

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE IOWA RESERVATION

By Berlin B. Chapman

This article is the counterpart of my study, "Dissolution of the Iowa Reservation", which appeared in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, December, 1936. It is commonly known among students of Oklahoma history that the Iowa reservation was set apart by an executive order of President Chester A. Arthur in 1883. However, the evolution of the executive order, the process of determining the location of the Iowa reservation, and the activities of persons associated therewith, is a hitherto untold story. It is the purpose of this article to relate how a portion of the Iowa tribe in Kansas and Nebraska removed to Indian Territory, and located on the reservation that acquired their name.¹

The Iowas in 1868 were about 245 in number. They occupied a reservation of 16,000 acres in southeastern Nebraska and northeastern Kansas, to which reservation they had a good title. A half dozen men in Congress from Nebraska and Kansas in a letter² to Superintendent Hampton B. Denman on June 13 stated that this reservation, the reservation of the Sacs and Foxes of the Missouri which joined it, and the Otoe and Missouri reservation, were so located as to retard settlements in the very best portions of their States, and that it was a matter of great importance to their people to have the Indians occupying the reservations removed and the reservation lands brought into market in some shape. "We would be very glad", the letter reads, "if you would in some way, so arrange as to get fair treaties made with these Indians, by which they will be removed, and their lands brought into market."

Denman on June 15 advised the Commissioner of Indian Affairs³ that he had reason to believe that it was the desire of the Sacs and Foxes of the Missouri and the Iowas to treat for the sale of their respective reservations and to remove into the Indian Territory. He explained that they were entirely hemmed in by white settlers who were clamorous for their lands. The local agent on December 28 reported⁴ that the two tribes requested that they be allowed to send delegations to Washington for the purpose of making a treaty with the United States, with a view of disposing of their lands and removing, either to the Indian Territory, or to the new reserve north of Nebraska. The Department of the Interior permitted delegations

¹ Students in my Oklahoma history classes in the Oklahoma A. and M. College assisted me in writing this article; I am also indebted to the Payne County Historical Society who made the contents of this article the subject of a lively discussion, March 8, 1942. In Washington, D. C., I profited by the consistent interest of Senator Elmer Thomas in promoting research in Oklahoma history.

² The letter is dated June 13, 1868 and is in OIA, N. Supt., I. 13-1869.

³ Denman to N. G. Taylor, June 15, 1868, *ibid.*

⁴ C. H. Norris to Denman, Dec. 28, 1868, OIA, N. Supt. I. 18-1869.

United States Indian Service,

Ne and Wy

Agency,

Indian Territory June 20th....., 1882.

Wm. M. Rice

Commissioner of Indian Affairs

Washington D. C.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that the Iowa Indians of whom I mailed you an enrollment the 20th inst have this day informed me that they have been out West of the Sac and Fox Reservation and selected lands situated in townships 14-15-16-17 North and Range 2-3 East, making Deepfork river the south line and the Red fork or Cumarene the north line, comprising an area of about 15 miles by 20 miles.

They say they have been a long time without any home, and are very desirous that the Government should secure them a home on the above described lands, or such a part of it as the Government may deem best.

These Indians show a disposition to try to make themselves home, and they want schools for and their children to, as soon as they can become located

United States Indian Service,

Agency,

....., 1882.

I would respectfully recommend that these Indians be located on such portions of the above lands, as the Department may deem advisable, I will await your instructions before taking any further action on the premises

Yours very respectfully

Jacob B. Carter

A. L. Indian Agent

to be sent accordingly At Washington on February 11, 1869, Denman and Thomas Murphy, representing the United States, concluded a treaty⁵ with them in which it was agreed that the Saint Louis and Nebraska Trunk Railroad Company and the Atchison and Nebraska Railroad Company might purchase the lands of the Iowas on certain terms. The treaty stated that the people of the Iowa tribe were desirous of selling their lands and of removing to a new and permanent home in the Indian Territory. Article eight of the treaty provided that a new home there, including twenty-five sections of land, should be selected for the Iowas by a delegation of the tribe, and sold to it in like manner and on like terms with the reserve to be provided for the Sacs and Foxes,⁶ according to the treaty Article eight also provided that the Iowas should remove thereto as soon as practicable, but not, unless with their consent, before the spring of 1870. President Johnson transmitted the treaty to the Senate on February 17, 1869.

In council on October 8 or 9 the chiefs, headmen and other members of the Iowa tribe, thirty-six in number, adopted and signed a petition addressed to the President and the members of the Senate, earnestly protesting against the ratification of the treaty The petition set forth that the treaty was made without consultation with the tribe, that it was contrary to the well known sentiments of a large majority of the Iowas, and that the price named therein as compensation for the lands was less than half their market value. The wives and mothers of the Iowas, many of them being present at the council, desired to enter a protest against the ratification of the treaty Twenty-two of them signed a statement to that effect, which statement was attached to the petition. In forwarding the petition to Commissioner E. S. Parker on October 18, Superintendent Samuel M. Janney remarked that the Iowas were greatly dissatisfied

⁵ The treaty is in OIA, Treaty File.

⁶ Article two of the treaty provided that as soon as practicable after the ratification of the treaty, a delegation of the Sacs and Foxes should be sent to the Indian Territory by the Secretary of the Interior, accompanied by such officer of the Department as he should designate, who should select there a new reservation for the permanent home of the tribe out of the lands recently purchased by the United States for the settlement of Indian tribes thereon, which new reservation should include 20,000 acres and should lie adjoining or near the new home to be selected for their brethren, the Iowas. The article also provided that if the selection should be approved by the Secretary of the Interior he should sell such new reserve to the Sacs and Foxes at the price per acre which the United States paid for the same, and should cause the tribe to remove thereto as soon as practicable, but not without their consent, before April 1870.

Article three provided that the United States should be reimbursed the cost of the new reservation out of the proceeds of the sales of the lands of the Sacs and Foxes in Nebraska and Kansas, at such time as might, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, considering the wants and interests of the tribe, be most expedient. It was agreed in article fourteen that any amendments to the treaty which might be made by the Senate, not changing the amounts to be received for the lands of the Sacs and Foxes of the Missouri and the Iowas or the payments to be made to either tribe, were thereby accepted and ratified in advance.

with the treaty. In his annual report Parker could hardly recommend its ratification. On February 4, 1870, President Grant requested the Senate to return the treaty to him, and it was not ratified. During the next half dozen years the question of the removal of the Iowas to the Indian Territory was one of only minor importance.

In a letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on December 25, 1876, S. M. Irwin stated that he had recently held a council with the Iowas, and had found all of them looking forward to a sale of their lands and a removal to the Indian Territory.⁷ Three days later three chiefs and two headmen of the tribe addressed a letter⁸ to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs saying in part: "It having been frequently proposed to us to dispose of our present reservation, and remove to the Indian Territory, and as that seems to be the desire of the Government, and the neighboring whites are urging it, we have this day agreed upon a visit of observation to that territory, with a view of removing our tribe thither if after examination we believe it to be for our best interests; Provided the government will furnish funds for payment of our traveling expenses, without encroaching upon our annuities." The inclination of the tribe to remove appears to have rested primarily on the hope that a change of location would to some extent free them from the "curse" of lawless whites. According to Acting Commissioner S. A. Galpin no funds, except those of the Iowas, were available for sending a delegation of the tribe to the Indian Territory.⁹ During the summer of 1877, the Iowas reached a unanimous decision that they would not send a delegation to the Indian Territory to select a location for the tribe, so long as it must be done at their own expense.¹⁰

On March 12, 1878, thirty-six Iowas addressed a petition¹¹ to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs requesting permission to send a delegation of their tribe to the Indian Territory at their own expense for the purpose of examining the country with a view of settling there. The signers stated that they believed eventually they would be removed to the Indian Territory. Between March 12 and 17 sixteen Iowas, representing in the main that part of the tribe in favor of improvement and education, signed a protest¹² against the use of their funds for paying the expenses of a delegation to the Indian Territory. Those signing the protest desired to remain on the reservation they occupied.

⁷ The letter is in OIA, Cent. Supt. I, 4—1877. Irwin sent the letter to Senator John J. Ingalls of Kansas who forwarded it to the Office of Indian Affairs with a note stating that he hoped the suggestions therein would receive early and favorable consideration.

⁸ The letter is dated Dec. 28, 1876 and is in OIA, Neb. K. 1-1877.

⁹ Galpin to Agt. M. B. Kent, June 8, 1877, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book* 136, p. 281.

¹⁰ Kent to Com. Ind. Aff., Aug. 20, 1877, *Ind. Aff.*, 1877, p. 141.

¹¹ The petition is in OIA, Neb. K. 122—1878.

¹² The protest is in *ibid.*

On September 24, Acting Commissioner W. M. Leeds in a letter¹³ expressly stated that the Sacs and Foxes at the Great Nemaha agency who desired to remove to the Sac and Fox agency might do so, with the understanding that if they went they were not to return. It may not be improper to imply from the letter that the same privilege was thereby extended to the Iowas. At any rate in less than three weeks about a dozen Iowas were at the Sac and Fox agency. Leeds on October 24 stated that they would be permitted to remain there.¹⁴ On May 29, 1879, twenty-two Iowas set out for the Sac and Fox agency¹⁵ without securing formal permission to do so. Before the close of the year the Office of Indian Affairs decided to curb this renegade form of migration.¹⁶ Almost one half of the Iowas were strongly contesting every movement toward the abandonment of their reservation. By September 4, 1880, forty-six Iowas were enrolled at the Sac and Fox agency and during the next year as many more set out for that agency. For nearly a decade after 1881, the removal of the Iowas to the Indian Territory was a subject much discussed, but in a practical sense no removals occurred.

At least a year from the autumn of 1879, the Office of Indian Affairs looked coldly on the migration of the Iowas to the Indian Territory, and tended to induce those who had left their reservation to return to it.¹⁷ In the spring of 1882, Secretary S. J. Kirkwood was willing for a delegation of the tribe to come to Washington for consultation at their own expense,¹⁸ if it should be found, among other things, that there was a strong likelihood of the removal of such of their members as desired to maintain their tribal relations to the Indian Territory. A delegation of the tribe went to Washington and expressed a willingness to examine the lands in the Indian Territory and if satisfied therewith to remove from their reservation. On January 8, 1883, four headmen of the Iowas in a petition¹⁹ to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs asked that \$500.00 from the funds of the tribe be used by seven members of the tribe in defraying expenses from the Iowa reservation to the Indian Territory for the purpose of looking at the country with a view of se-

¹³ Leeds to Kent, Sept. 24, 1878, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book 144*, p. 232.

¹⁴ Leeds to Agt. Levi Woodard, Oct. 24, 1878, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book 144*, p. 336.

¹⁵ Kent to Com. E. A. Hayt, June 2, 1879, OIA, Neb. K. 468—1879.

¹⁶ Hayt to Kent, Sept. 4, 1879, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book 150*, p. 508. Note the tolerant attitude expressed in the letter by Acting Commissioner E. J. Brooks to Agt. J. W. Griest, June 12, 1879, *ibid.*, p. 344.

¹⁷ Kent to Com. Ind. Aff., July 12, 1880, OIA, Nebr. K. 925—1880; Brooks to Kent, Aug. 9, 1880, OIA (Large) *Letter Book 172*, p. 435; Kent's rpt. of Oct. 6, 1880, Ann. Rpt. Bd. Ind. Commissioners 1880, p. 75; Ind. Aff. 1880, p. xliii.

¹⁸ Kirkwood to Com. Ind. Aff., March 2, 1882, OIA, *Rec. Letters Sent*, No. 28, p. 149.

¹⁹ The petition is in OIA, F 3631—1883. At the same time four headmen of the Sac and Fox Indians at the Great Nemaha agency addressed a similar petition to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

lecting a future home. The Interior Department complied with their request, but tacked on a statement that this authority should be subject to the proviso that all the Indians at the Great Nemaha agency belonging to the Iowa and Sac and Fox tribes should remove to the Indian Territory to join their people there.²⁰ The Iowas in Nebraska and Kansas then decided to remain where they were, but about July they began agitating the question of removal again.

It is proper at this point to inquire how the limits of the Iowa reservation in the Indian Territory were determined, and for whose benefit the reservation was set apart. On June 30, 1882, Agent Jacob V. Carter reported that the Iowas at the Sac and Fox agency, about eighty-eight in number, had that day informed him that they had been out west of the Sac and Fox reservation and "selected" a tract of land extending from the Deep Fork of the Canadian to the Cimarron, and situated in "Rang 1-2-3 East"²¹ "They say they have been a long time without any home", said Carter, "and are very desirous that the Government should secure them a home on the above described lands, or such a part of it as the Government may deem best." Carter recommended that they be located on such a portion of the lands as the Interior Department might deem advisable. The Office of Indian Affairs was willing to endeavor to provide suitable lands in the Indian Territory upon which to locate the Iowas, provided the whole tribe were willing to remove thereto, and to consent to the sale of their reservation.²²

On April 17, 1883, Carter stated that the Iowas in the Indian Territory had been encouraged to settle on lands west of the Sac and Fox reservation and that about fifty more Iowas were expected to join them during the summer.²³ In a letter²⁴ to Commissioner Hiram Price on the same day, Special Agent Eddy B. Townsend said of the Iowas in the Indian Territory: "These Indians are peaceable and industrious, and would, I believe, make for themselves permanent fields and homes if permitted to do so, but the uncertainties surrounding them, as regards their location, must inevitably discourage and demoralize them; more especially in view of the fact that other Indians are living upon and claiming lands west of this Res. and that more are coming all of which is calculated in their estimation to damage their prospects as to a Res., and permanency." Townsend urged the importance and justice of their having set apart for them, at the very earliest possible day, lands which should be recognized as their own. He recommended that there be set apart for them a tract of land, the width of three townships, bounded

²⁰ Sec. H. M. Teller to Com. Ind. Aff., March 3, 1883, OIA, *Rec. Letters Sent*, No. 31, pp. 260-261; Com. H. Price to Agt. H. C. Linn, March 9, 1883, OIA, *F Letter Book*, vol. 83, pt. ii, pp. 412-414.

²¹ Carter to Price, OIA, L. 12246—1882. The Iowas were residing on this tract.

²² Price to Carter, July 11, 1882, OIA, *L. Letter Book* 98, pp. 470-471.

²³ Carter to Price, OIA, L. 7395—1883.

²⁴ OIA, L. 7553—1883.

on the east by the Sac and Fox reservation and on the north and south as stated in Carter's letter of June 30, 1882.

Three months later a petition²⁵ signed by thirty-three chiefs and headmen of the Iowas at the Sac and Fox agency was addressed to Price, earnestly requesting that prompt steps be taken to sell their land at the Great Nemaha agency, and to procure a home for them in the Indian Territory. Price was satisfied that it would encourage the Iowas who were determined to remain in the Indian Territory, to give them a title of some kind to the lands they occupied. He prepared a draft of an executive order²⁶ for the Iowas, covering the tract described by Townsend, but specifying that the tract, in width, should extend from the Sac and Fox reservation to the Indian Meridian. He incorporated a clause stating that the tract should be set apart for the permanent use and occupation of "the Iowa and such other Indians" as the Secretary of the Interior might see fit to locate thereon. On the tract were some 240 Otoes and Missouriias who were unwilling to return to their reservation, which Price considered undoubtedly insufficient, owing to the character of the land and limited area, to support a larger number of Indians than were already there. For this reason, and the fact that the area of the proposed reservation was larger than the requirements of the Iowas demanded, the provision for "other Indians" was incorporated in the draft of the executive order.²⁷ Price considered it probable that the Iowa reservation in Nebraska and Kansas would, before many years be sold, when the Iowas residing thereon would join their brethren in the Indian Territory, making the number of Iowas there some 220. He also thought that the assignment of lands in Oklahoma district to Indians would tend to defeat David L. Payne and others "in their annoying raids" into that portion of the Indian Territory. On July 31 the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitted the draft of the executive order to President Arthur, who signed it August 15. The lands described therein were henceforth known as the Iowa reservation in the Indian Territory.²⁸ The reservation comprised 279,296.57 acres of land, ceded to the United States by the Creeks in 1866.

In July, Price expected that Congress would be asked to confirm, by patent or otherwise, the title of the Iowa reservation in the Indian Territory to the Indians designated in the executive order.

²⁵ The petition is dated July 18, 1883 and is in OIA, L. 13506—1883.

²⁶ The executive order is in OIA, *L. Letter Book 115*, p. 282; Kappler i, 843-844.

²⁷ Price to Sec. Int., July 30, 1883, OIA, Executive Order File, Aug. 15, 1883; same to same, Dec. 6, 1883, *S. Ex. Docs.*, 48 Cong. 1 sess., i (2162), no. 18, pp. 2-3; same to same, May 3, 1884, OIA, *L. Letter Book 125*, pp. 149-152.

²⁸ The Iowa reservation lay between the Deep Fork of the Canadian River and the south bank of the Cimarron River; and extended from the west boundary of the Sac and Fox Reservation (about two miles west of Chandler, Oklahoma) to the Indian Meridian. This tract is now included in adjoining parts of Lincoln, Payne, Logan and Oklahoma counties.

In his opinion the lands of the reservation should be secured to these Indians by a more permanent title so that they might have assurance of not being removed, except by their free consent. He prepared the draft of a bill²⁹ authorizing the President to cause a patent to issue to the Iowa tribe of Indians for the lands in the reservation, declaring that the United States would hold the same for the period of twenty-five years, in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Iowa tribe, and such other Indians as the Secretary of the Interior might see fit to locate with them, and that at the expiration of the said period the United States would convey the same by patent to the Iowa tribe, in fee, discharged of said trust and free from all charge or incumbrance whatsoever. The Senate tied up the issuance of a patent to the Iowas with the sale of their lands in Nebraska and Kansas. The Iowas in the Indian Territory desired Congress to confirm the executive order reservation to the Iowas in lieu of these lands. They earnestly petitioned³⁰ that Congress confirm that reservation to the use of the Iowas exclusively and that it be not shared in by any other Indians. The Interior Department submitted the matter to Congress. The effect of the executive order was not changed by Congress and the provision therein regarding "other Indians" continued to trouble the Iowas and was soon to involve the Tonkawas.

We may now review the events that led to the location of the Tonkawas on the Iowa reservation in the Indian Territory. In 1875 the Tonkawas numbered less than 150 souls. They had no reservation but were at Fort Griffin, Texas, under the supervision of military authority. On May 10 the commanding officer at Fort Griffin recommended that they be given a reservation in the Indian Territory.³¹ The Secretary of War on November 13 earnestly requested that the Interior Department take some action with a view of placing them on a reservation. A month later Commissioner John Q. Smith suggested that a home might be selected among the Kickapoos for them or that they might be removed to New Mexico. But it was found that there were no funds available for the removal of the Tonkawas. Indian appropriation acts from 1876 to 1878 provided annually a sum of \$2,000 or \$2,500 for their benefit, with the provision that no part of such funds should be applied to their removal from the vicinity of Fort Griffin to any Indian reservation.³²

²⁹ The bill is in *S. Ex. Docs., loc. cit.*, pp. 3-4. President Arthur transmitted it to Congress December 17, 1883.

³⁰ The petition is dated April 16, 1884, and is in OIA, L. 8101—1884.

³¹ "Tonkawa Indians at Fort Griffin, Texas" *H. Ex. Docs.*, 44 Cong. 1 sess., xii (1889), no. 102.

³² Indian appropriation acts from 1879 to 1883 provided annually a sum between \$3,000 and \$4,800 for the support of the Tonkawas at Fort Griffin, but made no mention of their removal.

In a communication³³ to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on July 4, 1879, Acting Agent J. B. Irwine observed that the Tonkawas had no land or reservation. He submitted that the first requisite in encouraging them in the arts of civilization was to provide them with land and a home that they could call their own. Acting Commissioner E. J. Brooks deemed it inadvisable to make any arrangement for their permanent abode at any place other than in the Indian Territory. On September 24 he requested Irwine to report fully upon their disposition to remove to and locate upon some suitable lands to be thereafter selected for them in the Territory³⁴. The Tonkawas were not favorably disposed towards such removal. Their principal objection to settling in the Indian Territory was their great fear of their enemies, the Comanches, at whose hands they had severely suffered. On October 7 Irwine reported that before making a decisive answer to the proposition of their removal, the Tonkawas suggested that a delegation of five or six of their principal men be sent to examine the country selected for them, and return and report to their people the advantages of the transfer³⁵.

Commissioner E. A. Hayt on January 23, 1880, instructed Irwine to take a delegation of not more than five Tonkawas and proceed to the vicinity of the location "recently selected by the Poncas and Nez Percés, at a point on the Salt Fork near its junction with the Arkansas River".³⁶ Hayt suggested that the lands in the angle formed by the north boundary of the Ponca reservation and the east boundary of the Oakland reservation, be explored with the object of selecting a permanent location for the Tonkawas. Between February 16 and 23 Lieutenant R. N. Getty and a delegation of five Tonkawas examined the country extending from Kansas to the Ponca reservation, and lying between Turkey Creek and the Indian Meridian. Getty was favorably impressed with the soil, timber, water and climate of this tract of country.³⁷ In his opinion the township directly east of the Oakland reservation would have been an excellent location for the Tonkawas. The delegation however, with one exception, were not pleased with the locality because of the proximity to tribes larger than the Tonkawas,³⁸ the coldness of the climate and the scarcity of game. The Tonkawas said that they were all born and raised in Texas and did not wish to leave that State, even though the Indian Territory was a much better country for agricultural purposes. They were confirmed in their disposition to remain in Texas by the hope that State authorities would ultimately

³³ OIA, Cent. Supt., I. 1546—1879.

³⁴ Brooks to Irwine, Sept. 24, 1879, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book 167*, p. 307.

³⁵ Irwine to Com. Ind. Aff., Oct. 7, 1879, OIA, Cent. Supt., I. 2204—1879.

³⁶ Hayt to Irwine, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book 169*, pp. 212-213. Nez Percés occupied the Oakland reservation.

³⁷ Getty to Irwine, March 3, 1880, OIA, Cent. Supt., I. 156—1880.

³⁸ It was observed that Indian tribes were so numerous in the Indian Territory that the Tonkawas, if there, might all be killed, one by one, while out hunting, and no one would ever know who killed them.

donate them lands on which they could permanently locate. Indeed this hope appeared to be so well founded that on April 23 Commissioner R. E. Trowbridge stated that no further steps would be taken at that time by the Interior Department toward the selection of lands for the Tonkawas.³⁹

In his annual report⁴⁰ for 1882 Acting Agent Elias Chandler stated that the Tonkawas had no reservation, and were dependent to a great extent upon the whims of the landowners in the vicinity of Fort Griffin. He noted however that they were well contented and apparently had a horror of the idea of being removed to the Indian Territory. On December 5 he reported that they were willing to remove there, provided they could secure a reservation remote from the Comanches and Kiowas, and near to a military post.⁴¹ Commissioner Price thought it advisable that some definite arrangement should be made for the permanent location of the Tonkawas. On March 29, 1883 he stated that if the plan met with their approval, Chandler might take one or two of their chiefs to the country lying west of the Sac and Fox reservation, between the Deep Fork of the Canadian and the Cimarron, and also to that portion of the Cherokee Outlet in the vicinity of the Ponca, Pawnee and Otoe reservations, to select a suitable place for the location of the tribe.⁴² However, the proposed visit to the Indian Territory was not made, because on April 12, Price explained that there was no money available to remove the Tonkawas there, even though a suitable location should be chosen for them.

For almost a year it appeared that the Tonkawas were destined to live on the Quapaw reservation. On December 17, Agent Daniel B. Dyer reported that a portion of the Quapaws expressed a willingness to allow the Interior Department to use two or three thousand acres of their lands as a location for the Tonkawas, the price thereof to be fixed by the government.⁴³ The Tonkawas on February 2, 1884, signed a statement⁴⁴ that they would remove to these lands as soon as it should be the pleasure of the government to complete its preparations for their removal. The Indian appropriation act⁴⁵ approved July 4 provided \$10,000 for their support, civilization and instruction, and for their removal to a reservation in the Indian Territory. Five days later Price recommended that they be removed to the Quapaw reservation, but Secretary H. M. Teller stated that their removal should not be started until definite arrangements had been made for their location on that reservation or upon such other

³⁹ Trowbridge to Irwine, April 23, 1880, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book* 169, p. 674.

⁴⁰ *Ind. Aff.*, 1882, p. 147.

⁴¹ Chandler to Com. Ind. Aff., Dec. 5, 1882, OIA, C. 22295—1882.

⁴² Price to Chandler, OIA, (Large) *Letter Book* 173, p. 299.

⁴³ Dyer to Price, Dec. 17, 1883, OIA, L. 23119—1883.

⁴⁴ The statement is in OIA, 5039-08-266, Gen. Service.

⁴⁵ Act of July 4, 1884, 23 *Statutes*, 91.

lands in the Indian Territory as might be finally selected for them. More definite arrangements were reported as made for locating the Tonkawas upon the Quapaw reservation, and on August 21 the Acting Secretary of the Interior granted authority for their removal there.⁴⁶ The letter granting this authority went to the Office of Indian Affairs, but upon request it was returned to the Office of the Secretary of the Interior and cancelled. Further negotiations with the Quapaws did not remove their opposition to the location of the Tonkawas on their reservation. On September 20 Teller and Price agreed that the Tonkawas should be removed to the Iowa reservation in the Indian Territory⁴⁷

The Iowas were no more willing than the Quapaws to share lands with the Tonkawas. On October 16, six days after the Tonkawas left Fort Griffin, Agent Isaac A. Taylor reported that he felt sure that if the Tonkawas were settled on the Iowa reservation, the main body of the Iowas would not remove to that locality, and that even the Iowas in the Indian Territory would leave their reservation.⁴⁸ On October 22, Price pointed out that according to the executive order setting apart the reservation, the Tonkawas had the same rights there that the Iowas had.⁴⁹ Price expected however that the Tonkawas would be so located as not to interfere with the comfort and convenience of the Iowas.

The Tonkawas, ninety-two in number, arrived at the Sac and Fox agency October 22 or 23 and were located on the Iowa reservation. The Iowas at that agency on October 27 addressed a letter⁵⁰ to Eddy B. Townsend, relative to the recent location of the Tonkawas, saying in part:

It was done without our consent and we were not even informed of their coming until we saw them at this place on their road to our reservation. We regard this as an injustice to us and earnestly protest against those Indians being located on our lands. As you are well aware, there is but a small percent of that entire Reservation suitable for farming purposes—no more than our tribe can utilize when our relatives now in Nebraska remove to these lands set apart for us. The remainder of our Reservation is broken, upland prairie and sandy, timbered ridges. Again injustice is done us just at this juncture of time, as our tribe has signed a petition praying for the sale of our Reservation in Nebraska and the purchase of this Reservation in the Indian Territory and while this change of our home is in process—to thrust into our midst and upon our lands a tribe of strange Indians, and dividing the lands for which we were

⁴⁶ M. L. Joslyn to Com. Ind. Aff., Aug. 21, 1884, OIA, *Rec. Letters Sent*, No. 36, p. 478.

⁴⁷ Price to Sec. Int., Sept. 20, 1884, OIA, *Rpt. Book 49*, pp. 560-561; Teller to Com. Ind. Aff., Sept. 20, 1884, OIA, *Rec. Letters Sent*, No. 37, p. 208.

⁴⁸ Taylor to Price, Oct. 16, 1884, OIA, L. 20192—1884. Taylor recommended that the "entire Oklahoma country" be set apart by executive order for the settlement of the Tonkawas and other Indians thereon.

⁴⁹ Price to Taylor, Oct. 22, 1884, OIA, *L. Letter Book 130*, pp. 396-398.

⁵⁰ Letter of Oct. 27, 1884, OIA, C. 22049—1884.

negotiating—seems to us an unnecessary and unjust disregard of our feelings and our rights. We have ample means to pay for all our lands here and regard it a safe and wise investment to exchange our valuable lands in Nebraska for cheaper lands in this country which will eventually become more valuable. We earnestly ask you to use every means in your power to prevent a division of our Reservation, with the Tonkawa Indians and ask that as soon as practicable they may be removed from our lands.

An act⁵¹ approved March 3, 1885, made provisions whereby the Sac and Fox and Iowa reservations in Nebraska and Kansas might be sold and the Indians residing thereon be removed to a reservation or reservations to be secured for them. The act authorized the President to issue a patent to the Iowa tribe declaring that reservation lands secured for them should be held by the United States in trust for their sole use and benefit. Taylor on March 17 recommended, for the welfare, happiness and advancement of both the Iowas and Tonkawas, that Oklahoma lands be set apart for the occupation of the latter tribe. In his estimation the Iowas could utilize all the good agricultural lands of the Iowa reservation, which lands he estimated at ten percent of the reservation. Commissioner J. D. C. Atkins on April 3 suggested that the Tonkawas be located near the boundaries of the reservation in such a manner as to enable the Interior Department to set aside a separate tract of land for their occupation, leaving the balance of the reservation to be patented to the Iowa tribe, should they elect to sell their lands in Nebraska and Kansas and remove to the Indian Territory.⁵² He recommended that an inspector or special agent be instructed to hold a council with the Iowa tribe for the purpose of ascertaining whether they were willing to accept the terms of the recent act of Congress for the sale of their lands in Nebraska and Kansas, and that he be authorized to inform them that if they so desired, they could be located on the Iowa reservation in the Indian Territory and receive a patent for the same, less a sufficient quantity of land for the requirements of the Tonkawas. The Acting Secretary of the Interior promptly approved the recommendation.

Atkins on April 4 directed Taylor to designate the location on the Iowa reservation that would be most desirable for the Tonkawas, having regard for their wants and the convenience of the Iowas. Taylor accordingly designated a rectangular tract of land,⁵³ where the Tonkawas were then located, embracing about 45,000 acres in the southeast corner of the reservation, just west and northwest of the present site of Chandler. As late as April 17 Atkins contemplated the continued occupation of lands of the Iowa reservation by the Tonkawas.⁵⁴ By April 20 he was led to the conclusion that to

⁵¹ 23 *Statutes*, 350.

⁵² Atkins to Sec. Int., April 3, 1885, OIA, 1606 Ind. Div. 1885.

⁵³ Taylor's report of April 10, 1885, and map submitted therewith, are in OIA, Gen. Service, *loc. cit.*

⁵⁴ Atkins to W. H. Robb, April 17, 1885, OIA, *L. Letter Book* 135, pp. 15-21.

keep them on the reservation would result to the disadvantage of both the Tonkawas and the Iowas and possibly in a failure to obtain the consent of the latter tribe to sell their lands in Nebraska and Kansas and settle together in the Indian Territory⁵⁵ Two months later the Tonkawas set out for the Oakland reservation, known thereafter as the Tonkawa reservation.

It comes not within the province of this study to trace the history of the councils held with the Iowa tribe in Nebraska and Kansas and in the Indian Territory with a view of consolidating the tribe on the lands of the Iowa reservation established by executive order in 1883. It is enough to observe that the Iowas in the Indian Territory favored such a union, and that in July 1885 the male adults of the tribe in Nebraska and Kansas refused, by the narrow margin of one vote, to sell their lands as proposed in the act of March 3 of that year.⁵⁶ The act was amended in 1887. But so far as lands in the Indian Territory were concerned nothing had been done under its provisions when in May 1890 the Iowas on the executive order reservation signed an agreement relinquishing to the United States all their right, title and interest in and to the lands of that reservation.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Atkins to Sec. Int., April 20, 1885, OIA, *Rpt. Book 51*, pp. 606-609.

⁵⁶ "Sac and Fox and Iowa Indian Reservations", *S. Ex. Docs.*, 49 Cong. 1 sess., iv(2336), no. 70.