

On the other hand, the English pioneers, by their charters and patents, got a jurisdiction over, but not a fee in, the lands conveyed. In the practice which England established, or professed to establish, occupation could only follow upon the extinguishment by purchase or treaty of the native title.

Thus the Indian had exemplified to him by these intruders two diverse policies. He was inclined to the French policy because it did not disturb his life, and drive him away from his ancestral hunting-grounds. Duquesne was wont to tell the Indians that the French placing a fort on the Indian's lands did not mean the felling of forest and planting of fields, as it did with the English; but that the French fort became only a convenient hunting-lodge for the Indian, with undisturbed game about it.

The Indian was inclined to the English policy because it showed a recognition of his right to the soil, for which he could get cloth and trinkets and rum, if he chose to sell it. But he soon found that the clothes which he obtained wore out, the liquor was gone, and the baubles were worthless. The transaction, forced upon him quite as often as voluntarily assumed, was almost sure to leave him for a heritage a contiguous settlement of farmholders, who felled the forests and drove away his buffalo.

The savage was naturally much perplexed between these rival methods, in determining which was more for his advantage. Accordingly, we find the aboriginal hordes over vast regions divided in allegiance, some preferring the French and others the English, and neither, by any means, constant to one side or the other.

Moreover, these two diverse policies meant a good deal to such disputants in the trial of strength between them. The French knew they were greatly inferior in numbers, but they counted on a better organization, and a single responsible head which induced celerity of movement, and