designs and treat them as common enemies; and that they will never listen to any idle stories of any White man or Indian who may spread false reports; but if any matter of grievance arises they are either through the channel of the Commandant of Detroit, or by personal application to Sir William Johnson, to represent their complaints.

ARTICLE 4TH.

That they acknowledge his Britannic Majesty's right to all the lands above their village, on both sides the Strait to Lake St. Clair, in as full and ample manner as the same was ever claimed or enjoyed by the French.

ARTICLE 5TH.

That they do to the utmost secure the Strait or Passage from Lake Erie to the Detroit, and do use their utmost endeavours to protect the navigation thereof, either with ships or boats, against any attempts of an enemy, as well as defend all persons who may have occasion to go or return from Detroit by land or water. And lastly, that they do now or at any other time, at the requisition of the Commandant of Detroit, or of any others his Majesty's officers, furnish such a number of their warriors as may appear necessary for the protection thereof or the annoyance of the enemy.

In consequence of the perfect agreement of the Hurons to the foregoing articles, Sir William Johnson doth, by virtue of the powers and authorities to him given by his Majesty, promise and declare that all hostilities on the part of his Majesty against the Hurons shall cease, that past offences shall be forgiven, and that the said Indians shall enjoy all their original rights and privileges, as also be indulged with a free, fair and open trade, agreeable to such regulations as his Majesty shall direct.

Given under my hand and seal at arms, at Niagara, the 18th day of July, 1764.

(Signed) WM. JOHNSON.

[L.S.]

The Chiefs of the Hurons have, in testimony of their accordation to the foregoing articles, subscribed the marks of their respective tribes, the whole being first clearly explained to them."

We cannot undertake to give with any correctness the names of the chiefs who signed the; treaty but, aftertheir names appear their *totems*, the first being a tortoise, the second something said by the learned to represent a beaver, the third is the figure of a man, and the fourth another tortoise. It would be somewhat strange that if, after the lapse of more than a century, Her Majesty should call upon the Hurons, in the words of treaty, "to furnish such a number of warriors as may be necessary for the protection [of her subjects] or the annoyance of the enemy." Yet such circumstance is not only not impossible, but has even been contemplated within the past few months.

In *Reg. ex rel. Flater* v. *Vanvelsor*, the objection taken by the relator was to the property qualification of the defendant, who qualified on real estate rated on the roll at $470. It appeared to have been sufficient unless reduced by the amount of a mortgage for a large sum, which however was shewn to have been paid before the election, or unless reduced by the amount due on a *fi. fa.* lands, which was in the sheriff's hands as a lien at the time of the election. It was contended that the defendant had goods sufficient to cover the claim, and therefore, as the goods must have been exhausted first, that there was in reality nothing which could be looked upon as sufficient to reduce the qualification. It was unnecessary to decide this point, though Mr. Dalton, before whom the case came, thought as long as the *fi. fa.* lands was in the sheriff's hands it must be considered as a lien or incumbrance for all purposes; but he raised the point whether liens or charges of that nature could be taken into account at all—and he held that as the statute said nothing about incumbrances, and that they could not be taken into consideration; in fact that if a person appeared to be rated on the roll for a sufficient amount, that alone, so far as his property was concerned, was all that the statute required, even though his equity of redemption or beneficial interest in such property might be worth less than nothing. The point, though nearly approached in another case, was not before, curiously enough, expressly decided.

Another case was that of *Reg. ex rel. McGouverin* v. *Lawler*, which, though not deciding any question of qualification or disqualification is new on a matter of procedure.

The defendants election was not complained of, but the relator sought to unseat him on the ground that he had been convicted of selling liquor without a license, and had thereby under 32 Vic. cap. 32, sec. 17 (Ontario), forfeited his office. It was however held, that the proceedings taken under sections 130 and 131 of the Municipal Act by summons, in the nature of a *quo warranto* summons, were not applicable to such a case as this, whatever