

Wichita Daily Eagle

A SOUTH KANSAS FARM

From the El Dorado Republican. Hon. J. W. Robinson owns 3,300 acres of land in Murdock township, Butler county, fifteen miles northeast of Wichita. This farm is located on the White-water river and comprises some of the best farming lands in the county. Last year he raised 2,000 acres of corn, 300 acres of wheat, 300 acres of oats, 500 acres of sorghum. The corn field averaged 65 bushels per acre, cost \$3 to 6 cents and brought 35 cents when fed to stock. He sold 10,000 bushels on the stock for 12 cents per bushel. He has fed 60,000 bushels and will carry 60,000 bushels over till next year. From the 300 acres of wheat he threshed 8,100 bushels, that sold at 31 cents per bushel.

Speaking of gold finds, a plowman turned a bag of gold, about \$800, one day last week, near Torrrence, Miss. It was no April fool, but actual stuff. It is supposed the treasure was hid there by some miserly old sinner "way 'fore de wah."

Yesterday, April 14, was the twenty-fifth anniversary of the death of our first martyred president, Abraham Lincoln. The death of Samuel J. Randall that occurred twenty-four hours before that quarter-century anniversary, could not but add peculiar solemnity and pathos to the occasion.

There is war between two rival Methodist churches in Norfolk, Virginia. As a supreme resort, one society has engaged a brass band to play in front of and inside the church edifice in order to draw saints and sinners alike from the house around the corner. As far as zeal and uproar is concerned, there is little difference between a political rumpus and church row in Virginia.

The resolution offered in congress Saturday by Representative Hitt, chairman of the ways and means, providing for commercial reciprocity with the other American countries seem to be in exact accord with the popular demand and the common interest. We can think of no good reason why it should not be adopted and carried into effect at once, as far as the acts of this government can do it.

Insomnia is now troubling royalty on the continent. King George, of Greece, cannot sleep because of indignation. His neighbor on the north, the czar of Russia, is not suffering from indignation, but he is so sleepless that he is thinking seriously of establishing a parliament, which would be an important move towards the liberty of the Russian people and the czar hopes to remove the danger that now hangs over his head.

The wonderful photograph is rapidly coming into general use as a means of communication. It seems peculiarly adapted to conveying messages of state and diplomatic character. And we apprehend that as a recorder of evidence and testimony of a legal character it will also soon become next to an indispensable auxiliary to courts of justice. The photograph is perhaps the most unique of modern inventions.

Erin Boy is a somewhat unucky individual viewed at this distance. He first gets lost, then he is rescued, and he hardly gets on Africa's shore when he looks up and falls out a window and pretty nearly kills himself. His last episode is to get a catarrh over his eye from which it is said he will go blind. It is said that the white people do not look to the African wilds and keep him from telling some awkward tales.

We print the full text of a recent decision of the Kingfisher land office, preceded by a summary of the agreed statement of facts upon which the case was submitted. This decision is interesting to the people of Oklahoma for the reason that it involves a construction of the words "enter upon and occupy" as they are used in the act of congress of March 2, 1889, and the president's proclamation thereunder of March 23, 1889, opening that country to settlement. Of course, the local officers may be reversed in the case, but the importance of their decision is in the fact that it assumes to be based upon the previous decision of the general land office recently promulgated in another case.

The death of Samuel J. Randall, the details of which event will be found in this morning's dispatches, though expected almost daily, if not hourly, for some time yet nevertheless cause universal regret. Although a strong party man, always, at times when he and his representatives were unjustly in the minority, yet by his many bearing and courageous advocacy and defense of what he believed to be right, won and held the respect of all. On account of his sterling integrity, supplemented by a high order of ability and long experience in the affairs of government, his loss to the country is a serious one and will be so regarded.

The Chicago News produced a profound sensation in that city Friday by stating that the present city administration is getting more than \$500,000 from the gamblers to permit them to run. The News claims to be able to substantiate its charges. It publishes on a page of scathing criticism of Mayor Corder and his subordinates, claiming the greatest corruption and open prostitution of official position to individual gain ever known in Chicago. Dates and names of men, gambling places and alleged bargains by officials are given. What a stupor the Louisiana lottery would have had if it had struck that modern Sodom. With such a record, unless it is absolutely approved, sober and conservative people will be afraid to attend the world's fair, if it should be held there, or any other gathering, lest some great calamity should befall them.

Reports from Berlin indicate that the emperor in his great zeal for reform (it is likely to bring the legislative department) of that government into conflict with him. If the parliament shall refuse or decline to enact measures in conformity with the wishes of his imperial highness the issue raised will become at once exceedingly interesting. Whether the emperor will exercise his prerogative and dissolve the parliament and order the election of a new one, or after getting rid of that body proceed to carry into effect his reform notions in his own way remains to be seen. This news from Berlin is in odd contrast with that from St. Petersburg where a movement is on foot to limit the czar's power by substituting a constitutional for the personal form of government. It is enough to say, perhaps, in this connection, that the revolution now going on in the eastern hemisphere is widespread and will work many radical changes, but it is hoped bloodshed may be avoided.

From the El Dorado Republican. The woman must be that leader. Running through all animal life the male is, with rare exceptions, the absolute ruler. The male is superior in size, mind and courage. The horn-fowl male is about one-third larger; he is armed with spurs, his bill is crooked and strong for offense and defense, his neck—the most vulnerable part—is clothed with long thick feathers, and like the tough and wrinkled hide of the bull dog, and the mane of the lion, is a defense. None of these are found in the females. So man is larger than woman, with hair covering his throat, as in the cases named, for a shield. So in the nervous, vascular and muscular systems man stands superior for offense and defense. Physically, then, he is the leader. Mentally he holds the same rank. In all the varied fields of intellectual effort no woman has ever held the first place. And so in courage, in self-possession and judgment and all the moral qualities which support command, the man is superior. The question then remains: Does the right of woman's suffrage over-throw the natural leadership of the family? I think it does. Politics leads to the most intense hatreds and bloody feuds. If the woman agrees with the man, her suffrage is useless. If she does not, the difference is fatal to the family. "I do not say that man is superior in all things. One sex is the supplement of the other; and so the physical, moral and intellectual developments are in some sense opposite. A bearded woman and a beardless man are monstrosities. And the sum of the faculties of all kinds may be admitted to be equal, but their spheres are different, and man's is the sphere of leadership and government.

"In the exercise of the suffrage all the bulwarks which the wisdom of all ages has placed around woman's virtue are leveled at one blow. The luxuries of conquering Rome corrupted the whole people. Then the chastity of woman was lost. Then came anarchy, conquest and slavery. Cataline first violated the sacred scenes of the Eleusian mysteries before he attempted the assassination of the senate and the destruction of the republic. Eighteen hundred years have not effaced the ruins of woman's fall. The Republican, Democratic, Labor and Prohibition parties may flourish and may fade, but woman suffrage gained, all is lost—like the dead worlds, it may be—forever.

According to the new York Herald, the tour of the southern states arranged for the foreign delegates to the Pan-American congress will occupy a period of time extending from April 18 to May 10. Among the points to be visited are Richmond, Va.; Charleston, S. C.; Augusta, Atlanta, Macon and Brunswick, Ga.; Ferandina, Jacksonville, St. Augustine, Tampa and Pensacola, Fla.; Mobile, Ala.; New Orleans, La.; Birmingham, Ala.; Chattanooga and Nashville, Tenn.; Roanoke, Va.; the Natural Bridge and Luray, Va.

Memphis, Tenn., does not appear on the list of places to be visited and the local papers are sizing him at their congressman, Colonel Phelan, because of his negligence to which they charge the omission. Columbus, Ky., is also expatriated at the snub given that village under the bluff, which still holds to the infatuation that it is some day to be the capital of the nation, because of a tradition that says that President Jackson so declared fifty years ago while standing on the "Chalk Banks," as the bluff overlooking that point on the Mississippi river was called at that time. It is really too bad that these two historic and renowned localities should have been given the g. h. in making up the trip for the entertainment and education of the distinguished visitors. But of such is life speed.

General D. W. Wilder's annual report, as insurance commissioner, is on our table. It is a complete vindication of his official conduct. "The Kansas Cats," as he denounces the men, women and children who have been trying to do him down. His report cannot be overthrown or weakened, because it is a compilation of history and of judicial facts. It is the strongest, the most invincible official document ever issued in the state, and as modest as it is imprugable. He waxes out the thieves' companies one by one and no bogus insurance company will ever again be able to get into Kansas to rob honest people. The last one has been driven from the state. He also explains or shows how the beneficiary societies were fooled into fighting him. Wilder in one of his classic paragraphs says: "Charles IX— and Villains before him—made a dead enemy always smells well." When we call to mind the men, women and children who have been trying to do him down in Kansas, we do not stop to shed tears over the fallen frauds. Nothing so well became them as their departure. Their presence here, for many a year, has left so many ruined homes, day's wages and children's will over permit their return. No test in human form has so wronged and robbed our state as the insurance fraud. In disaster and in death the dancing devil has been present. One of them testified in court in Topeka last February: "I can get business for a company that has no assets." And he held of a Topeka wild cat. "Temperance is well; temperance in eating and temperance in drinking; temperance in all things. But summary laws are forbidden by all the wisest apogees of the greatest thinkers. The world is governed too much. Power is always stealing from the many to the few. Temperance, like all the virtues, comes best by moral rule and sanction. The church, the Sunday school, the family, the common school, must teach temperance. Drunkenness, like other crimes, must be punished by fine, imprisonment, exile and death, if need be. But it is illogical to punish one for what another does. Stimulants are the good gift of Deity; as medicines they stand against all the other thousand drugs of the shop. I will not by my own consent yield up the right to use but not abuse them. Drunkenness makes more drunkards than whisky."

One of the managers of a big eastern knitting mill has made a calculation that the shoe strings of a working girl will come untied on the average of three times per diem, and that a girl will lose about fifty seconds every time she stops to re-tie them. Most of the employees have two feet, so this entails a loss of 300 seconds every day for each girl. There are about 400 girls employed in this factory, and therefore the gentleman finds that 43,800,000 seconds are wasted in the course of a year, which time, at the average rate of wages, is worth \$24,270. Orders have accordingly been issued that girls must wear only button shoes or congress gaiters, under penalty of discharge. It is indeed a great pity when a poor girl can not wear the shoes she wishes. The next thing and she will be prohibited hair that comes down.

If Secretary Proctor is bent on turning our American Indians into soldiers it might be well to turn the soldiers of the country to keep the number of military Indians within reasonable bounds.

Decision of the Kingfisher Land Office—Unlawful Sooner is no Defense. There is absolutely nothing in the agreed statement of facts that would lead to the conclusion that the defendant, James Ben Lee, entered the territory in the manner described, prior to noon of April 22, 1889, "for the purpose or with the intent" to gain an advantage thereby in the selection and entry of a homestead. We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 1889, prior to 12 o'clock noon April 22, 1889, that he was at noon of the 22nd day of April, 1889, a qualified homestead entrant, and who did not seek to or secure any advantage thereby, was such a violation of the law as to disqualify him from ever being "permitted to enter any of said lands, or acquire any right thereto." We therefore find as a matter of fact, that defendant, James Ben Lee, did not "enter upon and occupy" any of the lands in Oklahoma, within the meaning of the act of March 2, 18