

President Hayes has promised to place Fitz John Porter on the retired list.

The full text of Delegate Bennett's bill for the admission of Dakota will be found on the first page of this paper.

It looks now as though McCook's bill to place Gen. Grant on the retired list of the army would be snuffed under.

Sioux Falls has taken the preliminary steps toward establishing a school for the deaf and dumb of the territory. We give the report of the proceedings elsewhere.

Hon. Alexander Hughes, of Elk Point has been nominated by the president to be receiver of the land office at Yankton, Dakota, vice Lott S. Bayless, whose time has expired.

The Daily News, heretofore a democratic organ in Milwaukee, has been purchased by a company of republicans and will be issued hereafter as a republican paper. It is thought the Sentinel will take the independent sheet.

Congressman Springer has introduced a resolution changing time of holding congressional and presidential elections from November to October. The resolution was opposed by southern members because of the prevalence of epidemics in October and because it would interfere with cotton picking. The sentiment of northern members was more favorable.

Elk Point Courier: Judge Barnes, of the third judicial district, is endorsed by the entire bar of his district for reappointment. Judge Barnes has many warm friends in this section of Dakota who hope he will secure a reappointment. By the way if we should all happen to go together, Judge Barnes would make excellent timber to select a United States senator from.

Vermillion Republican: There is a class of republicans in this county who delight to dub themselves stalwarts. The principal characteristics of these men are that they bolted the territorial convention, bolted the county convention, and are now clamorous to reorganize themselves into some sort of respectable political shape, if such a thing be possible. They have our sympathy, and can be assured that time will heal their ills.

Our dispatches last evening contained the intelligence that Theo. F. Singiser, of Pennsylvania, had been appointed secretary of Idaho territory. It is nearly ten years since this gentleman severed his connection with the Dakota Herald as its editor. Either Mr. Hayes is to be credited with a generous leaning toward Democracy, or Mr. Singiser has seen the error of his political ways, repented, reformed and become a "flopper."

DAKOTA MATTERS IN THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

We have received the annual report of the Hon. Carl Schurz, secretary of the interior. It comprises a pamphlet of eighty pages, the greater portion of which is taken up with a discussion of the Indian question, which is handled in the most candid manner, and it might be added, with that ability which indicates that the writer is thoroughly informed concerning his subject. Speaking of railroads through Indian reservations, the report says:

It has been the policy of this department to facilitate the building of railroads through Indian reservations as much as laws and treaties permitted, at the same time in every instance protecting the interests and rights of the Indians. In a few cases a certain prejudice prevailing among the Indians against the establishment of railroads has made it necessary for their reservations had to be overcome. But it was made clear to them that it is important to their security and well-being not to provoke hostile feelings on the part of the white people by needlessly offering obstacles to the progress of civilization and to the execution of enterprises generally useful. Neither can it be doubted that it is ultimately best for the Indians to come into contact with truly civilized agencies. In the same measure the Indians become producers, agriculturists and herders, the proximity of railroads will become important to facilitate the exchange of their products and thereby enhance the value of their products. When application is made by railroad companies for permission to pass through an Indian reservation, the Indians are assembled in council and consulted as to their consent and wishes, and as to the measure of compensation to be paid by the railroad company seeking the privilege. In this way the consent of the Indians has, so far, in every case been readily obtained, and the required compensation paid by the respective companies. Rights of way have been granted through the Sisseton reserve in Dakota, to the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul railway company; through the Otsego and Missouri reserve, in Nebraska, to the Republic Valley railroad company; through the Winnebago and Omaha reserve, in Nebraska, to the Saint Paul and Sioux City railroad company; and through the Walker reserve, in Nebraska, to the Carson and Colorado Railroad Company.

The Dakota Central and the Chic go, Milwaukee and St. Paul railroads are now making preliminary surveys, with the consent of the Indians and under an escort of Indian police, through the great Sioux reservation, in Dakota, to connect the main line of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul with the Missouri river and eastern railroad systems. Negotiations with the Black Hills for the right of way are now pending, and satisfactory adjustment of the question of compensation is expected in the near future.

The following reference to Dakota is made: The governor reports a rapid extension of railroads in the territory, and that prosperous towns are springing up upon all the lines of travel. The Northern Pacific railroad system has four hundred miles of road in operation in Dakota at present, and the line which is to be completed to the western line of the territory during this year.

The governor estimates the white population of the territory at the close of the fall of the present year at 150,000. Advance in the development of the mining resources of the territory is reported, and the opinion is given that the Black Hills will yield large quantities of gold and silver for generations to come.

The governor alludes to the great destruction of timber in the pine forests around the Black Hills by fires started during the dry season either by carelessness or with criminal intent, and recommends that measures be taken for the protection of the timber. He suggests that an agent be appointed to sell the same for mining and building purposes. He suggests that a small sum be expended in protecting the timber will save millions of feet annually, and that unless some action is taken to end mining operations will soon be checked by the security of timber. He also suggests that the laws now in force are not adequate for the protection of the sections donated by congress for educational purposes.

The territory of Dakota having no penitentiary, it has been necessary to transport its convicts to Detroit, Mich., for imprisonment at an expense of nearly \$10,000 yearly to the territory. The penitentiaries in other territories have been built at the expense of the general government, and the propriety of making an appropriation for the building of one in Dakota is submitted for the consideration of congress.

The financial condition of the territory has improved to that it is expected that at the close of the present year it will be free from debt.

A Washington dispatch of the 14th says: "The designation of Ramsey to be temporary secretary of the navy cannot continue under the law for a longer period than ten days. In accordance with section 180 of the revised statutes, the president has sent an invitation to a person living in a distant state to be secretary of the navy for the remainder of his term, and it is expected that he will be here to enter upon his office, if he accepts the place, before the expiration of the ten day limit."

CONGRESSIONAL.

In addition to the proceedings of congress, the 16th, published in our telegraphic reports, we give the following: SENATE.—Messrs. Burdette and Morrill advocated the bill devoting part of the proceeds of the sales of public lands to public education.

Senator Brown followed Mr. Morrill in support of the bill. He pointed out that nearly all the prominent men from Washington (Garfield, had been of poor parentage, and had by their thirst for knowledge and their industry, worked their way up to the top. Doubtless thousands of boys of equal capacity with those he had named remained rude and inglorious through the absolute impossibility of favorable circumstances for obtaining the necessary education to lift them above the masses.

The bill was then informally laid aside until to-morrow, when it is designed to reach a vote on it at 4 o'clock. On motion of Mr. Cockrell, the senate took up the secretary of war, the relief of Samuel A. Lowe, appropriating \$4,750 to pay him for services and expenses as clerk of the territorial legislature of Kansas in 1855.

Mr. Ingalls said this was an attempt to give money granted for the compilation of that act known as "the bogus statutes of Kansas," or "the slave code," which was seized and publicly burned by the free-soilers as soon as they obtained control of the state. The statutes were the blackest and most damnable body of laws ever attempted to be passed. They never were recognized as the laws of Kansas.

Mr. Johnston, under direction of the military committee, offered an amendment making the first section of the fortification bill read as follows: "That \$500,000 be appropriated for the modification, protection, preservation and repair of fortifications and other works of defense, the same to be expended under the direction of the secretary of war at the most important and exposed harbors."

Considerable discussion followed which finally closed and the amendment was adopted. Yeas 56, nays 50. The committee then retired and reported the bill to the house, and it passed.

Mr. Gibson of Louisiana, from the committee on Mississippi levees, reported a bill appropriating \$1,800,000 for the improvement of the Mississippi river, to be expended by and under the direction of the secretary of war, in accordance with the recommendations, plans, specifications and estimates, and under the advisory supervision of the Mississippi river commission.

THE ELECTRIC LIGHT.

What Edison Proposes to Do When He Gets Ready. New York, Dec. 13.—The electric light is again taking possession of the public mind. Thomas A. Edison, the well known inventor, says: I am preparing a test for a sub-division of the electric light and will soon have it all ready. I am already satisfied, but I wish to show the gentlemen who are to put their money in this thing its practical working before they take the step. There is to be no guess work about it. We will know exactly the cost of everything before we go ahead. Because I have been a few months perfecting this thing, the public said I had failed.

They forgot there are millions of dollars invested in gas, and they must not expect one little Jersey man to revolutionize the light of the world and render all the capital useless. The light I produce is better and cheaper, and these are the two qualities that will kill gas. Besides there is no dirt from my light, no danger from escaped gas or combustion. The light is incandescent—a simple light produced by the impact electric particles upon carbon. It is a clear, steady, unflinching blaze, and possesses none of those disagreeable peculiarities which the public have come to associate with the idea of the electric light gained from those distressing glaring balls which you see suspended in front of the theaters and other buildings.

The difficulty hitherto has been in the subdivision of the light, so as to bring its application within the reach of money. A great many writers upon the subject have declared this to be impossible, but it is not, and I have proved it. Electric light may be furnished at a cost of something like \$300,000 less than it would have cost by the original method. I calculate that the city of New York can be lighted by my method at a cost of something like \$200,000, which is a very reasonable amount. My light will be perfect before a great while. I am working very hard.

Blankets very cheap at R. A. KETCHUM'S.

A splendid assortment of Christmas candies at Jenkinson's.

Go and see the New Extension Library Lamp at China Hall.

Fresh oysters as low as the lowest and in any quantity at H. A. SCHORREGER'S.

If you wish to see a good picture look at the one of L. M. Johnson in Morrow's show case.

Felt hats, 25c; 50c; 75c, and \$1.25, and bonnets way down, at MIS. E. J. MORROW'S.

Bazaar Glove Fitting Patterns. Mrs. E. J. Coggins, agent, Third street, Yankton, Dakota.

Get rubber weather strips to put on windows and doors. It is the boss. Richey has a supply of it.

Five hundred pairs of spectacles from 25 cents to \$10.00 just received and for sale by H. G. Clark & Co., the jewelers.

Call and see the bargains I will offer you on fancy goods just purchased from bankrupt sales in Chicago. R. A. KETCHUM.

You are invited to call at my Capital St. Grocery store and examine my stock and get my prices. TOM MARSHALL, The Strictly Cash Grocer.

THE STATE.

The Territorial Press on the Subject. Elk Point Courier.

Judge Bennett improves the first day of congress in introducing bills asking that the territory be divided on the 46th parallel and that the southern portion be admitted as a state. The bill which relates to division is undoubtedly the wish of the entire people of this territory and the 46th parallel is the line generally marked out and the proper one. As to the admission there are probably but few who are opposed and they are men who have lived on the frontier so long that they have a kind of a notion in favor of living in a territory. The bill will probably pass the present session, but they do not pass until after our territorial legislature meets, congress will be apt to hear from Dakota through that honorable body.

Dakota Republican.

The people of Bismarck, if their newspapers represent their views, are opposed to a division of the territory on the 46th parallel, or on any other line. They want the whole territory admitted as a state, and that at as early a day as possible. There is little, if any, force in the idea of a great state geographically, or of figuring along with California and Texas as the three great states. To be as large as New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Ohio, or as three or four Iowa might result in a certain barbarous sort of satisfaction, but not a real one. The result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to Dakota and save trouble and expenses to all concerned? This would make a state sufficient in territory to admit of the result of civilization nor add to the value or stability of state organization by covering so vast a territory. The state would be no better and perhaps not worse, from being so large. If the question of size, geographically, does not matter, then in forming a state, why not attach Montana or Wyoming or both to