

being so, therefore when Congress passed this law of March 1st, 1889, having express relation to the moneys out of which alone said ten per cent., or any other compensation to the attorneys, must be paid, and providing, in said section 4, for the disposition of said moneys, and thus making the act of Congress to be *in pari materia* with said Creek legislation, it is therefrom *presumed*, as a matter of law, and as a rule of interpretation of statutes, that Congress had in view and mind, *and thus recognized and validated*, the said Creek legislation including said two acts ratifying the said six and one-half and said three and one-half per cent. compensation.

Third. Not only is it *presumed*, as a matter of law, as stated in the preceding paragraph, that said section 4 of the act of March 1st, 1889, was passed in *view and recognition* of said Creek legislation, but the letter of Secretary Vilas, to the chairman of the committee having said legislation in charge, when it was still pending in Congress (such letter being Exhibit G in said printed statement, p. 26), expressly called the attention of the committee, and, through the committee, of Congress to the existence of said contracts for compensation, and *invited Congressional action regarding the same*, such letter suggesting that the existing contracts should be annulled, and declaring the willingness of Crawford "to accept in compensation such sum only as the *National Council of the Creek Nation shall deem to be just for his services, and such as they may be willing to pay him by a direct act of their Council for that purpose.*" (See Printed Statement, pp. 26, 27.)

Thus is fixed upon Congress express and official notice, from the Executive, that it was understood the compensation of Crawford should be that just compensation voted by the Creek National Council, and also *express notice* of the ratification of that contract of February 4th by the Creek National Council.