

(being that country justly claimed by the Six Nations, their allies and dependants,) that I will, to the utmost of my power cause the same to be observed; and I do strictly enjoin all such persons to pay due obedience thereto.

Given under my hand and Seal at Arms, at Johnson Hall, the 24th day of December, 1763, in the fourth year of the reign of our Sovereign Lord, George the Third by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, France and Ireland; King, Defender of the Faith, and so forth.

(Signed) WILLIAM JOHNSON.

By order of Sir WILLIAM JOHNSON.

(Signed) WITHAN MARSH,  
*Secretary for Indian Affairs.*

GOD SAVE THE KING.

Now, it is true, that while these treaties are bi-lateral agreements, the Crown being the party of the first part and the Indians the party of the second part, nevertheless, the Indians had to accept the treaties or lose their interests in the land. Anyway, that was inevitable with the process of colonization; and that was very frankly pointed out to the Indians by various Royal Commissioners making the treaties. Under the treaties the most important provision is that the Indians were guaranteed residential reserves for their own use which could not be alienated ever, except by mutual consent of the Indians and the government, or except in cases of special expropriation, of course, which would lie against any land in the hands of private owners, such as lands taken over for war purposes, and then, only upon payment; and then there is the other important provision of the treaty, as the treaty system developed, that education was to be provided; agriculture assistance was to be given, and assistance to various kinds of employment, fishing tackle, ammunition, and various conditions according to the requirements of the particular area in which the group of Indians being dealt with was located.

*By Mr. Castleden:*

Q. Was there any reference made in this proclamation to the fact of any provision or arrangement made with the French government before that time, or with the French Seigneurs? Could those be terminated, or could the Indians go back to the treaty arrangements made with the French governors of Canada which were made prior to that time?—A. As I mentioned before, Mr. Castleden, we cannot find where there was anything comparable to our treaties, between the French authorities and the Indians. Now, it is true—take an area like Caughnawaga, which was set aside by the permission of the King of France in order for the Indians to have a home and where there would be a Jesuit mission established and maintained for their christianization. There was a similar area at Oka and at St. Regis. There were areas like that but I do not know of any treaty obligations that would either be cancelled out or reverted to at their option, as you suggest.

But I would say that these treaty obligations were a British policy. Now, in the province of Quebec, the British government did not make any treaties at all with the Indians because the Indians there had already been established on a certain relationship with the French colonists and were getting along all right there, so it was not considered necessary to make a treaty; and they are still not under any treaty. The same thing applies to the Maritime provinces, although it is true that there was some agreement there between