnificent bequest. Do it to remove the stain from our own people; do it in fulfillment of the pledge, implied if not written, with which we received them at the hands of the Russian government; do it in the name of their religion and ours, in the name of the American people, who desire to see every individual, high and low, poor and rich, Greek, Gentile, or Jew, brought within the benefits and the advantages of this system of education whose lack we so much deplore, and to restore which and to encourage which we now prepare to-day to give such a bountiful donation."

Senator Dolph, who it must be remembered speaks from personal observation, having visited Alaska last summer, gave the testimony: "I do not agree with the Senators who have said that the money appropriated for education in Alaska has been either misapplied or has not produced good results. I undertake to say that, there has never been money appropriated by the federal government or by a state for the education of whites or Indians in any part of the United States that has produced better results than the expenditure of the money appropriated by Congress for education in Alaska. The natives of Alaska can never be placed upon reservations and out under government supervision. They are at present self-supporting, and there is no reason why they should not always remain so. In order that they may remain self-supporting they must always be treated in respect to their occupations the same as the white inhabitants of the territory, and in any educational system which we may establish, for that territory schools must be common to all the citizens of the United States and to all the uncivilized tribes. I think the Aleuts are already entitled to citizenship under the provisions of the treaty ofcession. There being no territorial school system, there being no way in which a discrimination can be made between white children and native children under the law, there are no two systems in the territory. There is but the system to be established for the present under the direction of the secretary of the interior, and to be maintained by appropriations made by Congress, and there is no reason that I can see why the people of Alaska should not have in the bounty of the government under the provisions of

this bill. There are no obstacles in the way. The interest manifested by Senator Dolph in the rights and the welfare of the people of the territory, gives a strong hope that the day of the misrepresentation and unchecked abuse with which they have been so long oppressed is near its close. Mr. Dolph has become entitled to the sincere regard of all true friends of justice and faith, for the gallant fight he has made in this instance, and especially for the manly communications with which, through the whole debate, the claims of Alaska were asserted.

But so artfully have the misrepresentations of Alaska been manipulated and managed, and through the complicity often of men in official positions, that even the government reports, which are relied on as authoritative, are in some respects grossly erroneous, and men who are friendly to the territory are only half-armed in defense of our rights. Senator Blair uses this language showing his feeling in the case: "It seems to me that as an act of recognition and confession of that justice which is due to these people it would be well to adopt the amendment. It is a recognition that they are a portion of the American people, and may furnish a precedent of great good in the future; and certainly the debate which has been evolved by this amendment is very instructive and must have some effect in the direction of more liberal appropriations hereafter." And yet he asserts, speaking from the census report, that there are less than 500 whites in the territory.

Now we state a fact that the census of southeastern Alaska has not been taken at all, and that the enumeration of its white population for the year 1880 is a gross and willful under-estimate, based upon no grounds of truth. The census taker, Mr. Ivan Petroff, never came to southeastern Alaska, nor was it ever intended that he should. He took the census of the western islands and peninsula in 1880, getting as far east, (according to his account), as Kenai. He returned to Washington in the fall, and in the spring of 1881 was sent out again, ostensibly, and doubtless honestly, as far as the superintendent of the census was concerned, to take up his work where he had left off. He was gone till the fall and when he returned stated that the Indians about Copper River had seized his boat and held him a prisoner all the summer, and that he had with difficulty at last escaped from them. To those who knew a thing or two this story was of course too utterly thin; to those who do not know how the Alaska matter has been run, its thinness will appear from the fact that no official inquiry was ever made into it, or any attempt made to punish the Indians.

Well, Mr. Petroff returned again to Washington and made out his report. He found 127 whites at the western trading stations, and 3,400 Aleuts and creoles, who are civilized, and entitled to the literal fulfillment of the promise of the government, which (the promise) they have enjoyed for nearly twenty years. He put down the population of southeastern Alaska at 23, and it has gone at that figure in the report. At that very time there was one single town, Juneau, in southeastern Alaska with over 500 residents beyond a doubt. The population of Sitka, taken by the naval authorities showed over 250 whites, besides the 230 whom he classifies as creoles, many of whom are pure Caucasians. An election was held at which 304 votes of white male, adult citizens were cast, and many can be named who did not vote. And the testimony of unimpeachable officers and other gentlemen before the Senate committee on territories, taken the winter after that summer when Petroff should have been here, put the population at the time at 1,200 beyond a doubt. That it is now 2,000 cannot be doubted, and if Congress would allow men to acquire homes in the territory, by giving us land laws, nineteen-twentieths of those who come here would remain. We shall not let this subject lie dormant, though we stop here for the present.

The education bill passed the Senate by a vote of 36 to 11, each nearly equally divided between democrats and republicans. It is doubtful if it will pass in the house. It provides that for eight years after its passage there shall be annually appropriated from the treasury the following sums in aid of common school education in the states and territories and districts of Columbia and Alaska: The first year, \$7,000,000; second year, \$10,000,000; third year, \$15,000,000; fourth year, \$18,000,000;

fifth year, \$11,000,000; sixth year, \$9,000,000; seventh year, \$7,000,000; and eighth year, \$5,000,000—making \$77,000,000—besides which there is a special appropriation of \$2,000,000 to aid in the erection of school houses in sparsely settled districts, making the total fund \$79,000,000. The money is given to the several states and territories "in that proportion which the whole number of persons in each state, who, being of the age of ten years and over, cannot write, bears to the whole number of such persons in the United States," according to the census of 1880, until the census figures of 1890 shall be obtained, then according to the latter figure. Alaska's share, according to the estimate of Senator Blair, will be about \$27,000 under the first distribution, and about twice that under the highest apportionment. An effort will be made to get an additional amount in the regular appropriation bill.

The usual narration of fearful losses of life in the dangerous fisheries off the coast of Massachusetts came along in the last mail. Fifty-six men were lost off the coast from Christmas to April 1st, chiefly in the halibut districts. There are more halibut in the Alaskan waters than on the eastern coast banks, and it costs no more money and no valuable lives at all to take them.

W. F. OLDS. S. W. KING.

OLDS & KING, Dealers in STAPLE AND FANCY GOODS, FURNISHING GOODS, ETC., FURNISHING GOODS, ETC., FURNISHING GOODS, ETC. No. 186, First Street, PORTLAND - OREGON.

Special attention given to PARTIES DESIRING ANYTHING IN OUR line will do well to call or communicate with this house. Our prices are LOWER THAN THE LOWEST.

CORBITT & MACLEAY, Wholesale CORBETT & MACLEAY, FURNISHING GOODS, ETC. Catalogue furnished on application. J. G. SCOREY, Manager.

COMMISSION MERCHANTS, AGENTS FOR SALEM ROLLER FLOURING MILLS CO. PORTLAND, OREGON.

EDWARD DEGROFF, SITKA, ALASKA. (Late with the Northwest Trading Company.) IMPORTER AND DEALER IN GENERAL MERCHANDISE.

GARDEN SEEDS, GARDEN SEEDS. SPECIAL ATTENTION WILL BE PAID TO orders for all goods not to be found in stock.

RELIABLE PURCHASING AGENTS HAVE been secured at Portland; San Francisco and eastern cities to personally select and fill all orders received.

IN PREPARATION PHOTOGRAPHIC views of Alaska scenery and native life.

PROMPT ATTENTION GIVEN TO ALL correspondence and orders from abroad.

CURIOSITIES AND FURS, PORTLAND CEMENT, NEWSPAPER AND PERIODICAL SUBSCRIPTION AGENCY.

F. S. CHADBOURNE & CO., Portland, Oregon.

THE LEADING FURNITURE DEALERS on the Pacific Coast. Carry a full line of

BEDDING, BEDDING, BEDDING, AND AND AND

UPOHISTERY, UPOHISTERY, UPOHISTERY

PIONEER BOOT AND SHOE STORE, MANUFACTURER AND DEALER IN

BOOTS AND SHOES, BOOTS AND SHOES, BOOTS AND SHOES, BOOTS AND SHOES.

REPAIRING A SPECIALTY. All orders attended to with neatness and dispatch.

J. TWAN, Proprietor. JUNEAU CITY, ALASKA. dec12-3m

MAYFLOWER BILLIARD HALL, JUNEAU, ALASKA.

THE UNDERSIGNED RESPECTFULLY calls the attention of the sporting public to his new combination POOL AND BILLIARD TABLE.

And solicits their patronage. He also keeps constantly on hand the best brands of cigars the market affords, and the most excellent quality of mill refreshments.

FRANK M. BERRY. NOTICE OF FORFEITURE. SITKA, ALASKA TERRITORY, January 15, 1886.

To Joseph Twan: You are hereby notified that we have expended one hundred dollars in labor and improvements upon the Seattle Lodge building claim, situated upon Douglas Island, Harris mining district, Territory of Alaska, as will appear by certificates filed December 17, 1885, and January 1886, in the office of the Recorder of said Harris mining district, in order to hold said premises under the provisions of section 254, Revised Statutes of the United States, being the amount required to hold the same for the year ending December 31, 1886.

And if within ninety days from the service of this notice by publication, you fail or refuse to contribute your proportion of such expenditure as a co-owner, your interest in said claim will become the property of the subscribers, under said section 254.

W. H. WHELOCK, D. FLANNERY, 15w (First publication February 27, 1886).

WOODARD, CLARKE & CO., Wholesale and Retail DRUGGISTS, 141 First Street and 26 Alder Street, PORTLAND, OREGON.

PRESCRIPTIONS A SPECIALTY. Orders by mail respectfully solicited and can be depended on to arrive by the return mail.

W. CLARK, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW. SITKA, ALASKA.

M. P. BERRY, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW. SITKA, ALASKA.

JOHN J. McLEAN, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW. SITKA, ALASKA.

JOHN F. MALONY, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW. JUNEAU CITY, ALASKA.

J. G. HEID, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW, JUNEAU CITY, ALASKA.

M. D. BALL, Sitka, Alaska. ALFRED B. FRANK, Portland, Oregon. BALL & FRANK, ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW. Practice together in the Courts of Alaska. nov28-11

PIONEER BOOT AND SHOE STORE, MANUFACTURER AND DEALER IN

BOOTS AND SHOES, BOOTS AND SHOES, BOOTS AND SHOES, BOOTS AND SHOES.

REPAIRING A SPECIALTY. All orders attended to with neatness and dispatch.

J. TWAN, Proprietor. JUNEAU CITY, ALASKA. dec12-3m

MAYFLOWER BILLIARD HALL, JUNEAU, ALASKA.

THE UNDERSIGNED RESPECTFULLY calls the attention of the sporting public to his new combination POOL AND BILLIARD TABLE.

And solicits their patronage. He also keeps constantly on hand the best brands of cigars the market affords, and the most excellent quality of mill refreshments.

FRANK M. BERRY. NOTICE OF FORFEITURE. SITKA, ALASKA TERRITORY, January 15, 1886.

To Joseph Twan: You are hereby notified that we have expended one hundred dollars in labor and improvements upon the Seattle Lodge building claim, situated upon Douglas Island, Harris mining district, Territory of Alaska, as will appear by certificates filed December 17, 1885, and January 1886, in the office of the Recorder of said Harris mining district, in order to hold said premises under the provisions of section 254, Revised Statutes of the United States, being the amount required to hold the same for the year ending December 31, 1886.

And if within ninety days from the service of this notice by publication, you fail or refuse to contribute your proportion of such expenditure as a co-owner, your interest in said claim will become the property of the subscribers, under said section 254.

W. H. WHELOCK, D. FLANNERY, 15w (First publication February 27, 1886).

WOODARD, CLARKE & CO., Wholesale and Retail DRUGGISTS, 141 First Street and 26 Alder Street, PORTLAND, OREGON.

PRESCRIPTIONS A SPECIALTY. Orders by mail respectfully solicited and can be depended on to arrive by the return mail.

The Alaskan

Entered at the Postoffice, Sitka, Alaska, as Second-class Mail Matter.

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR.

SATURDAY, MAY 18, 1886.

[Continued from first page.]

adoption, and I have not been able to find that any exercise of the law-making power which is provided in it for giving it effect, was ever brought to bear upon Indians living under their own laws and customs in tribal communities. Certainly it was not intended to operate except upon citizens, and no one will contend that the Indians are so held. The civil rights bill is framed to prevent the holding to servitude or the denial of certain rights under color of any territorial laws, but it nowhere prohibits the Indian tribes from the enjoyment of their own customs. Section 1900 is similarly framed, and operates only on territorial laws. Section 2079 abolishing further treaties with the Indians, does not affect their laws. And section 5525 does not at all apply to this case.

The jurisdiction of this court is limited by express law, and the uniform tenor of legislation in regard to the Indians has been to leave the Indians to their own customs, as far as practicable, and consistent with the protection of the whites. This is shown in sections 2145 and 2146, where offenses between Indians have been left to their own laws, and the recent act of March 3d, 1885, is confined to the expressly enumerated crimes therein, and in which slavery is not included.

The Court—Mr. Ball, do you not think that kidnapping involves an assault, and is not assault one of the crimes cited in that act?

Mr. Ball—Assault with intent to kill, your honor, but not simple assault.

The Court—Is not the lesser offense included in the greater?

Mr. Ball—I should think the statute should be strictly construed, as to designation of the offense, although of course on a trial for the greater a verdict for the lesser might be rendered. But there is another section, 1837, which forbids any construction of territorial laws which can "impair the rights of person or property pertaining to the Indians in any territory so long as such rights remain unextinguished by treaty between the United States and such territory." This seems to me such a declaration as embodies the manifest and uniform purpose of the government, and the latest case, that of Crow Dog, 109 U. S. supreme court reports, in which that purpose has received judicial interpretation, sustains this conclusion.

These have occurred to me as considerations proper to present to the court, in order to the right adjudication of this subject. Whatever the legends of slavery in Alaska show, the record of this case is that the slaves are treated humanely. I have no desire to deny to the sweet boon of freedom to our country one thing to uphold, in the fullest measure of its benefit, the blessings of unattested liberty to those fitted to enjoy it. It may be quite another to force our civilization upon savage tribes before they are prepared for it, in derogation of their long-established usages, and against their desire or consent.

Major M. P. Berry closed the case for the relator as follows: It is supposed by at least three-fourths of the adult population of our country that no vestige of human slavery exists within the borders of the United States. What will be the feelings of the masses of our contemporaries when this court decides authoritatively and says that, undoubtedly, slavery still exists in this the last purchase and most distant of the territories of the United States? The question will be asked, and it must be answered, wherefore this more than criminal neglect of the God-given right of man to liberty after all the declarations of the government to the contrary, in the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments to the constitution, and section 1900 of the United States revised statutes? I anticipate that the reply by the government to the question of the people will be that, heretofore there was no official knowledge of such slavery existing among this people—a plea of ignorance which will be as incredible as the fact itself—yet that such subterfuges may be met and controverted; I present the following: During the early days of the reign of the tyrant in the straits of Alaska, reports were made to the officers occupying prominent positions, that a horrid state of human slavery existed among the native tribes. During the

winter of 1874-5, Lieutenant, now Captain Dyer, 4th U. S. artillery, was stationed with a small number of troops at Fort Wrangel. He in conjunction with a deputy collector of customs went upon the beach in front of the Indian village and rescued a slave woman who had been bound and gagged and thrown where the incoming tide would end her miserable existence; the act was done in face of the loud protestations of many of the holding savages. About the same time there were two men slaves drowned. The dead bodies lay in ropes, with which they were originally encuffed, and drifted back and forth, the sport of the waters, until the horrified white men then at the place gave them sepulchre.

Shortly after, one of the head men of the Stickeen was subpoenaed to appear before the U. S. district court at Portland, Oregon. He demanded the privilege of taking with him a favorite slave, a kind of body servant. The marshal consented and about the time of the entrance of the steamer into the Columbia river, the master committed suicide, cutting his throat in a room in the cabin of the ship, and simultaneous with that act the slave threw into the furnace of the vessel a package of gun powder, hoping thereby to destroy the steamer and accelerate his own death, which he believed was a fixed fact because of the suicide of the master. The fireman of the steamer seeing the act quickly raked from the furnace the can or cans of powder thereby averting a catastrophe. He in turn was violently attacked by this slave, whom he partially disabled with a blow of his poker or rake, but did not succeed in overcoming him until assistance arrived. The slave was put in a cage and held until the steamer returned to Wrangel, where he was put ashore. Gen. H. M. Sibley, commander of the artillery department of the Columbia, soon after visited this post of his command, called the Stickeen into council, and paid the relatives of the suicide five hundred blankets. All these cases and many more were from time to time reported officially to the proper officers of the government.

I desire to point out the effect of what at the time we who lived here designated as the emancipation proclamation. Officers of the army and navy who were stationed here, notified the natives at Sitka—who a few years since had many slaves—that slavery was prohibited by the government which they represented, and they promised submission to obey, quietly removed the greater portion of them to other and distant parts of the country. Now, what became of these people? Some were undoubtedly destroyed, but the greater portion were distributed around among other families. That is the manner in which the much talked of obedience was rendered to the emancipation proclamations of these officers. All the effect that they had was to make the natives more guarded and vigilant. That which I desire to impress upon your honor is, that the natives were, in reality, not followed up with the strong hand of law, or are of no avail against this people. A prospector passed up the Chilkoot inlet intending to make the village of the same name his headquarters while exploring the mountains thereabout for ore. On his arrival at the village he found it in a great state of excitement over the death of their chief, medicine man or shaman. There was to be a sacrifice of three slaves to assist his medical highness across the river Styx. The slaves were naked, bound and staked to the ground. He said: "I heard the moaning of the victims and went where they were; two of whom I recognized as slaves formerly belonging to Sitka; they were starved from the time they were seized. I thought it my duty to save them if I could. My first effort was to talk and protest vigorously against the horrid rite; next to purchase them. I offered all that I had and dealt liberally in promises. The Indians were very sulky—nothing that I could say or do made any impression on them—the fate of the slaves was sealed. They were consigned to torture and a lingering death. I then thought it my duty to shoot them and made up my mind so to do. To conclude I did myself wrong, being glad to escape myself. The slaves were then consigned with the sacrifice and attending orgies were completed." To my enquiry: "Did you ever report the circumstances?" My informant replied that he did, and where he reported it, it stopped.

There are many other cases showing the fact that real genuine barbaric slavery exists in the district of Alaska, and that you are now called upon to meet it without adequate means so to do. None of these many collections of

people will bring their slaves near enough to be reached by an order of this court. I can see no immediate remedy for the extinction of this unjudifiable evil, unless Congress places at the disposal of your honor proper means to enforce obedience to the mandates of your court.

OPINION OF THE COURT—DANLAW, J.

Petitioner alleges that he was unjustly restrained of his liberty by the respondent, who claims to own him as a slave and chattel, and prays to be released from the restraint imposed upon him by the respondent. Respondent, by way of return to the writ, in substance alleges that both he and the petitioner are Indians of the Tlinkit or Katsian race, that they are uncivilized natives, that they and their ancestors have inhabited the Alaskan shores from time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, in communities independent of any other law, authority or jurisdiction except that established by their own rules and customs. That the buying, selling and holding of slaves is one of the rites and customs of their race and tribe, that the civil authorities have no jurisdiction over them, and implicitly asserting that Alaska is Indian country, and that they as inhabitants are subject to no law, save the usages and customs of Indians.

The issue presented is important, and necessarily involved an examination of the treaty by which this vast region was ceded to the United States by His Majesty, the Emperor of all the Russias, as well as certain acts of Congress in relation to Alaska. The third article of the treaty of March 30th, 1867, is as follows: "The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years, but if they should prefer to remain in the country, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country."

It will be observed that the power to make laws and regulations for the government of the Indians is expressly granted to the United States, thus indicating very clearly that they were even then regarded as subject to some power superior to their own untamed inclinations. Pursuant to the power reserved in the treaty, Congress, on the 27th day of July 1868, extended the laws of the United States relating to customs, commerce and navigation to and over all the mainland, islands, and waters of Alaska, and conferred upon the President of the United States power to restrict and regulate or prohibit the importation and use of fire arms, ammunition, and distilled spirits into and within the territory. (Secs. 1054 and 1065, revised statutes.)

On the 3d day of March, 1873, Congress amended the two sections referred to by extending over this territory two sections of the act of June 30th, 1834, known as the "Indian Intercourse Law," relating almost exclusively to the interdiction of the liquor traffic among the Indians, and to the distillation of ardent spirits in the Indian country. But I cannot infer that when Congress in express terms extended two sections of the same act, and made them applicable to a certain people, it was intended to extend the whole act.

The presumption is clear that by singling out, mentioning, and extending two sections only, the intention was clearly withheld or excluded from the territory all the other sections of the act. If I am correct in this conclusion it necessarily follows, that only as to the prohibited commerce mentioned in the sections referred to, can Alaska be regarded as Indian country. (Opinions of Atty.-Gen., vol. 14, p. 230, 1842, vol. 16, p. 141.) What then is the legal status of Alaska Indians? Many of them have connected themselves with the mission churches, manifest a great interest in the education of their youth, and have adopted civilized habits of life. Their condition has been gradually changing until the attributes of their original sovereignty have been lost, and they are becoming more and more dependent upon and subject to the laws of the United States, and yet they are not citizens within the full meaning of that term.

From the organization of the government to the present time, the various Indian tribes of the United States have been treated as free and independent within their respective territories,

governed by their tribal laws and customs, in all matters pertaining to their internal affairs, such as contracts and the manner of their enforcement, marriage, descents and the punishment for crimes committed against each other. They have been excused from all allegiance to the municipal laws of the whites as precedents or otherwise in relation to tribal affairs, subject however to such laws as have been enacted by the United States, deemed necessary for their own protection, and for the protection of the whites adjacent to them. (Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia, 5 Peters, 1, 16, 17; Jackson vs. Goodall, 20 Johns, 138.) This policy upon the part of the United States grew out of the ordinance of 1787 adopted by the confederate Congress for the government of the territory northwest of the Ohio river, and has been constantly and scrupulously observed in relation to all Indians existing under tribal customs, and with whom the government has treated, and recognized as independent tribes.

The doctrine enunciated by the supreme court of the United States in the Crow Dog case in 1890, 109th U. S. Reports, 556, is based upon the idea of the supremacy and independence of the Brule Sioux tribe of Indians, in their tribal capacity as admitted and recognized by the United States in a treaty stipulation. It was held that the district court of Dakota had no jurisdiction to try and punish Crow Dog for the murder of a member of his own race because he had been or was liable to be punished by the local law of the tribe. But does the rule in that case apply to the Indians of Alaska? I think not, and for various reasons. The United States has at no time recognized any tribal independence or relations among these Indians, has never treated with them in any capacity, but from the organization of Congress in relation to the people of this territory it is clearly inferable that they have been and now are regarded as dependent subjects, amenable to the penal laws of the United States and subject to the jurisdiction of its courts. Upon a careful examination of the habits of these natives, of their modes of living, and their traditions, I am inclined to the opinion that their system is essentially patriarchal and not tribal as we understand that term in its application to other Indians. They are practically in a state of pupillage, and sustain a relation to the United States similar to that of a ward to a guardian, and have no tribal independence or autonomy which will permit them to sustain and enforce a system of forced servitude at variance with the fundamental laws of the United States. Counsel for respondent suggests that these people are not included within the thirteenth amendment to the constitution, and the subsequent legislation by Congress to enforce it.

Before discussing the amendment and its object it is necessary to briefly examine the system of slavery among these natives. The object of all intellectual research is the discovery of truth, and unless we close our eyes to obvious facts and disbelieve an unbroken chain of human evidence, we cannot escape the conclusion that slavery in its most shocking form has been thoroughly interwoven with the social policy of the Indians of Alaska, and still exists in many localities under circumstances of extreme cruelty. The life of the slave is entirely at the disposal of his master or his mistress, and it has been customary among them to kill one or more slaves on the death of a master, or on the happening of some other event, such as the completion of a new house. Boring the ears, or putting out an eye of a slave or some other mode of marking the flesh has been and is now a custom with some of the nomadic and nomadic people. The evidence shows that the object of such mutilation is to impress upon the slaves their inferiority and render their humiliation complete; that they are believers in witchcraft, and that when a spirit of insubordination becomes manifest upon the part of the slaves the Juggler is called upon, and that he by exorcisms and magical incantations pretends to drive out the rebellious spirits, and the slaves are compelled to submit. Can such a system be tolerated in a country whose people lay claims to civilization and christianity? Does not every precept of religion, every principle that underlies our system of government, every axiom of our political fabric cry out against such monstrous inhumanity?

What was the object of the thirteenth amendment to the constitution? In construing the constitution or any of its amendments, or any of the laws enacted in obedience to its commands, the court may derive aid from contemporaneous exposition; may look to the history of the time of its adoption;

may ascertain the evil sought to be remedied and the object to be accomplished. (Story on the Const. §406.) The object of the thirteenth amendment is easily understood. Its language is sweeping and far reaching. African slavery had practically been abolished by the action of the military arm of the government. A few scraps had remained upon the American people. The last vestige of forced servitude except for the punishment of our political system, by organic law. The thirteenth amendment was proposed to the several states by the thirty-eighth Congress on the 1st of February 1865, and was declared in a proclamation of the secretary of state, dated on the 18th day of December following, to have been ratified by the legislatures of twenty-seven of the then thirty-six states.

The amendment is brief but broad in its scope. Sec. 1—"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction." Sec. 2—"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

It is indeed seldom that so much meaning is contained within the compass of so short a sentence, and for the purpose of making the amendment effectual, the law known as the "civil rights bill" was enacted in April 1866. By it the last relic of slavery or forced servitude in any conceivable form except for the punishment of crime is annulsated. Section 1900 abolishes peonage in New Mexico, and in every state and territory where it had a foothold. On March 3d, 1871, Congress passed a law absolutely forbidding any slave or freed slave of the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction; see section 2079, revised statutes. And by an act approved March 3d, 1885, U. S. statutes at large, vol. 23, p. 385, Congress made all Indians amenable to the criminal laws of the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction of its courts for all offenses designated in said act, committed against the person or property of any other Indian, or any other person.

The last act of Congress referred to materially strengthens the view herein expressed that the Indians of Alaska are under the control of and subject to the laws of the United States. The petitioner testifies that he was captured and sold into slavery when a mere boy, and his labor from that time to this has been appropriated by others. He has lost one eye, his ears are badly mutilated, and he is certainly a sad spectacle of humiliated manhood. The crack of the lash, the torture of mutilation, the fear of death, the annoyance of the Juggler, the excess of manual labor imposed upon him, with the extreme hardships of his life, with the sense of degradation and inferiority constantly before him have subdued his manhood, and the pitiable spectacle of his once stately form is an evidence of the blighting course of slavery. It has been already argued on both sides and all the legal arguments of the attorneys has been brought to a bear, but I am arrive at no other conclusion than that the petitioner should be released from the merciless restraint imposed upon him and go forth a free man, and that is the order of the court.

NOTICE OF FINAL SETTLEMENT.

In the Probate Court of the District of Alaska.

Now comes Samuel Mitchell, the executor of the estate of Antonio G. Cozian, deceased. Order appointing day for final settlement—Now comes Samuel Mitchell, the executor of the estate of Antonio G. Cozian, deceased, having rendered and presented for settlement and filed in this court, his final account of his administration of said estate. It is ordered that Monday the 7th day of June, A. D. 1886, being a day of a subsequent term of said court, shall be and that account thereof, A. D. 1886, at 10 o'clock A. M. of said day, and the said executor is hereby appointed for the settlement of said account, and that notice of said settlement be published in the ALASKAN A newspaper published in Sitka, Alaska, at least once a week for four consecutive weeks prior to the said day of settlement. Done in open court this 5th day of April, A. D. 1886.

JOHN G. BRADY,
U. S. Commissioner and ex-officio Probate Judge.

NOTICE TO CREDITORS.

ESTATE OF MICHAEL POWERS, DECEASED.

Notice is hereby given by the undersigned, administrator of the estate of Michael Powers, deceased, that he has been appointed to administer the same, and that he has taken the oath of office, and that he has filed in the Probate Court of the District of Alaska, a true and correct list of the claims and demands against the said estate, and that he has published the same in the ALASKAN A newspaper published in Sitka, Alaska, at least once a week for four consecutive weeks prior to the said day of settlement. Done in open court this 5th day of April, A. D. 1886.

JOHN G. BRADY,
U. S. Commissioner and ex-officio Probate Judge.

ESTATE OF MICHAEL POWERS, DECEASED.

Notice is hereby given by the undersigned, administrator of the estate of Michael Powers, deceased, that he has been appointed to administer the same, and that he has taken the oath of office, and that he has filed in the Probate Court of the District of Alaska, a true and correct list of the claims and demands against the said estate, and that he has published the same in the ALASKAN A newspaper published in Sitka, Alaska, at least once a week for four consecutive weeks prior to the said day of settlement. Done in open court this 5th day of April, A. D. 1886.