

It is further proper for me to say that no one who is acquainted with the holdings of the Supreme Court (21 Wall., 450) defining the distinction between lobby work and legitimate professional services, rendered in matters under consideration in the Departments or in Congress, and who, moreover, knows the kind and the extent of the services rendered by me during the said four years, (involving, as these services did, investigating, deciding upon, and advising about the state of the treaties, of the laws, of the rulings of the courts, and of the Departments, upon which the said rights of the Creek Nation depended—in enforcing those rights before the authorities having the disposition of such rights, in drawing memorials—in writing letters—in holding consultations and correspondence with the said Nation, in preparing the other documents required in furtherance of the legislation and treaties which resulted in the securement of the said rights of the Creek Nation,) can, with any pretense of truth or reason, deny that my services were lawful, were legitimate, and were not only needful, but indispensable to the securement of the said rights ultimately attained in virtue of said agreement of the 19th of January, 1889, and the appropriation act of the 1st of March, 1889.

Their lawful character, their great value, and my right to be compensated therefor, were and are, so far as I know, never denied, but on the contrary, were expressly affirmed by the Legislative Council of the Creek Nation. And my said right to compensation was admitted by the said Secretary Vilas, not only in the two letters above-named, written by him, but also in his interviews with me in procuring my said surrender of said written contracts.

I conclude this communication by again requesting that the Secretary of the Interior will transmit, along with any report he may make to the Attorney-General in the pre-