

The Crown's Promise

Report Submitted to: Sto:lo Nation Aboriginal Rights and Title Department

Prepared by: Jody Woods

November 30, 2001

Contemporary Stó:lō oral testimony tells us that, in the mid-nineteenth century, the first two governors in BC, Douglas and Seymour, made a series of oral promises on behalf of the Crown to the local First Nations. With the full intention of eventually negotiating treaties throughout BC, Governor Douglas (1849 - 1864) promised "lasting support" to Natives and that they could continue with their traditional hunting and fishing practices on all unceded. Later, during a public celebration of Queen Victoria's birthday in New Westminster, Governor Seymour (1864 - 7) promised the Stó:lō and other Natives of BC a share of revenues for the sale of off-reserve lands and/or compensation for such lands and their resources. Subsequent governments did not keep these promises. This report summarizes the Stó:lō oral history and written accounts related to these promises and attempts to place them within a broader historical, social and political context

In Early 2001, Stó:lō Elder Rena Point Bolton told researchers about a number of promises that were made to Native people in BC. These promises were made on behalf of Queen Victoria, via her representatives Governors Douglas and Seymour in the late 1800s. Mrs. Bolton also discusses many events that followed and suggests reasons why these promises were never kept. She heard about this from her grandfather Pete Silver and from Dan Milo, who is related to her grandfather. Mrs. Bolton's account spawned further research into this project and is included in some detail here as an example of the things many Stó:lō have been saying for almost a century.

They [Indians] were allowed to till 6 inches of the soil. Everything below the 6 inch and everything they tilled - 25 cents on the dollar would go back to the Indian people [...] that their hunting and fishing rights would never be changed - always free to hunt and fish - and that their land would be as far as the eye could see in every direction -that they [the government] would never change these things. I heard it from my grandfather Pete - heard him in conversation talking to other Elders who were also talking about it. Talking about how the government cheated them by saying it [the promise] never existed. And then Dan [Milo] talked to me directly about it. ...

The proclamation was made by Queen Victoria. It was presented to the Indian people at Fort Langley. Many people came to hear these words. Queen Victoria made all the proclamations. They were always signed by her. There were many proclamations read at Fort Langely, supposedly written by her. I suppose she wanted to make the rules - Indians back in the east had treaties. Didn't really care what happened to BC. Just a pile of rocks. Some effort should be made to protect them or look after them. We don't know if she meant to do it for the right reasons or not. ...

Then the proclamation was given to the oblate missionaries at St. Mary's for safekeeping. They were to hold it in trust for the Indian people. Not long after Queen Victoria died, the school burned down. The missionaries said that the proclamations burned with the school.

The leaders of the Stó:lō people and a few other chiefs - Vancouver Island - decided to head a delegation to England [refers to the 1906 delegation]. Simon Pierre from Katzie was chosen to lead the delegation because he could speak English and interpret for them. He was a young leader at Katzie. ... When they arrived he [Simon? Another delegate named Xwexwyluk Hoiwayaluck was welcomed. But King Edward said there was no such proclamation made by his mother. The chiefs were given dinner. They had a banquet at the palace. The dessert was delicious. The chiefs were licking their plates. Simon told them not to lick their plates. It wasn't done. The chiefs said oh no, it's a sign to the cook that the food is good. And so they continued. Everyone laughed - story was repeated after Simon told the people. Everyone thought it was hilarious.

Government built up a new school. Beautiful school. The people thought they were bought off. I believe the proclamation did not burn. ... After they [government] found out there was a lot in BC and they wanted to confederate in BC they decided to destroy the proclamation it would stand in the way. ...

I remember them saying that they called all the Chiefs from BC to listen while this [proclamation] was being read. Even from up here the Chiefs when (sic.) [went] down to listen to some proclamations. Chiefs from all over went. They had to go to Ft. Langley and listen to these proclamations being read. This was the proclamation the older people talked about all the time. The old people thought of the gold and gravel being hauled away all the time. They thought of the water. They heard later that people were drilling for oil. They were mining from [for] nickel. People would say "but isn't that beneath the 6 inches?" They are taking everything and not giving anything for us. They are literally stealing from us. They were horrified. They were really upset. This would be destroying the land and taking what didn't belong to them. Everything on earth belonged to their grandchildren. They weren't allowed to steal it or sell it. They were the guardians for their grandchildren. This was a strong Stó:lō law: everything must be protected for the grandchildren. ...

Dan [Milo] said that people were so happy that this lady in a far away land was going to take care of them. They were happy. She said that she wouldn't allow any harm to come to the land. They could fish and hunt as they had in the past. They didn't worry so much anymore. ...

When they heard it [the proclamation] was burnt, they were very upset. Especially when the delegation came back. ...

The elders weren't lying or fantasizing. They told the same story; it was real to them. They used to call it "the Promises of Queen Victoria." It took me along time to call it the proclamation. First heard it called that in 68 or 69 at a Union [of BC Indian Chiefs] meeting. Then I heard about the proclamation. Evelyn Paul -executive director of the Indian homemakers association. She explained that it was the rules that the queen made out. (Document #1 Pages 4-9)

Mrs. Bolton identified many other elders who she believes have knowledge of Crown's promises to the Stó:lō (see Appendix A) We interviewed those who were still alive and reviewed interviews from earlier researchers of those who had passed away and discovered a wealth of evidence suggesting such promises were made.

"Lhseqmi:t" Twenty Five Cents on the Dollar

Mr. Peter Dennis Peters says his grandfather **Dennis S. Peters**, told him the Queen instructed BC Governor James Douglas to "charge taxes, something like that," and to "split every dollar four ways ... 25cents to the Indians... Then they put... the Indians [on] reservation ... they lost their land, different government." (Document #3) Mr. Bill Pat Charlie says his uncle **Patrick Charlie** said "25% of every dollar was to be paid to them [Natives]." Patrick heard this from **Captain Charlie**. (Document #4 - part one). Ms. Leona Kelly says she heard from her grandmother **Agnes Kelly** of "every dollar the government made 25% would go to the Aboriginal people." Leona was told this in 1988 when she was a teenager and told not to forget. (Document #4 - part two)

Mr. Bill Mussel explains how his grandfather (**Jones Julius Mussel**) and father (**William J. Mussel Sr.**) told him how: "the leaders were promised that they would be compensated for the loss of their lands and resources at \$0.25 on every dollar made and there was no questions in mind ... and their concern was that they've seen absolutely no evidence [of] implementation of that decision by the authorities. [...] our forefathers ... did believe in the promises made in the earliest by the Queen. " Jones Julius Mussel's father (the first Mussel) lived in New Westminster in the late 1800s" (Document #6) Mr. Mussel also lists other people he thinks may have useful knowledge about this (See Appendix C).

The late Grand Chief Sam Douglas says his grandfather, **Charlie Douglas**, used to talk about the Chiefs going to New Westminster for meetings with the Queen's representative: "He says we were supposed to get \$0.25 out of every dollar and that was his exact wording that he told me." His father, **Albeit Douglas**, also talked about the promise of \$0.25 out of every dollar. Sam recalls **Pat (Alfred)**, from Alert Bay, also saying, "... whatever happened to the \$0.25?" (Document #7)

Finally, Mr. And Mrs. Albert and Mathilda Gutierrez remember hearing about a promise of a percentage to be given to Natives. They also explain that the memory of Seymour's broken promises affected his reputation to such an extent that unflattering Halq'emeylem terms were used to describe him:

"Si:mo": "I use[d] to hear my granddad talk about Si:mo. They didn't say Seymour, they said Si:mo ... Wel qel mestiyexw, that's all he said, qel mestiyexw, means a bad person, I guess cause he wasn't keeping his promise for them. The way I heard it was that a, Queen Victoria was the one, gave it to the government to make sure that we get it. And hey, out of every' industry, is that what they call it, and a, we were suppose to get that kind of percentage for the native and there was lots of money in there, so I hear, but where is it, where is it? ...

Lhseqmi:t, they used to say, for, quarter [1/4], lhseqm:t. We were promised that, suppose to be so money kept piling up, piling up. Now when we ask for a grant or something, they call us a tax burden. ... as far as money was concerned was also in Ottawa, see, and they said that some money was stored for them, so I guess there so much cents like places in Westminster. And far as I know, I have no proof about that, but it's hear say, it's what we hear." ... Yeah, lhseqmi:t. Xetes Stoxwes seqmi:t qelex. Telie te siya:m lliches se qetes te tale te lite, o ich slhi lliches sem oqwes toxwes. Soon as we ask for it we're going to get it. But we have to beg for. Hey? We don't need that ... That's the way it's supposed to be, as soon as we ask for it we're supposed to get. But now we have to beg for it. So, seventy five cents first I gather, Indian, I mean the whiteman and a quarter goes to the Indians. See, imagine how many quarters, its gathered like that it's put in Indian Affairs, and its really lots, so we had lots of money in their government, still lots in there so I hear. I hear there's still lots there (Document #2).

Mrs. Gutierrez knows of several people who talked about this when she was a girl (see Appendix B. For other information derived from the interviews, see appendix D)

Older Oral testimony

From 1885 to 1923, there is a sizeable gap in the oral record about Crown promises and related events. There may be several reasons for this. In the 1880s, the potlatch, the main social mechanism for transferring rights, property and information, was legally banned. However, it wasn't until the early 1920s that the ban was fully enforced. At the same time, and largely as a result of a growing movement among Native people to settle the issue of Aboriginal title in court, a 1927 amendment to the Indian Act made it illegal for Natives to gather in large groups and discuss the land question or to hire lawyers to help them secure land rights. Such restrictions made it extremely difficult for Chiefs to get together to discuss anything like unfulfilled government promises. And, even if they were able to meet, for instance at funerals, they were denied the use of the mechanism which allowed them to do anything about it: the courts.

However, the prevalence of contemporary accounts about the Crown's promises suggests that, despite restrictive legislation, these stories were still being passed down. In the period from 1923 to 1985, knowledge of the Crown's Promises was kept alive through regular family story telling. After the repeal of the restrictive amendment in 1952, this knowledge was also maintained through the meeting of groups like the Allied Tribes of BC, the American Indian Association, the United Native Brotherhood and the Union of BC Indian Chiefs (see Documents #1,26).

Another reason for the gap is that, though many oral interviews have been conducted over the years with Stó:lō Elders and informants, questions about Crown promises and Queen's birthdays were not asked. With the odd exception, academics tended to focus on issues related cultural practices. They worked within a "salvage paradigm" which assumed Native cultural practices needed to be documented because their cultures would soon be extinct.

Proceedings of the conference between the Allied Indian Tribes of BC and Duncan Campbell Scott. August 7th, 1923

In 1923, members of the Allied Indian Tribes of British Columbia met with Superintendent General Duncan Campbell Scott to discuss the "cessation of Aboriginal title in BC" (Document # 26 page

2). Contained in these lengthy proceedings are testimonials from several Stó:lō Chiefs, including: Andrew Paul of Squamish, Stephen Petasket of Lillooet, Chief George Mattheson of the Lower Fraser tribes; Simon Pierre of the Lower Fraser Tribes and other Salish Chiefs. Much of their testimony focuses on stopping the reduction of reserves in spite of the recommendations of the 1913-15 Reserve Commission to increase reserve sizes, in many cases. Some of it focuses specifically on the compensation many Chiefs were seeking based on earlier promises for the taking of lands originally surveyed by Douglas.

Andrew Paul of Squamish tells of a promise made by reserve commissioner O'Reilly that "there will never be any white man around here, you will always have those lands" (Document #24, page 78). Chief George Mattheson of Sardis tells how James Douglas "paced out" Chilliwack reserves. These 'Douglas Reserves' were never officially recognised and were subsequently occupied by whites. Mattheson speaks for three Chilliwack bands wanting compensation for the taking of these off-reserve lands:

Chief Billy and his people want this adjusted; they are not asking that those white people be chased off, but they want Justice, either by compensation or new land. They put it like this, if the white people had not come into James Douglas' survey, we would have had sufficient land today; but because those lands were taken away - Sir James Douglas' survey was taken away from us, that is where we were reduced. So they gave me authority to say this, that as soon as the authorities see fit to deal with this in a serious way, they say they are by justice entitled to compensation or to new lands. ... And they make two propositions, either for compensation, compensate the Indians for what is taken away, or if not, give them [other] land [in lieu of the Douglas survey] - for their hunting grounds and fishing grounds"(Document #26 page 82-3).

Mr. Paul also refers to "section 49" (presumably) of the Indian Act which deals with the sale of timber for Indian lands. He testifies about his understanding of that portion of the Act. I include this here to evidence the continuing understanding among Native people that money held in trust for them in Ottawa is due them:

Doctor [Scott], what the Indians have in mind is this, the way the Act reads I think is that 50% of the proceeds is given to the Indians in cash, the other 50% according to the Act, remains in

trust for them. That is the way the Act reads, you see. But the demand of the Indians in general is that that should not prevail, that whatever agreement is entered into by the Indians should prevail, as to the disposition of the proceeds ... It's been a general cry among the Indians about that 50% that is in Ottawa. They want to see some of that money aside from the interest that they realize ...

[Mr. Scott proceeds to tell Mr. Paul that the Indians are welcome to the money] "if they wished to erect buildings, or anything in the general interests of the bands." ...

[Mr. Kelly responds] The trouble is this, they are not, as you are aware of, asking for public buildings, and are not spending their tribal funds on any public improvements, to any great extent. And this has been brought up to me again and again, should the Tribe become extinct, what is going to become of the 50% that is in Ottawa? They look that far ahead, and they think they should have a little more coming to them than just to keep it in trust there. Now that has been seriously raised. This is not just a light matter, but it has been spoken of in a serious way. It does not just apply to the proceeds of the sale of timber lands or any other land, but it applies to everything, lands, or mineral claims, or any other matter that may come up in connection with the sale of Indian lands ... There is more money - that 50% retained in trust for them is more than is necessary to build buildings and ditches and other things ... there is too much money there for the purpose for which it is kept there; and the Indians would like to realize some money now, before they go out of existence entirely. Now we do not anticipate dying off tomorrow, or I hope we do not die within the next two or three weeks, but there may be a time coming when Indians will be absorbed into the general citizens. Now when they do that, what is going to become of all this accumulated 50% of the proceeds?

Mr. Ditchburn [‘s reply]: Then you will get your money. (document #26 pages 192 -195)

Mr. Paul and Kelly deal repeatedly with the issue of compensation, as a portion of a treaty settlement, for the cessation of title and lands. Mostly, they focus on types of compensation: money, schooling for Native children, and health care (document# 26 pages 238 - 256). But they link their right to compensation to Douglas' original arrangement with them that they would not be disturbed on their lands. They view the withholding of the money derived from the sale of off-reserve lands and resources from Natives as a breach of Douglas' promise.

1922 Testimony of Dennis S. Peters to James Teit, Anthropologist and Secretary for the United Native Brotherhood

On February 3rd, 1922, James Teit, an anthropologist who also worked as Secretary for the United Native brotherhood, interviewed Stó:lō Siya:m Dennis S. Peters to gather census-type information for the Department of Indian Affairs. During the interview, Mr. Peters expressed his people's concerns about reserve sizes, the poverty in which many Stó:lō were living, restrictive fishing legislation, the forcible pre-emption of Native lands without treaties, and the difficulty his people were having in clearing and cultivating the lands they were allotted for farming. Mr. Peters also specifically mentions Douglas' and Seymour's promises. Mr. Teit took notes of this conversation which he then passed on to the Department of Indian Affairs:

Gov. Douglas when he set aside the reserve for the Katzi or the Port Hammond Indians said all inside the lines of the reserve would remain the real property of the Indians and all outside would become white mans land. The land taken over by the whites would be like a tree, which should blossom and bear fruit for the Indians meaning that the Indians would share in the benefit of the use of their tribal lands by the whites.

Later Gov. Seymour called a great meeting of the Stalo and other Indians at Queen's Borough (now New Westminster) There were very many Indians and whites at this meeting. He said:

- (1) The Queen desired the two races to live together peacefully and neither to harm the other. That they would be as brothers, the whites the elder, and the Indian the younger.
- (2) When Indians worked they would have the same wages as the whites for the same kind of work.
- (3) Money or revenue would be coming to the Gov. from the lands outside the reserves. This money or revenue would be as in four: 1/4 would go to the Queen or Crown or Gov. 1/4 would be used by the BC gov. for the purposes of the country development, road making etc. 1/4 would go towards education and 1/4 for the benefit of the Indians, assistance to them etc.

The Indians in those days believed the words of those big men in authority (or chiefs of the whites) and they never

thought of asking them for written agreements nor their words in writing. Both Gov. Douglas and Gov. Seymour promised assistance to the Indians and compensation for their lands taken." (Document #29 (also catalogued as Petition # 42). See also Document #30. See also Document 19 - Testimony from Chief Paul of Skookumchuck: the only other non-contemporary account so far that mentions a 1/4 share of compensation. All other Royal Commission testimony mentions 1/3).

Royal Commission Testimony

In 1913 - 1915, a joint Provincial / Federal Royal Commission on Aboriginal Affairs travelled to Native Villages throughout BC to talk to First Nations about the land question. Resulting testimony contains numerous, detailed references to promises made by Crown representatives. As with subsequent testimony, several Stó:lō interpretations are evident in these documents:

1. Promises made by the Governors Douglas and Seymour represented the promises of the Queen.
2. Such promises were binding.
3. The Provincial and Federal Governments were legally and morally bound to keep the promises made by Douglas and Seymour on behalf of the Queen.
4. Despite this obligation, the Stó:lō believe the promises made by the Queen were subsequently broken, ignored, or even "buried" by the British Columbia Government.
5. Money originally put aside as a result of these promises still exists somewhere in Ottawa and ought to be given back to the Natives.

A statement from the members of the Scowlitz Band clearly identifies two of the Crown's promises as they were made through her representatives, Governors Douglas (see also Document #26 page 150) and Seymour. It describes how Seymour promised 1/3 of all revenues from the sale off-reserve lands or resources would go "to the Indians for their benefit." It also reveals several important perceptions maintained by many Stó:lō:

1. the provincial Government has contrived to hide evidence of such promises
2. the 1/3 share promised to Natives is still owing to them
3. the Stó:lō fully expected the BC and federal Governments were obligated to keep the promises made "verbally" by Douglas and Seymour decades earlier.

Sir James Douglas, the first Governor made a verbally promise to us Indians in his first surveying the land. He said for which land I have surveyed it belongs to the Indians only that no white man shall intrude [upon] your land. And for all the outside lands Her majesty Queen Victoria will take and sell to the white people land which is taken away from the Indians will be like a fruit tree and from this said fruit Her Majesty

Queen Victoria will give it to the Indians for their lasting support. ... The second Governor Seymour also made a verbally promise in his speech that her Majesty Queen Victoria will divide the revenue in three parts. One third to the Indians for their benefit. One third to the Crown. One third to the public for road works etc.... But we have not heard anything of it for the latest Governments of the province has concealed and burried (sic) it and worked all kinds of skeems (sic) to keep it hidden. (Document #9)

A statement of members of the Squamish Indian Tribe on March 15, 1915 briefly mentions a promise made by Douglas that Natives could remain "at liberty to take and kill [game] for our own use at any time". Although no mention of percentages is made, this statement does support the contention that Natives understood the contemporary BC Government had some obligation to keep the verbal promises made by Douglas fifty years earlier (Document #10).

A statement of Squamish Chiefs on March 8, 1915 reiterates that speeches made to Natives by the Governor were the words and wishes of the Queen herself:

¹ Many years ago when Sir James Douglas was surveying our land, he gave the chiefs, at that time, the understanding that he was sent by her majesty Queen Victoria, ruler of all the people in British Columbia and the British Empire. Anything that I do is the same as if the Queen were doing it herself. Also anything I say is the Queen herself that is talking. And we were all glad to hear the good word spoken to us by Sir James Douglas. And when he put the posts down [survey stakes], he said, no one shall take that out, for it is the work of Her Majesty the Queen and not myself. (Document #11)

The 1915 opening statement of Chief John Leon (per Arthur Phillips) of the Chehalis tribe also mentions specifically promises made by both Seymour and Douglas. As in other testimony, it indicates Seymour promised 1 /3 of revenues were to go to the Natives and Douglas' promised "lasting support" of Natives and uses the metaphor of a fruit tree to describe the relationship between the Queen and Natives (see also Document # 16). The Chehalis are explicit in their expectation that later Governments had the duty to fulfil the promises of earlier Crown representatives. They suggest the best way to accomplish this is to pay the Natives the money they are owed (from their 1/3 share) in the form of a monthly pension. Finally, they insist any new

arrangement be written - clearly having lost some faith in the BC and Dominion Governments to honour oral promises of the Governments.

Sir James Douglas, the first Governor made a verbal promise to us Indians on his first surveying the land. He said for which I survey as Indian lands I really belong to the Indians only. That no white man shall intrude in your lands and for all the outside of your lands Her Majesty Queen Victoria ... Will be likeness to a lasting fruit tree for the Indians. Her Majesty will take the said fruits and give it to the Indians as their lasting support. And the second Governor Seymour by name he also made verbally promise in his speech. He said Her Majesty the Queen will divide the revenues in three parts. One third shall remain for the Crown, one third shall be spent to the public for roads etc., and one third shall go to the Indians the owners of the lands for their lasting support and benefit and that we shall hold just so much privilege as a white man, and that we must treat the white men the best way possible and that we shall be treated the same way as if we were brothers. Now for this last many years standing we have been expecting to receive those good promises in the name of Queen Victoria but it yet has never come, because the latest government of the Province has concealed it and buried it and worked all kinds of schemes around it to keep it hidden. ... And we are deserving of lasting monthly compensation to come in the shape of a pension [from] the British Columbia Government for all lands which they used and sold and now taken or occupied ... And we want them to hand us a written agreement for all our claims. (Document #12)

In Chief Charley's (of the Matsquie (sic.) tribe) opening statement to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs, he testifies about the Crown's promises:

In the time of Sir James Douglas, he made a lasting promise to us Indians, as all the Indians preserve a lasting support and benefit by the name of Queen Victoria. Also Governor Seymour, the second Governor. He also made a lasting promise to us Indians in New Westminster, that we will receive or preserving one fourth from all taxes this money for our support or to improve our land, these promises never was kept. If those good promises was up by the British Columbia Government the Indians would be all rich, and they would all be living comfortable be as happy as our white brothers today. ... and what has become of the money, the Indian agent tells us that he sends the money and then at times I would ask him

for some money to get what we want,. He would say the money is all gone and have no money in the bank ... they never tell us what become of our money (Document #8).

On behalf of the women of the of the Langely reserve, on Jan. 9th, 1915 Mrs. Joseph Gabriel asks for clean drinking water to be supplied for her village at Langley. In her testimony, she claims: "we have money in charge of the Indian Department at Ottawa." This may be a reference to the money many Stó:lō believe waits (or should be waiting) for them in Ottawa as a result of earlier promises made to them that a share (1/3 or 1/4) of revenues would be "for the Indians." (Document #14)

Natives, by this time, had come to understand the BC and Federal Government were separate entities with sometimes-disparate agendas, even when working together within this joint Royal Commission. A statement of Chiefs Che-ack-mus (Tom) on behalf of the Squamish Tribe in 1925 reveals Natives "assume that the appointees of the Dominion Government are our advocates and are acting especially in our interests." They believe the Federal Government has the interests of Natives much more in mind than the BC Government. No mention is made of dividing revenues and apportioning shares to Natives or of any like promises. However, this document can be informed by other related testimony: the notion to the Stó:lō that oral promises are binding may be strengthened by their belief that the Federal government has a duty and legal obligation to take care of them (i.e. keep their promises to them). (Document #15)

In 1911 in a petition from various BC tribes (including the Stó:lō) to Frank Oliver, Minister of the interior represents an earlier reference to the Crown's promises. In it, the petitioners claim that, only through hindsight have they come to understand that Government promises are insincere:

"All the promises made to us when the whites first came to this country have been broken. Many of us were driven off our places where we lived and camped from time immemorial ... because ... the Government wanted them for white settlers. This was done without agreement with us and we received no compensation. It was also in direct opposition to the promises made to us by the first whites, and Government officials, that no white men would be allowed to locate on any place where Indians were settled or which were camping stations or gardens. Thus were we robbed by the Government, and driven off our many places by white settlers (backed by the Government), or coaxed off them with false promises. Then

we were promised full freedom to hunt, fish and travel over our country unrestricted by regulations of the whites, until such time as our lands were purchased or at least until treaties were made with us. Another promise broken, and so on with all. . We can tell you all of them if you want to know, and prove them through witnesses still living. What of Governor Seymour's promises made to the Lower Fraser Indians who convened at his request purposely to hear his message to them concerning the proposed policy of the whites towards the Indians of this country? They rank with other earlier promises all broken. ... we have learned that most whites do not keep their word (especially when it is not the written word). Only those very few whites who help us appear to be trying to keep the white man's promises made to us by the white chiefs of this country in early days (Document #28).

Compensation

Other Royal Commission testimony from Stó:lō representatives focuses on compensation to Aboriginal people for their original rights, for the interference in their traditional resource gathering and for the "land outside" (the sale or alienation of off-reserve traditional lands), (see Documents # 16, 17, 18, 20 and 21). Chief Kassimer of Langley says specifically that Seymour promised compensation for "lands outside" reserves at the Queen's birthday in New Westminster in 1864 (Document #20). Chief James of Yale goes so far as to point out that he expects their Indian Agent, Graham, to help secure such compensation since "out of our [Indian] funds the Agents are paid." (Document #16). Chief Michel of Seabird Island also wants the government to pay Natives the money owed to them for the previous sale of off-reserve land. (Document #18).

The Departure of the "Great Chief: Governor Douglas Retires

In early 1864, James Douglas, colonial authority in BC for decades, retired and was succeeded by Frederick Seymour. Douglas had been popular with BC First Nations (Document # 64). Word had quickly spread on the mainland that he negotiated treaties on Vancouver Island, in accordance with Indian land policies applied in the rest of Canada. In 1858, the gold rush began which brought with it a massive influx of white prospectors and settlers. At the same time, when it became evident no more financial support would be forthcoming from Colonial authorities for treaty-making in BC (Document # 40), Douglas took the unique step of creating reserves to diffuse cross-cultural tensions over land rights. Douglas seemed to view this step as interim until treaties could be negotiated (Document #53. See also Document #72). In the midst of this, Douglas also made a

series of promises to Natives recognizing their hunting and fishing rights. Such promises were based on his belief that Natives should be treated "in all respects as British Subjects" (Document #54).

Douglas' approach on the mainland was to tour Indian Villages and survey reserves (Document # 50). It was during these visits that Douglas made his promises to the Natives, which he mentions himself in a letter to Barclay:

I informed the Natives that they would not be disturbed in the possession of their Village sites and enclosed fields, which are of small extent, and that they are at liberty to hunt over the unoccupied lands, and to carry on their fisheries with the same freedom as when they were the sole occupants of the country." (Douglas to Barclay May 16, 1850, quoted in Arnett 1999 p. 33. See also Document #16 which describes a promise to keep whites off Native land unless it was purchased first).

Such actions and promises made Governor Douglas extremely popular and trusted among First Nations - a fact that did not escape the notice or concern of his successor, Governor Seymour who remarked to Cardwell that Douglas' departure left Natives feeling as though they were without a protector:

On the departure of Sir James Douglas, who had been known by the Indians as a great Chief, the principal authority in this territory for upwards of forty years, an impression was allowed to arise among them that their protector was withdrawn and would have no successor. The Fraser River Indians uttered many lamentations over their deserted condition, and it became desirable for me to make myself known to the Natives and show them that I had succeeded to all the power of my predecessor and to his solicitude for their welfare (Document #22. See also Documents # 51, 52, 64).

Certainly of great concern to the new governor was his status with local First Nations vis a vis the previous Governor Douglas. To introduce himself to Natives as the new governor and to establish with Natives "some of the same rapport that Douglas, their "Great Chief had previously enjoyed" (Ormsby 1974 page 8), Seymour decided to invite BC Natives to New Westminster to celebrate Queen Victoria's birthday (See Documents #23 for a later published example of such an invitation).

There were other developments, which helped to shape the events and speeches of May 24, 1864. Increasing fears of an "Indian war" crystallized in April 30, 1864 when thirteen road builders were killed by Cowichan men (Fisher, page 107. Historian Margaret Ormsby lists the number of dead at 18. (Ormsby, 1974 page 8. See also Document #37, 45, 46 and 64). Known alternately as the 'Bute Inlet Massacre' and the 'Cowichan Uprising', this event directly influenced Seymour's approaches to Aboriginal affairs in BC - particularly as they were demonstrated at the Queen's Birthday celebrations. Seymour's manner of dealing with the attack combined his own notions of swift, severe justice with the "calm & just" rhetoric of the Colonial Office, as Ormsby writes: "Avoiding declaring martial law, he [Seymour] immediately ordered Gold Commissioner W.G. Cox to proceed westward from Cariboo with volunteer force. ... Meanwhile, the Governor went ahead with his plan to have Fraser River Indians gather at New Westminster to celebrate the Queen's birthday." (Ormsby pages 8-9. See also Documents # 38, 37, 39, 42, 43). By the time of the Massacre/uprising, invitations to attend the Queen's Birthday had already been sent to First Nations and most of the organizers felt it was too late to cancel the gathering. However, it is probable the bloodshed influenced Seymour's speech to Natives, in which he is sure to explain that "bad" Indians will be punished - an odd thing to say outside of the context of the Bute Inlet event. (Document #22. See also Document #25). In a letter to the Colonial Office in October of that year, Seymour indicates how far he was willing to go to prevent more Indian uprisings, and to punish "bad Indians":

Should a real war take place between the Indian population and the whites, the former numbering about 60,000, the latter about 7,000, I may find myself compelled to follow in the footsteps of the Governor of Colorado, whose Proclamation I forwarded in my dispatch no. 49 of the 24th of September and invite every white man to shoot each Indian he may meet Such a proclamation would not be badly received here in case of emergency. (Document # 32. See also Document #31 for the Colonial Office' reply. See also Document #36 Colorado Governor's Proclamation)

These are an astonishing lengths in light of his stated hopes of "obtain[ing] moderation from the white men in the treatment of Indians" (Document #46. See also Ormsby, 1974 page 8): Calmer voices prevailed, however, at the May 24th gathering. While sending troops (and later going himself) to Bute Inlet to arrest Cowichan men (Document #46 chronicles in detail the excursion to

capture the Cowichan men involved), he was also making what he called "conciliatory policies" towards the Natives who showed up in New Westminster (Document 70). In an apparent effort to head off an emergency, Stó:lō oral testimony indicates that Seymour was making generous, conciliatory promises (like 1/3 or 1/4 of revenues) to the thousands of Natives who showed up for the celebration. Such offers may have been made discreetly outside of earshot of angry and frightened white settlers and miners. Seymour had the difficult task of trying to calm public fears, diffuse the perceived threat of Native violence and assure Natives they still had a protector in their new Governor. To this end, Seymour's official offers to Natives included promises of "gifts of greater value" (Document #33. See also Howay p. 167) at the next year's (1865) gathering - a "practice which worked very successfully in Honduras", Seymour's previous posting. (As an aside, Seymour's decision to give better gifts the following year may have stemmed from the fact that more Natives showed up in 1864 than were expected and the gift supply had to be stretched. As W.E. Cormack indicates: "the number of persons collected having been greater than was expected, the quantities had to be a little curtailed." (Document #34).

How the Stó:lō interpreted receiving these gifts may be another story altogether. The gifts themselves, flags, staffs, molasses, were obviously tokens - similar to those given by Douglas to Island Chiefs during treaty negotiations a decade earlier. Historian Chris Arnett explains Douglas¹ gifts of blankets were not interpreted by their recipients as payment or compensation for alienated lands, but as "witnessing gifts":

The *hwunitum* [white] price [for the gifts] was irrelevant and in the minds of *hwulmuhw* recipients, had nothing to do with the value of the land which Douglas believed was being sold. The Aboriginal leaders who took part in these early land sale agreements accepted the Hudson's Bay company blankets not as payment for 'the whole of their lands', 'but as symbolic payment comparable to the blankets and other goods distributed at the *stlun'uq*, or potlatch, for the witnessing of important events'. In this instance, the acceptance of three blankets by each *si'em* validated Douglas' word that 'they would not be disturbed in the possession of their village sites and enclosed fields ... and that they were at liberty to hunt over unoccupied lands, and to carry on their fisheries with the same freedom as when they were the sole occupants of the country.' (Arnett, page 35)

A Stó:lō *Stl'etl'axel* or ceremony at which lands or resource access rights could be transferred or exchanged might follow this format: a master of ceremonies or "speaker" hired by the host family would welcome all guests then call witnesses using a phrase which translates roughly into "you are asked to witness the work that is being done here". Members of the host family would thank each witness by clasping their hands and leaving a few coins or small token items in the witnesses hands. The "work" (whatever transaction, wedding, naming or event that was being celebrated) would then be performed. The witnesses, whose responsibility it was to remember and share what they had seen would then speak. Then more gifts (such as blankets, foods, etc) would be distributed (a more detailed description be found in Carlson 1997,184).

The Queen's Birthday celebrations of the 1860s and 1870s followed a similar agenda: people were ceremoniously gathered, the "work" was performed (speeches outlining an arrangement and series of promises) in front of witnesses and gifts were given by the hosts. It is reasonable to assume that Stó:lō Chiefs would have viewed the events with similar significance and the gifts as tokens of the Crown's sincerity.

The approach of offering more gifts next year, Seymour felt, would make the 1865 gathering even larger than the 1864. He was right. Indeed, so successful were these gatherings that they continued for ten years (Document #44). But, different people measured success differently. Seymour's main concerns were to prevent Indian violence and to pave the way for white settlement. Lower Fraser Chiefs' concerns to ensure they had a sufficient land and resource base and to reiterate Indian title to the land. That they returned year after year to hear the Governor's promises suggests these Natives' concerns were at first being adequately addressed in the promises they heard. At later celebrations, the Chiefs used the opportunity to voice their increasing discontent. They complained of the continued encroachment of settlers onto their land and the increasingly apparent unwillingness of the Crown to keep its promises (this will be discussed later).

"We Are Happy To Welcome You" - the Queen's Birthday celebrations at (New Westminster) - May 24,1864

Descriptions of the Queen's birthday celebrations and the official speeches of Seymour and the Native Chiefs were reported in Seymour's and Colonial secretary Birch's own correspondence (Documents 22, 24, 25, 31, 55 and 64). These accounts provide few details about the speeches and

discussions that took place at the meeting between the Governor and the Stó:lō, as Seymour's own account exemplifies:

About three thousand five hundred attended the summons. They came by water, and the priests marshalled the procession of canoes, which formed an extremely striking scene as they rounded a point of the Fraser and approached my house. The Indians sang a catholic hymn until they passed under my windows, when they cheered vociferously. They landed at the site selected for public park, where luncheon was provided at the expense of the government. I joined them in the afternoon when the enclosed addresses were exchanged between the Chiefs and myself.

The day was observed as a holiday by all, and passed off with perfect tranquillity. For the following week the shops in New Westminster were constantly filled with eager purchasers, and then the Indians began to return home, their canoes loaded with goods. On my recent tour in the interior the chiefs who had spent Her Majesty's birthday at New Westminster everywhere came forward to give me a respectful and friendly welcome. (Document #22. See also: Document #34, which lists the expenses incurred for the Queen's Birthday celebrations)

Father Gendre's account of the day is significantly more detailed than that of governor Seymour. Gendre, with other members of the Order of the Mary Immaculate (O.M.I.) stationed in Mission, BC, was asked by Seymour to assemble BC Natives at New Westminster on May 24, 1864 to celebrate Queen Victoria's birthday. Seymour took advantage of an already strong network of relationships established between O.M.I. Missionaries and BC Natives to advise on and to get the word out about the festivities (Document #41). This proved to be a very effective method of communication as approximately 3500 Natives attended the event (Document #27. See also Documents #22, 24, 25, 33 and #69). In his journal, Gendre provides his account of the Queen's Birthday gathering:

The R. P. Fouquet... travels through the rows [of Natives] to give his orders, and at his command all the vessels moved off shore; six to seven hundred ships [canoes] slide into the current of the Fraser. Sixty flags, on which shines the symbol of redemption, wave in the free will of the wind; fifty five savage chiefs lead the first line. The students of St. Marie hold a place of honour. They break into the song of the oar and three thousand five hundred mouths hold the mountains and the

forests at bay. What a panorama! What enthusiasm! As for me, it was difficult to hold back shouts of admiration.

A few moments later, we arrived at our landing stage, quite close to the governor's house. A large number of whites, friends or enemies, were present at the landing stage and assisted in the spectacle of disembarkation. The reunion took place a few feet from the residence. The R. P. Fouquet thus opened his grand paper wrapped in red ribbon, he pronounces all the names of the savage chiefs, and carefully, in order not to insult their vanity, places them in a semi-circle so that no one comes last. The school children of St. Marie formed two rows above the chiefs, and our three or four thousand savages grouped themselves around the semi-circle: All the colonists of New Westminster contemplated the Indian meeting. Finally, at noon, the R.P. Fouquet, who had been assigned a place of honour, arrives at the residence of his Excellency. The Governor thus emerges from his lodgings with his first officers in full dress; he is accompanied by his guards and lead by a musical band. Upon arrival, all heads turned and a thunder of twenty thousand cheers for his Excellency could be heard far in the distance. What a dignified moment for our dear savages! One should have seen them, their eyes wide open, their mouths half open, contemplating the first grand English chief in gold clothes, with golden epaulettes, whereas, on his right, more humble than a violet, the modest father Fouquet, wearing a pitiful hat on his head, which he found in the house of New Westminster, a poor replacement for the hat he had lost on the great ocean. It was a beautiful day for the Missionary.

When there was silence, the first chief, who had been given orders to speak first presented himself to his Excellency, gave a grand salute and proceeded to recite imperturbably his short speech given in his native language, interpreted in Chinook by another savage, and finally translated in English by the R. P. Fouquet. The first speech followed by the second, followed by a third. The governor responded to the three speeches with one. *The R. P. Fouquet translated the words of the governor into Chinook, and three good interpreters would then translate these words into their own natural language, with loud bellowing voices in order to be heard by the people far in the distance. This truly unusual scene brought smirks to the lips of the spectators [my italics].*

The speeches were thus followed by the distribution of presents. Each chief presented himself before his Excellency to receive a gift reflective of his royalty; a pretty cap laced with gold braids that dazzles, like the sun's rays, the joys of the day;

fifty-five chiefs, fifty five royal caps. The little school children of St. Marie, all took turns in frond of the governor to receive promises, a handshake and complimentary ties. With the completion of the gift distribution the governor leaves the chair and re-enters his dwelling among the loud and dizzying cheering (document #27 pages 3-4).

Newspaper accounts of the day's events support Gendre's description (see Document #68). As with official descriptions of the Queen's birthday from 1864, newspaper accounts also included a copy of the official speeches made by Governor Seymour. It also includes a copy of the Chiefs' speech, drafted with the aid of Father Gendre (Document 27). Both speeches were relased to the media by the Governor's Office:

Seymour's Speech

My Indian friends,

I am glad to see you and to find that so many have come down to show their loyalty to Our Queen . You are right. The Queen has a good heart for the good Indians. I shall be good to them but harsh and severe to the bad ones. I will punish them as they deserve.

I am glad to find that you have given up strong drinks. They are not good for you.

As you say there is plenty of land here for both white men and Indians. You shall not be disturbed in your reserves. I shall protect you both from bad white men and from bad Indians.

I am glad that you wish top be civilized and raised to an equality with the white man. Cultivate your lands, send your children to school, listen to what the clergy men tell you and believe in it.

A am stranger here and don't yet speak your language but I am as good a friend to you in heart as my predecessor.

I give you but trifling presents now but, next year, on the Queen's birthday, I shall give better ones to all good Indian Chiefs. Those who behave badly shall have none.

I wish you all goodbye and hope you will have a pleasant day.

I have no more to say. (see Documents #22,24)

Chiefs' Speech

The assembled Indian Chiefs of New Westminster, Fort Yale, Fort Douglas and Lillooet have resolved to address the Governor, the Representative of Queen Victoria, through their representatives as follows.

Great English Chief

We beg to speak to you

We, the native Indians are gathered to welcome you and to show you our good dispositions.

We know the good heart of the Queen for the Indians. You bring that good heart with you; so we are happy to welcome you.

We wish to become good Indians, and to be friends with the white people. Please to protect us against any bad Indians or bad white men. Please to protect our land, that it will not be small for us; many are well pleased with their reservations, and many wish that their reservations be marked out for them.

Please to give us good things to make us become as the good white men, as an exchange for our land occupied by white men.

Our hearts will always be good and thankful to the Queen and to you great Chief

We finish to speak to you (see Document #22)

It is difficult to explain the discrepancy in tone between father Gendre's description and Seymour's. Seymour comes across as a bland individual. The two men may simply have been very different personality types which is reflected in their writings. Certainly, Gendre's role as one of the event organizers may have made him particularly observant about the day's details. He was also caught up in a sense of evangelical fervor (as well as some cross denominational rivalry). In contrast, Seymour's description and copy of the official speech focus less on the accuracy or detail of the official recounting of the event than the sentiment Seymour felt he engendered.

Regardless, despite the recent bloodshed at Bute Inlet, this seems to be a time of great hope for Mainland Natives. They have heard of treaties negotiated on the Island; they have promises of

protection, continued fishing and hunting on unoccupied lands; they have a reasonable expectation of compensation for alienation lands and resources; and, the new Governor is promising to be as benevolent a protector as Governor Douglas.

Though some of the sentiments of the day are certainly conveyed in these speeches and in Seymour's description of the events (see Document #22), the contents of these versions of the speeches clearly differ from the collective Stó:lō memory of what Seymour promised to the Chiefs. This could be for several reasons. The day was intended to be a ceremony designed to symbolically acknowledge the Queen's sovereignty and define the relationship between First Nations and the new Governor. What was said publicly at the event itself there may actually reflect a culmination of informal arrangements between First Nations and newcomers. If this was the case, the details would not have been not discussed here - but elsewhere. It was, Father Gendre who wrote the speeches for the natives at this event and these official speeches were relatively simple and general (Document #27 p 2).

Also, according to Father Gendre, each speech was being 'double-translated' from English to Chinook, to the Aboriginal language of each tribal representative (or the other way around). If complex ideas were conveyed via the trade jargon, Chinook, they could easily have been oversimplified or even distorted. According to George Gibbs who, in 1863, published a dictionary of Chinook, there were only 500 words in the language, mostly derived from the Chinook language, French and English, as well as from other coastal languages (Shaw, introduction, p. 3). The Chinook jargon has many nouns and few verbs and its vocabulary was based on expressions of trade and travel. Conveying complex political and social ideas using Chinook jargon would not have been very effective (Shaw, Introduction pp. 3-5)

To encourage more involvement from First Nations the next year, Governor Seymour promised more (and more elaborate gifts)— a practice that proved to have the desired effect. In 1865 a reported 5,000 Aboriginal people showed up to celebrate the Queen's Birthday (Document #67. See also Document #70 — Seymour's correspondence which puts the number at 7,000). The 1865 event went well, despite ill-favoured weather. For the most part, Seymour's and the Chiefs' official speeches echoed the official 1864 addresses. Significantly, Seymour announced: "we have passed laws to place you as equal with the white man in the courts of justice" a painfully ironic statement in light of the almost concurrent enacting of anti-alcohol legislation (Document #67. See also Petition

2). The accounts in local newspapers describe a scene similar to that described by Gendre a year earlier: a radiating semi-circle of Chiefs, St. Mary's pupils and Natives surrounding Seymour and the four representative chiefs and translators. Speeches, a newspaper reporter explains, were delivered in a very humble and inaudible manner, by means of interpreters" (Document #67).

With the exception of 1866, the May 24 event proved to be a very popular outlet for BC Chiefs and government officials to meet, exchange good will and voice their positions on various issues. The event was officially called off in 1866 due to a smallpox outbreak - but not before 2,000 Natives showed up to celebrate (See Document #75). After 1866, First Nations participated and attended each year until 1875.

After the Promises

The Stó:lō continued to hope the Crown's would keep its promises of a share of revenues and compensation for lands outside reserves and that Natives could continue to hunt and fish on unceded lands. Lower Fraser Natives gave Douglas, Seymour and his successor, Powell, a number of years to make good on these promises. Indeed, First Nations' willingness to take part in annual events like the Queen's Birthday celebrations suggests they were more than eager to believe the promises Seymour and Douglas made (Document #65). Yet, by the 1873 Victoria Day regatta, it had become increasingly clear to First Nations that Powell, for all intents and purposes, disregarded these earlier promises (descriptions of this event can be found in Documents #73, 74, 76). In his speech to the assembled Chiefs, Powell promised only "that every Indian family would have land" (Document #66 - a significant departure from Douglas' and Seymour's earlier detailed promises.

Events that followed the 1864 gathering that served to shape the nature of future Native lands and Native political action in BC are summarized in a paper entitled "Superintendency Report, whose authorship is not clear:

On November 19, 1866, the Island and Mainland Colonies united to become British Columbia.

In 1871, the Colony of British Columbia signed the Terms of Union, which admitted the Colony into Canada. B.C. received certain jurisdictional powers as part of its Terms of Union. Article 13, of the Terms of Union states:

The charge of the Indians and, the trusteeship and management of lands reserved for their use and benefit, shall be assumed by the Dominion Government and a policy as liberal as that hitherto pursued by the British Columbia Government shall be continued by the Dominion Government after the Union.

To carry out such policy tracts of land of such extent as it has hitherto been the practice of the British Columbia Government to appropriate for that purpose, shall from time to time be conveyed by the local Government to the Dominion Government in trust for the use and benefit of the Indians on application of the Dominion Government; and in case of disagreement between the two Governments respecting the quantity of such tracts of land to be so granted. The matter shall be referred for the decision of the Secretary of State for the Colony".

Vaguely worded, Article 13 meant different things to different people. The Dominion Government, it appears, did not have an understanding of what had been done in B.C.; the supposedly very liberal policy toward the Indians in B.C. was very ungenerous according to all conceptions of Indian policy followed in other parts of Canada. On the other hand, the B.C. Government found in Article 13 documentary support for its alleged liberality in dealing with Indians, and hence, justification for its attitude of not making further concessions to the Dominion Government.

Powell was Superintendent of Indian Affairs in 1873 when the Privy Council of Canada recommended 80 acres per family, to be held in severalty (in the name of the family) and delegated Powell as Indian Commissioner for B.C. British Columbia policy had grudgingly allowed 10 acres per family be held communally by the Tribe or Village rather than in severalty. On July 16, 1873, the B.C. Government decided that the requirement of 80 acres/family was in excess, and proposed that Indian reserves should not exceed 20 acres per family of five. The Dominion Government responded by amending this to 20 acres/ family, regardless of the size of the family.

Faced with the prospect of having to make large additional grants of land to bring the reserves up to the required acreage, the Province now declared that the question of extension of present Indian reserves was not included in the order in council at all, but that it referred only to future reserves.

The Provincial Government then proposed:

That no basis of acreage be fixed for Indian reserves. And that:

In the event of any reserve being abandoned, or decreased in population, disproportionate to the number of occupants. Such reserves or part of. reserves shall revert to the Provincial Government.

This reversionary right proved a matter of contention for the next 40 years until it was resolved by the McKenna-McBride agreement of 1912.

A large number of chiefs in the Fraser Valley addressed a petition to Powell as Indian Commissioner complaining about the policy of the Government of B.C. in allowing so little land, and of the arbitrary way in which their reserves have been located and divided. They petitioned for 80 acres as an absolute necessity, and said that if the local Government would not respond to their petition, they wished to appeal to the Dominion Government. They quoted discrepancies in land allotments; such as 488 acres of good land for 20 families at Ohamel (24 acres/family), and only 108 acres for 100 people at Keatsy. They also complained of the white man's taking all their cleared land, so that they were compelled to clear the forests to gain lands.

Thus, there were two real points of contention concerning land:

- (1) Amount of land, and
- (2) Actual ownership of reserves (Document #72)

By the 1870s, more white settlers were pre-empting Aboriginal lands, existing reserves were being reduced, legislation restricting Native lands and resource rights was being introduced and hopes of adequate reserve lands were rapidly being dashed. In response, the Stó:lō presented several petitions to the successive Governors and to the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works - a form of protest considered by colonial officials to be preferable to the violence they so feared (see Document #71). These petitions demonstrated Natives growing concern about the alienation of their lands and the reduction of Douglas' interim reserves (See petitions 3-7). Through their petitions, the Chiefs demonstrated their belief that contemporary British justice systems would eventually right the wrongs that had been done.

By 1873, Natives had realised the Crown's promises were not going to be honoured. This is particularly illustrated in the aforementioned petition which was presented to I.W. Powell, Superintendent of Indian Affairs. In it, Natives complain bitterly about the reduction of their

already small and poor quality reserve lands: "For many years we have been complaining of the land left us being too small ... and we have felt like men trampled on and are commencing to believe that the aim of the white men is to exterminate us as soon as they can" (see Petition # 8. See also Petition #9). On March 15th, 1875, nine days before the Queen's Birthday Regatta, Fraser Chiefs take the unprecedented step of refusing to join in the celebrations in protest:

We have heard that you have obtained from the Dominion some money in our name in order that we should celebrate properly the Queen's Birthday. We come to inform you that we do not wish to celebrate the Queen's day. She has not been a good mother and Queen to us, she has not watched over us that we should have enough land for the support of our families. She knows that the British Columbia Government has deprived us of our land leaving but few acres and in some cases not even one acre per head; she knows that we have made a petition nearly one year ago praying that eighty acres [go] to every family. She has not yet said a word in our favour. If she is so great as we have been told, she must be powerful enough to compel the British Columbia Government to extend our present Reserves so that every Indian family will have eighty acres of land.

We come to tell you to send back the money the Dominion allowed for the celebration of the Queen's day. We do not wish it to be spent for us as long as our land question is not settled according to our wishes.

We are in sadness and our sadness is growing to an irritation of feelings and to despair and you know despair is a bad advisor. White men are coming in great numbers and take all the land around our villages. If our land question is not settled immediately there will be no possibility to extend our present insufficient reserves. We will be forced to act as Seashell Indians have done with just reason this winter, drive out every whiteman who would try to pre-empt the lands we wish to have outside our present Reserves... (Petition #10)

Clearly frustrated, Stó:lō chiefs had lost confidence the Dominion Government was going to keep any of the promises it had made. Indeed, by 1874, the BC government clearly stated it had no plans to provide meaningful compensation to Natives but instead embarked on a gift-giving campaign:

... it is assumed that the Government does not contemplate giving the Indians of British Columbia any compensation for their lands, as has been done with the Indians of the Northwest. ... it would be advisable to spend a small sum

annually in the distribution amongst them of useful presents, such as garden tools ... (Document #58. See also document #61)

This policy, in effect, had been practiced since the early Queen's birthday celebrations - though perhaps not articulated clearly as policy at the time (see Document #67). In 1865, for instance, Seymour actually made good on his previous year's promise to provide more gifts to Natives. But the imparting of essentially meaningless token gifts was, over time, not uniformly well received by First Nations and, as early as 1865, some Natives were already suspicious of the Crowns' intentions. Seymour himself demonstrates this in a letter to Cardwell: "a few were intimidated by the ridicule of the tribes on the Lower Fraser who jeered at those of the interior for coming, as they said, hundreds of miles simply to be fed by the Governor" (Document #70)

Regardless, Natives continued to petition the Government to deal fairly with them (see petitions # 11, 12,13,14). Petitions in this era ask for protection from land alienation, white settlers and liquor peddlers, as well as surveying reserves and compensation. In seeming support of some of these claims, I.W. Powell even acknowledges the importance "that full effect be given to both the letter and spirit of all Sir James Douglas' agreements and dealings with the Indians in the province" (Document #59). Despite this, new legislation was enacted which had the effect of further restricting Native land and resource rights - such as the imposing of licensing restrictions on hunting, fishing and trapping (see Document #59) and the banning of the potlatch - the mechanism used by the Stó:lō to transfer land and resource access rights. Natives also protested vigorously against these laws (see petitions 15 and 16).

By the early twentieth century, Native political action became more fine-tuned as their knowledge and mistrust of the British legal system increased; they gained support from sympathetic white organisations, like the Friends of the Indians of BC; and, as they formed their own political organisations, like the United Native Brotherhood). (See Document # 60). Issues of protest continued to include lands, compensation and the potlatch ban but also grew to include fishing, hunting and trapping rights as the British laws governing these things became more restrictive (See petitions 18,19,20).

After BC joined Confederation in 1871, a growing division between the BC and federal governments developed over how to manage Aboriginal Affairs. This is evidenced in an 1877 letter from David Mills, Federal Minister of the Interior to G.M. Sproat:

It is obvious that the discontent of the Indians is wholly due to the policy which has been pursued towards them by the local authorities. The Government of British Columbia having all along assumed that the Indians have no rights in the soil to extinguish, and they acted toward the Indian population upon this assumption. This policy is wholly at variance with that which has hitherto been pursued by the Crown in dealing with the Aboriginal population of this continent (Document # 56 page 2).

Clearly, federal policy asserted the need for treaties with BC Natives and sufficiently large reserves to be set aside. BC policy, on the other hand, did not at all acknowledge Aboriginal title (Documents # 57 and 62). This division was paralleled by a growing fear again of an "Indian Outbreak" of violence (Document #63) witnessed in the U.S. and Okanagan.

During this very active political period for Natives, no mention of Crown promises was made in the surveyed documents. However, the memory of such promises remained and the spirit of these promises - compensation for alienated traditional lands - continued to inform later Native protest and political action, as evidenced by accounts in 1911 and in 1913-1915 Royal Commission testimony.

1906 Delegation to King Edward VII

Since Governor Douglas' time, colonial officials told First Nations Queen Victoria was their protector — and made promises in her name. When the Crown's agents failed to keep these promises, many Stó:lō logically took their grievances to the Crown itself, as historian Daniel Marshall points out

It is little wonder then, that after years of procrastination and continual trespass by governments and settlers alike ... that they [Natives] would look to the highest authority for redress in the person of Victoria's son, the new Monarch King Edward VII (Marshall, p.128)

To this end, in 1906, Chief Joseph Kayapalanexw (Capilano) of Squamish, Chief Charley Tsulpi'multw of Cowichan, Chief Basil David of Bonaparte (Ashcroft) and interpreter Simon Pierre

of New Westminster comprised a delegation that went to England to petition the King. The delegates chose to keep the details of the planned trip secret which heightened the media's and the public's interest in the event (Marshall p. 148). The organizers held numerous meetings, marches and rallies throughout the province to garner support - to which the three Chiefs travelled in their full regalia (at Capilano, Kamloops and Vancouver).

The delegation travelled from Vancouver by train to Ottawa in late July of 1906, along the way remaining cryptic about their mission. In Ottawa, as one newspaper recounts, the Chiefs made a "loyal yet pathetic explanation" as to their reasons for travelling to London to see the King (Document #77) and only as they were finally departing from Canada did they release a copy of their petition (will be discussed later).

The Chiefs arrived at Liverpool by steamer and travelled by train to Euston Station in London on August 3. They wore full regalia (except Chief Basil David) (Documents 78, 80). They told London reporters they wished to "lay before the Great White Father a protest against the encroachments of the white man on their fishing and hunting preserves.... As they could obtain no redress from the local authorities they decided to cross the sea.. ." (Document 78. See also Documents 79, 80, 81, 83, 90 and 94).

Despite their long journey and the media attention it afforded, King Edward did not immediately grant the delegates an audience, but instead attended a yacht racing regatta — making his guests wait almost days (Document 82). In this time, it appears Lord Strathcona arranged that the Chiefs be taken on a whirlwind tour of London, keeping them busy with sightseeing and public appearances, all the while postponing their audience with the King. One report recounts:

Chiefs have been toured around London by Mr. H.H. Aflingham, who lived for many years in Vancouver, where he knew the Chief well. The Zoo pleased them most Joe Capilano related the humorous anecdote of his experiences there. A Lion in the zoo smelled Capilano's coat and tried to follow him growling. However, they were bothered when an interpreter at the zoo asked if he could have a clipping of each Chiefs hair. He apparently was collecting hair samples from around the world, but had none from North American Indians: "He make too free and ask too much." They stayed for hours at Mme Tussaud's "though they were frightened at the lifelikeness of some of the figures. The representation of the "Flood" at the Hippodrome appealed immensely to them. "It was,

however, Westminster Abbey which impressed them most. They speak of the tombs of the chiefs in it with bated breath" (Document 94)

The Chiefs were both impressed and overwhelmed by London noting its extensive railways, high buildings, hot climate and overcrowded streets but also taking delight in many sites and monuments (Document 78). On August 5th, they attended church services at Westminster Abbey. They found the coronation chair an object of especial "veneration, so also were the tombs of the Royal Dead and the Shrine of Edward the Confessor ... The object, however, which seemed to arouse their greatest interest was the memorial to General Wolfe... Whereas they had viewed the previous memorials in reverent silence, they exchanged an animated conversation over the death scene of the famous soldier" (Document 80).

Despite the publicity they generated, reports indicate the delegates are "quiet unobtrusive men who shrink from the public gaze" who prefer to stay in the soldiers' quarters where they are staying to the "ordeal" of seeing the sites of London and the crowds (Document 80). Yet during this time, the Chiefs attempted to take full opportunity of the media attention they were receiving to begin to disseminate their message. The media learned Chief Joe (Chief Capilano was often referred to in the papers and Chief Joe) was chosen to present a "petition", and act as something of a spokesperson, reportedly because he was a good sober man: "We have other Chiefs, but they are very bad, they drink whisky too much, too much, just like you here" (Document 78). The Chiefs began to release snippets of their intended address to the press: "Our home is beyond the great Atlantic ocean, beyond the great inland seas of Canada, beyond the vast wheat growing plains of Manitoba, beyond the Majestic Rocky Mountains, away on shores of the Pacific Oceans" (Document 78) Though reporters described Chiefs Capilano's talk as "characterized by expressions of the hyperbolic," it was nonetheless effective in keeping the public interested in their visit and Capilano was probably capitalizing on European's tendency to romanticize Aboriginal peoples.

Nine days after their arrival, the Chiefs had still not heard word about the audience they sought. Newspapers report they were tired of London. The noise and crowds un-nerved them, and at night the rattle of motorcars brought on terrible nightmares. Chief Basil suffered the most. According to translator Simon Casimir Pierre, several times a night, Chief Basil "springs out of bed and runs to my bed and catches me by the throat: horrible, horrible,' he cries. And then a car hoots

and I fear he will strangle me ... He is strong and it hurts me and I do not like motorcars" (Document 84). Frustrations and even fears mount as Chief Capilano explained how white people told him not to come to see the King, that the King did not like Indians, and that he would never return alive from London (Document 84). Possibly by way of appeasement, the same article explains the King was benevolent towards Indians. He has "always been interested in his red skinned subjects. While Prince of Wales and travelling Canada, he encouraged a six Nations Chief to come to England and take courses at Oxford" (Document 84).

By August 13th, the Chiefs were finally permitted an audience with the King. The evening before, they announced to the press their goodwill explaining "each of the Chiefs is the bearer to King Edward of the hand shakes of every member of his tribe ... they will endeavour to convey the good wishes of their 200,000 subjects by one great handshake" (Document 84). Despite the long wait, the Chiefs were pleased to learn that theirs would be the King's first audience since returning from the regatta (Documents 93 and 94). Prior to the meeting the delegates conferred with Lord Strathcona (possibly on the protocols associated with this type of audience): "For two hours they had been holding a 'pow-wow' with Lord Strathcona in the High Commissioner's Office (Document 91).

The Chiefs indicated to the press the visit with the King was well worth the wait. In his description of the audience, Chief Capilano was excited at having met the King and Queen. He explained in both Chinook and broken English how they gave portraits and basket gifts to the Queen. Concerning the political aspects of the delegation: "His Majesty gave the chiefs some valuable advice relating to their grievances which they deeply appreciated.... 'Yes' said Joe, 'he called us his children and we are.'" Capilano was very excited and said he would spend the next six months in Canada telling great gatherings of the tribes the wonderful story of how kind the King was. The Cowichan and Bonapart chiefs will do the same and word will quickly spread throughout BC. They leave on the Steamer Lake Manitoba with "views and presents galore" (Document 85. See also Documents 86 and 94). One report claims the Chiefs were so pleased with the visit that even Chief David was happy: "Even the face of Chief Basil who has never smiled since he left his reserve of the Bonaparte Tribe over which he presides was radiant" (Document 87)

The August 14th edition of the London Daily Express provides the most detailed account of the audience:

The Three Indian Chiefs who travelled over 6,000 miles to petition the King to preserve their hunting grounds have succeeded in their object. They are overjoyed at the hearty greeting of His Majesty ... it was only yesterday that they were told that an audience had been secured. They wore regalia and were accompanied by Simon Pierre their interpreter and an official from the High Commissioner's Office. "What happened was vividly described last night to an 'Express' representative by Chief Joseph [Capilano] who speaks a little broken English. He lapsed into Chinook as he became more and more excited." Capilano presented cedar baskets woven by his daughter Emma, as well as a picture of his daughter and himself ... The petition was then presented to the King, who talked for over a quarter of an hour with the Chiefs. Chief Joe would not, of course, divulge this part of the interview, but we understood that his majesty gave his visitors advice as to the best way in which they could get their grievances redressed, and that they were thoroughly satisfied with their mission.

Capilano explained that it would take many months for them to travel about and tell all their people about their meeting with the king: 'They will kneel to us because we bare the word of the Great White Chief and have looked upon him'. Here Chief Tsilpaymilt [Cowichan] interrupted through the interpreter [Simon Pierre]. He is the old man of the party, being more than seventy years of age and every muscle of his thickly lined face quivered as he strove to conceal his emotion: 'I have prayed to be allowed to live long enough to see the Great White King,' he said earnestly, 'and tell him the wishes of my people. Now I have seen him and my heart beats with joy. Once let me bear the glad news to the wigwams of my tribes, and I care not how soon death claims me.' (Document 94. See also Document 92)

Other accounts also provide more (and sometimes conflicting) detail about the audience. An article in the Morning Post explains,

Chief Joe Capilano made, in Chinook, the language of the British Columbian Indians a formal speech of greeting to their majesties. The speech, which was subsequently rendered to the King and Queen in English by the interpreter, stated that the Chiefs were rejoiced to see their Majesties in person, and to be able to convey to them the greetings of the thousands of their Majesties Red Indian subjects in British Columbia (Document 88).

Further details about the audience are pieced together from various newspaper accounts. One article describes how, when greeting the King they arranged themselves with Chief Joe, the leader, in the centre (Document 92). Chiefs Capilano and Tsulpi'multw wore full regalia, while Basil David continued to dawn European style clothing. If Chief David did this to focus attention away from himself, it seems to have had the opposite effect, as one article reports: "Capilano is the leader of the delegation, but Chief "Napoleon Basil" of the "Bonaparts" is the one who attracts attention. He is the most "stoic" and the one who does not wear traditional regalia" (Document 94).

Another report describes how the chiefs made two separate presentations; " One was to the King, and took the form of an address in which the chiefs recalled the great love their tribes bore to Queen Victoria, and expressed their loyalty to his Majesty." The others were the baskets and picture of Capilano and his daughter" (Document 87). One account tells of a note, written by Emma Capilano, and given to the Queen to accompany the gift baskets (Document 88). The contents of the note are not known.

Reports suggest the Chiefs did not, in fact, convey their intended petition to the King; one account reports pleasantries and gifts were exchanged:

"the Chiefs bowed with low obediences. Then they were formally presented by Sir. Montagu Ommanney, Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies. To the sovereign. His majesty shook hands... An address was presented in which the Chiefs recalled the great love their tribes bore to Queen Victoria, which love they also felt for their present Sovereign." Through the interpreter Capilano begged the Queen to accept the gifts of the baskets etc. "With this pleasant incident the brief audience closed" (Document 89)

Despite the Chiefs' stated goals about securing the preservation of their fishing and hunting grounds as promised to them by early colonial Governors, another article reports these messages were not conveyed: "It is understood that the question of the limitation of their hunting and fishing rights was not touched upon in the course of the audience" (Document 87). This seems incongruous with both the Chiefs' pleasure about the meeting and with the explanation by Chief Capilano that "his majesty gave his visitors advice as to the best way in which they could get their grievances redressed, and that they were thoroughly satisfied with their mission" (Document 94). Chief Capilano himself confirms this when visited by a reporter on August 14th:

'Has the King granted your petition,' asked our representative? The Chief shook his head gravely. 'No, the Great White father has granted no petition because none was presented to him.' But apparently this was not of extreme importance. The thing the redskins had most at heart was to approach His Majesty in person, to be hallowed, as they explained it, by the presence of Royalty. 'You see,' said Chief Joe, 'when we go back to Canada we are much bigger men. Other Redskin Indians bow to us because we have bowed to the King and the King has bowed to us. Grand! Grand! We shall also tell our people of the gold, the big lamps, the large looking glasses, the nice, pretty pictures in the Great White Father's house, and they will wonder greatly. They will say how happy we have been to see all these things, and bow to us and say 'Yes, you are much bigger men now.' 'And so, indeed, we shall be, for ever, much bigger and much happier,' concluded Chief Joe, accentuating the statement by vigorously banging the table (Document 90).

The audience with the King was very short, after which they returned to the High Commissioner's Office and spoke with reporters, reiterating their pleasure:

...and here it was that a 'Daily Chronicles' representative found three very dazed chiefs - dazed with the glamour of the Palace, and the mightiness of their achievement ... 'The King,' began Chief Joe again, through the interpreter, 'was very kind. He shook us all by the hand, and said that he hoped we had enjoyed our stay in London. Then we bowed as we had been told to do, and gave our message from our tribes. After that I presented to the Queen four baskets... Then we presented an address of loyalty'" (Document 91)

It may have been during the pre-meeting with Lord Strathcona that the Chiefs were instructed not to present their petition: "Of the official reason for their visit they are not allowed to speak Their 'mission' is to obtain the removal of the restrictions that the Dominion has placed on their hunting, fishing and shooting; but if you ask Chief Joe, Chief Charlie, or Chief Basil any questions on that matter they show the whites of their eyes and gleaming teeth, and they reply that they have seen the Great White King" (Document 91).

The text of the petition they intended to present to the King was, in fact, released to Canadian reporters "just prior to their Departure" (Marshall p.149). We know they were prohibited from presenting this to the King during their audience and whether the King ever saw a version of it is unclear.

Our home is beyond the great Atlantic Ocean, beyond the great inland seas of Canada, beyond the vast wheat growing

prairies of Manitoba, beyond the majestic Rocky Mountains, away on the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

We bring greetings to your majesty from thousands of true and loyal hearts....In other parts of Canada the Indian title has been extinguished, reserving sufficient land for the use of the Indians, but in British Columbia the Indian title has never been extinguished, nor has sufficient land been allotted to our people for their maintenance.

Many years ago Sir James Douglas came to our country and told us that he had been sent by her majesty the late Queen Victoria whom we learned to love as a mother, and for whom we continue to mourn. Sir James Douglas told us that large numbers of white people would come to our country, and in order to prevent trouble, he designated large tracts of land for our use, and told us that if any white people encroached upon those lands he would remove them, which he did, and that we should receive remuneration for the lands settled upon by the white people; but when we asked for anything we were refused. But when Sir James Douglas was no longer governor other white people settled upon our lands, and titles were issued to them by the British Columbia government. We have appealed to the Dominion government which is made up of men selected by the white people who are living on our lands, and, of course, can get no redress from that quarter. We have no vote. If we had it might be different....The government acknowledges that portions of our land was given to us, which is quite true, but they took the very best of our land and give us rock and gravel.

[W]e are persuaded that your majesty will not suffer us to be trodden upon, or taken advantage of. We leave ourselves in your majesty's hands, and trust that we may be able to return to our people with good news.

We cannot tell your majesty all our difficulties, it would take too long, but we are sure that a good man, or some good men, will be sent to our country who will see, and hear, and bring back a report to your majesty. (Marshall p. 149)

Like earlier and subsequent petitions and speeches, the address to the King also contains appeals for compensation as "Sir James Douglas told us" (Marshall, 149); it continues to affirm the memory of Crown promises made to the Stó:lō. And, like the speeches delivered at the Queen's birthday celebrations 50 years earlier, the opportunity for their appeals to the King and their talks with

reporters to be simplified was enhanced by that fact that communications were often double-translated from Native languages to Chinook jargon to English.

In many of the newspaper accounts of the Chiefs' tour and audience with the King, it is Chief Capilano, not the interpreter Simon Pierre who speaks with the media. Capilano's tactic appears to have been to appeal to the overly romantic views of Natives held by many Europeans. Using this tactic, Capilano would, for instance, refer to his people as the King's children or to Queen Victoria as their Great Mother. Coupled with his broken English and his tendency to lapse into Chinook or Halq'ameylem when he was excited, this had the unfortunate effect of simplifying not only their mission but, in the eyes of Londoners, them as men and leaders. Articles about the delegation became increasingly less reverent and more patronizing in tone so that, by the time of their audience with the King, the opportunity to have their concerns about broken promises and land and resource protection were not taken seriously.

Conclusions

Like Governor Douglas, Governor Seymour faced the difficult conundrum of having to free up Native land for white settlement without the benefit of Crown financial support. Seymour decided to follow as policy the reserve establishment structure Douglas set up as an interim measure to proper treaty negotiations. Yet, it is clear from the body of oral and written evidence that in making this decision, Seymour meant for Natives to receive some form of compensation or payment for alienated lands or resources and promised them such. Seymour's and Douglas' promises are remembered by Stó:lō in several ways:

1. They were promised a share of revenues generated (from sale of off-reserve lands?) was to be given to or held in trust for Natives (1/3 or 1/4 usually).
2. They were promised compensation for alienated lands and resources.
3. They were promised lasting support for Natives (often in the form of a pension and often discussed metaphorically as fruit from the Queen's fruit tree).
4. They were promised the freedom to hunt and fish on unceded lands as they had in the past.

With the urging of colonial agents, the Stó:lō viewed these promises as the word of Queen Victoria herself. They made choices based upon the belief that these promises would be kept. The memory of Governors Douglas and Seymour's promises informed later petitions, positions and actions taken by the Stó:lō such as the 1906 (and future) delegation to the King — whom they also hoped would honour promises made in his predecessor's name. As of yet, the Crown's promises to the Stó:lō have not been kept.

SUMMARY OF CROWN'S PROMISE RESEARCH REPORT

AR&T, June 5, 2002

The AR&T department conducted research back in early 2001 related to the apparent promises made at the Queen's Birthday celebration in New Westminster on May 24, 1864. We found a dozen oral references to a promise from Governor Seymour which was made to the Sto:lo and other Natives of BC that a ¼ or 1/3 share of revenues for the sale of off-reserve lands should go to Aboriginal people:

Recent oral history

1. Peter Dennis Peters grandfather Dennis Peters - 25 cents on the dollar of taxes to Natives
2. Bill Pat Charlie's uncle Patrick Charlie - 25% dollar
3. Leona Kelly's grandmother Agnes Kelly - 25%
4. Bill Mussell's grandfather Jones Mussel and father William Mussel - 25 cents on the dollar
5. Grand Chief Sam Douglas' grandfather Charlie Douglas - 25 cents on the dollar; Albert Douglas - 25 cents on the dollar
6. Albert and Tillie Guterrez, Tillie's grandfather stated that "Simo" [Seymour] was "a bad person. I guess cause he wasn't keeping his promise for them." He promised 1/4 of the money.

1920s

- 7. (Feb. 3, 1922): Dennis S. Peters testimony to Anthropologist James Tiet. 1/4 of the "lands outside for the benefit of the Indians."
8. Chief Paul of Skookumchuck - 25 cents on the dollar

Royal Commission 1913-1915

9. Chief at Scowlitz - 1/3 share of revenues from the sale of off-reserve lands or resources would go "to the Indians for their benefit."
10. Chief John Leon of Chehalis - Seymour promised 1/3 of revenues/ Douglas lasting support
11. Chief Charlie of Matsqui - 1/4 of all taxes
12. Chief Kassimer of Langley says that compensation for the "lands outside" was promised at the Queen's Birthday celebration in 1864. Chief James of Yale and Chief Michel of Seabird Island both made it clear they expect compensation for money owed to them from the sale of off-reserve land.

Accounts in newspapers and oblate records from 1864 do not directly confirm these promises but it is clear that the very celebratory tone of the first Queen's Birthday in 1864-65 had changed drastically by 1873. By the 1870s many Sto:lo were no longer paying compliments to the Queen or her representatives but, instead, were angry about the little land being left for them in the Fraser Valley - at reserves such as Katzie and Ohamil. During this period, a flood of petitions to the successive Governors and the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works began appearing expressing anger and despair over the alienation of lands and the reduction of the Douglas Reserves. By 1875, they realized

that the promises were not going to be kept. On March 15th, 1875, nine days before the Queen's Birthday Regatta, Fraser Chiefs took the unprecedented step of refusing to join in the celebrations in protest. They stated:

We have heard that you have obtained from the Dominion some money in our name in order that we should celebrate properly the Queens Birthday. We come to inform you that we do not wish to celebrate the Queen's day. She has not been a good mother and Queen to us, she has not watched over us that we should have enough land for the support of our families. She knows that the British Columbia Government has deprived us of our land leaving but few acres and in some cases not even one acre per head; she knows that we have made a petition nearly one year ago praying that eighty acres [go] to every family. She has not yet said a word in our favour. If she is so great as we have been told, she must be powerful enough to compel the British Columbia Government to extend our present Reserves so that every Indian family will have eighty acres of land.

We come to tell you to send back the money the Dominion allowed for the celebration of the Queen's day. We do not wish it to be spent for us as long as our land question is not settled according to our wishes.

We are in sadness and our sadness is growing to an irritation of feelings and to despair and you know despair is a bad advisor. White men are coming in great numbers and take all the land around our villages. If our land question is not settled immediately there will be no possibility to extend our present insufficient reserves. We will be forced to act as Seashell Indians have done with just reason this winter, drive out every whiteman who would try to pre-empt the lands we wish to have outside our present Reserves....

Clearly frustrated, Stó:lō chiefs had lost confidence the Dominion Government was going to keep any of the promises it had made.

Appendix A:
Elders Identified by Mrs. Rena Point Bolton who she believes have knowledge of
Crown's promises to the Natives of BC

1. Pete Silva / Silver - Mrs. Bolton's grandfather (passed way): Mrs. Bolton heard him and other elders discussing it.
2. Dan Milo - related to Mrs. Bolton's grandfather and Stó:lō historian (passed away): Mrs. Bolton was told the story directly by Dan Milo
3. Louis Squadits - Pete Silver's Uncle: Mrs. Bolton thinks Pete Silver probably heard the story from Louis Squadits (passed away)
4. James Point from Musqueam: Mrs. Bolton thinks he might know the story (might have heard the story from Dominick Point) (passed away)
5. Joe Phillips from Deroche ("punch"): Mrs. Bolton says he was the one who talked to Pete Silver about it.
6. Willie Pierre [?] Steven Point thinks he might have knowledge of it
7. Julius Malloway (Richard Malloway's father) - used to visit Mrs. Bolton's grandmother and Dan Milo and talk about promise
8. Richard Malloway - talked about promise at Band meetings
9. Amy Cooper mentioned promise
10. Evelyn Paul - executive director of the Indian homemakers association. Talked about promise as "queen's rules"
11. Other names mentioned in interview:
 - Martha Washington
 - Joe Washington
 - Hoiwayaluck (Mrs. Bolton says he went with Simon Pierre and delegation to see king in 1906
 - Georgina Malloway - brother Jimmy
 - Jimmy [Malloway? - sister Georgina]: Mrs. Bolton's mother and his mother were sisters
 - Ihagwalex Slochlalalich (Dan Milo's grandfather)

Appendix B
People who Mrs. Gutierrez heard discussing the Crown's Promise

- **Harry Uslick**
 - **Dennis Peters**
 - **Pat Charlie**
 - **The Coopers**
- D Shiloh Malloway

Appendix C

Other People Bill Mussel Thinks May Have Useful Knowledge About This

Andy Paul (passed away) might have information about the promises
Jack Mussel (Bill's Brother and member of the North American Indian Brotherhood)
Mary Lou Andrew
Archie Charles
Albert Douglas
Richard Malloway
Henry Coulsitlou (Volunteer Lawyer for North American Indian Brotherhood)
Freddy Garrin (North American Indian Brotherhood)
Gertrude Garrin (Musqueam)
George Leonard
Don Moses

Appendix D

Other Information From Contemporary Oral Interviews

Ms. Rita Pete says she heard something about it [the Crown's Promise] probably from **Oscar Peters** but did not know any more details. (Document #4 - part three) Ms. Marge George remembers hearing about Queens' birthday celebrations. She also remembers hearing that **Simon Baker** of the Squamish band has records about the 1906 delegation to England. (Document #4 - part five) Mr. Simon Baker does not seem to have knowledge about the government or Crown promises but he remembers stories about a 1906 native delegation to England that his grandfather (**Chief Joe Capilano**) attended (Document #5)

Crown's Promise Report - Document Numbers

SECTION A	
Document #1	Interview notes: Mrs. Rena Point Bolton with Leslie Pinder. March 14, 2001. Sto:lo Nation Archives
Document #2	Interview transcripts: Mr. And Mrs. Albert and Tliie Gutierrez with Albert McHalsie. March 4, 2001. Sto:lo Nation Archives
Document #3	Interview transcripts: Mr. P.D. Peters with Larry Commodore. July 21, 1985. Sto:lo Nation Archives
Document #4 Parts one - five	Collection Held at: Sto:lo Nation Archives Part one: Interview Notes: Mr. Bill Pat Charlie with Timothy O. Peters c. February, 2001 Part two: Interview Notes: Mrs. Leona Kelly with Timothy O. Peters February 19, 2001 Part three: Interview Notes: Ms. Rita Pete with Timothy O. Peters c. February, 2001 Part four: Interview notes: Ms. Audrey Peters Sr. with Timothy O. Peters c. February, 2001 - no mention of Crown's Promise Part five: Interview notes: Ms. Marge George with Timothy O. Peters c. February, 2001
Document #5	Interview notes: Mr. Simon Baker with Timothy O. Peters c. April 4, 2001. Sto:lo Nation Archives
Document #6	Interview transcripts: Mr. Bill Mussel with Sonny Mchalsie, March 3, 2001. Sto:lo Nation Archives
Document #7	Interview Transcripts: Mr. Sam Douglas with Sonny McHalsie, February 26, 2001. Sto:lo Nation Archives
Document #8	Opening statement of Chief Charley of the Matsquie (sic.) tribe to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. Feb. 1 st , 1915 Included as Exhibit #B-39
Document #9	Statement of the members of the Scowlitz Band to Royal Commission on Aboriginal Affairs [exhibit B-48]
Document #10	Statement of members of the Squamish Indian Tribe at Brackendale to the Royal Commission at Indian Affairs. March 15, 1915 [includes as Exhibit B-49]
Document #11	Statement of many Squamish Chiefs to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs March 8, 1915 [Exhibit B-51]
Document #12	Opening statement of Chiefs John Leon per Arthur Phillips of the Chehalis tribe to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. C. 1915. Included as Exhibit #B-26]
Document #13	Opening statement of Chiefs Harry Joe, William George, Gus Williams of the? tribe to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. C. 1915. Included as Exhibit #B-10

Document #14	Opening statement of Chiefs Harry Joe, William George, Gus Williams of the ? tribe to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. C. 1915. Included as Exhibit #B-10
Document #15	Statement of Chiefs Che-ack-mus (Tom) or behalf of the Squamish Tribe to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs c. 1925 Included as exhibit B-46
Document #16	Statement of Chief James of Yale to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. November 19, 1914
Document #17	Statement of Chief Johnnie of Musqueam to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. June 24, 1913
Document #18	Statement of Chief Michel of Seabird Island to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. November 23 rd , 1914
Document #19	Statement of Chief Paul of Skookumchuck to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. August 27, 1915
Document #20	Statement of Chief Kassimer of Langley to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. January 9, 1915
Document #21	Statement of Chief Kwak-a-pilt to the Royal Commission on Indian Affairs. January 9, 1915
SECTION B.	
Document #22	Letter Seymour to Cardwell 31 August 1864. Including enclosures of Chiefs speech/petition & Seymour's speech. BCARS PRO CO 60/19 Call # B0665
Document #23	Invitation poster to the 1873 Queen's celebrations in New Westminster RG10) 3580 799
Document #24	Address by Governor Seymour to assembled Chiefs at Queen's Birthday. May 24, 1864
Document #25	British Columbia Diary - excerpt Birch's official diary May 22 - July 21, 1864. BCARS MSS 0061 Vol. 3/4
Document #26	Proceedings of the conference between the Allied Indian Tribes of BC and Duncan Campbell Scott. August 7 th , 1923 (excerpts)
Document #27	English translation of: Missions de la Congregations des Missionnaires Oblats de Marie Immaculee. Volume 4, 1865, pp. 290-307
Document #28	1911 (May) petition of Various BC Tribes to Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior (transcribed in <i>A Sto:lo - Coast Salish Historical Atlas</i> page 176)
Document #29	1922 Testimony of Dennis S. Peters on behalf of Chief Pierre. Edward Lorenzetto and others, 3 February 1922. In <i>Report on the Hope Band, February 3, 1922</i> , by J.A. Teit. RG10, vol. 11302, file 158/30, national Archives of Canada, Ottawa. (Transcribed in <i>A Sto:lo - Coast Salish Historical atlas</i> pages 185 -187)
Document #30	Presentation by Chawathil Indians to the Government, c. 1923. <i>Sto:lo History and Information: Before You Know Where You Are Going, You Must Know Where You Have Been</i> . Edited by Clarence Pennier. Booklet Compiled for the Sto:lo Tribal Council, 1994. Sto:lo Nation Archives, Chilliwack. (Transcribed in <i>A Sto:lo - Coast Salish Historical atlas</i> pages 190-191)

Document # 31	Correspondence the Colonial Office In London to Seymour. December 1,1864. Public records Office London. CO. 60/19
Document #32	Seymour to Col. Office London October 4, 1864. BCARS B-1434 dispatch #56 pages 298-305
Document #33	Letter Seymour to Cardwell September 23, 1864. BCARS GR 1434 Colonial Correspondence Vol. 601
Document #34	Letter W.E. Cormack to the Colonial Secretary. Alliance of Tribal Nations, Call # v0360 and v0361
Document #35	Letter from Seymour to Cardwell September 9,1864 BCARS B -1434 Dispatch # 39
Document #36	Letter Seymour to Cardwell September 24,1864 BCARS B - 1434 Dispatch # 49
Document #37	Letters Seymour to Cardwell October 7,1864 BCARS B - 1434 Dispatch # 49
Document #38	Letters Seymour to Cardwell November 23,1864
Document #39	Letters from Seymour to Cardwell February 25,1865 BCARS B - 1435 Dispatch # 10
Document #40	Letter from Seymour to Cardwell May 3,1865 BCARS B - 1436 Dispatch # 39
Document #41	Seymour to Cardwell May 22,1865 BCARS B -1436
Document #42	Seymour to Cardwell June 8,1865 BCARS B - 1436
Document #43	Seymour to Cardwell July 19,1865 BCARS B - 1436
Document #44	Correspondence between W. Fisher to Governor Musgrave April 28, 1870 BCARS c.o. f 565 pt. 14
Document #45	Seymour to Duke of Newcastle. May 20, 1864. BCARS B-1434 dispatch #7
Document #46	Seymour to Cardwell. September 9, 1864. BCARS B-1434 dispatch #37
Document #47	"The Address of the Chiefs" in The British Columbian, May 28, 1864. P. 3. UBC Microforms.
Document #48	"Address of Indian Chiefs to Governor Seymour in Victoria Daily Colonist, May 30,1864, p. 3. UBC Microforms.
Document #50	Colonal Moody to Gov. Douglas April 28, 1863 Col. Corr. Vol # 935 File # 10 Rep #
Document #51	Douglas to Lytton October 12,1858 BCARS c.o. 6011 File # 883 Id Reel # B-1434
Document #52	Douglas to Lytton BCARS c.o. 6011 883 Id B - 1434
Document #53	Douglas to Duke of Newcastle February 18, 1860 BCARS B - 1425 Dispatch # 25
Document #54	Douglas to Duke of Newcastle March 22, 1860 BCARS B - 1426 Dispatch # 33
Document #55	D'Une Mer A l'autre Les Oblats de Marie - Imaculee au Canada (1851 - 1961) UBC Main Library call # BX 3820 M 3024

Document #56	David Mills to G.M. Sprout NAC RG10 Vol 3597 File 1353 Reel #10103 Aug. 3,1877
Document #57	Sproat to Mills Aug. 27, 1877 NAC RG10 Vol 3653 File 8705 Reel C-10,114
Document #58	Memo re: Policy to pursue towards Indians of BC NAC RG10 vol. 3608 File 3129
Document #59	G.M. Sproat to Powell July 16,1878 NAC RG10 Vol 3666 File 10 143 Reel C-10,117
Document #60	Sproat to Powell June 30,1877 NAC RG10 vol 3650 File # 8497 Reel # C-10,114
Document #61	Committee of the Privy Council Report 19 May 1874 NAC RG10 Vol 3608 File 3129 Reel # C-10, 103
Document #62	A.C. Elliot to Sproat re: David Mills letter (#56) Sept. 27, 1877 NAC RG10 Vol. 3597 file 1353 Reel C-10,103
Document #63	Indian Reserve Commissioner to Sproat July 16 Aug. 1874 NAC RG10v3651 File 8540 Reel C-10,114
Document #64	"Victorian Odyssey" Chapter IV British Columbia in 1863 A.N. Birch Reminiscences BCARS MSS 0061 Vol. 2 Birch Papers Reel A00272
Document #65	Cardwell to Seymour 1 Sept 1864 - Source?
Document #66	Powell to Sec. State for BC June 25, 1873 {?} - Sources?
Document #67	"The Queen's Birthday", article in The British Columbian May 26, 1865. UBC Micros (+June 1,1865)
Document #68 (a)	"The Great Indian Gathering at New Westminster" in Victoria Daily Colonist, May 30,1864 p.3.
Document #68 (b)	"The Celebration" in The British Columbian, May 25, 1864 pp 1-3.
Document #69	Colonial Correspondence copy of the 1864 Chiefs' speech to Governor Seymour at the Queen's Birthday BCARS PRO CO 60/19 B0666.q
Document #70	Seymour to Cardwell 7, June 1865 BCARS CO. 60/19/22.
Document #71	Seymour to Cameron Feb. 19,1867. British Public Records Office CO. 60/27 #33.
Document #72	Indians protest at New Westminster, 1874 BC Superintendency Reports, Vol. 1001.
Document #73	Program for the "Celebration of the Queen's Birthday" in Mainland Guardian, May 24,1873 UBC Microform AW1 R122.
Document #74	"Queen's Birthday Celebration" May 28,1873 in Mainland Guardian. UBC Microforms AW1 R1dd - p.3.
Document #75	"The Celebration" in The British Columbian, May 26, 1866. UBC Microforms.
Document #76	"Celebration of the Queen's Birthday" in Daily British Colonist, May 25,1873. UBC Microforms.
Document #77	"Stray Points," Canadian Gazette, August 3, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #78	"Red-Skin Visitors," Daily News, August 3, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.

Document #79	"To Petition the Great White King: The Indian Chiefs Who have Arrive in London Canada to ask King Edward to Protect their Gam Preserves," Daily Graphic, Friday August 4, 1906, p. 13, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #80	"Indian Chiefs in London: They see the Queen and Visit Westminster Abbey," The Observer, August 5, 1906, p.3, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #81	"Red Chiefs to See the King," The Graphic, August 11, 1906, p.5, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #82	"Cowes Regatta Week," Supplement to the Graphic, August 11, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #83	"Red Indians Deputation to the King," The Illustrated London News, August 11, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #84	"Redskins to see the King: Chiefs go to Buckingham Palace To-day," Daily Express, August 13, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #85	"Good Kind King: Indian Chiefs at Buckingham Palace," Daily Mail, August 14, 1906, p.3, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #86	"The King and Indian Chiefs," The Daily Graphic, August 14, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #87	"Indian Chiefs Received by the King Today: A Present for the Queen," Evening Standard, London, August 13, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #88	"The King and the Indian Chiefs: Audience at Buckingham Palace," The Morning Post, August 14, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #89	"Red Indian Chiefs: Reception by the King and Queen," The Daily Telegraph, August 14, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #90	"Great White Father: Red Indians at Buckingham Palace: Chief Joe Exultant," The Daily News, August 14, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #91	"Great White King: Red Indian Chiefs Received by His Majesty," The Daily Chronicle, August 14, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #92	"The King and the Indian Chiefs," The Canadian Gazette, August 16, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #93	"To Pow-wow with the Great White Chief: Red Indians on their Way to Buckingham Palace," The Graphic, [An Illustrated Weekly Newspaper], August 18, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #94	"Redskins See the King: Chiefs Delighted with their Reception," Daily Express, August 14, 1906, London: British Library, Newspaper Division.
Document #95	"Indians Present Address: Chiefs of Cowichan Bands Address Prince Arthur of Connaught," Victoria Daily Colonist April 1, 1906, p.7. DM-FN#47.

Document #96	"Indian Chiefs' Plans. Band En Route to England Make Call on Mayor of Vancouver.", Victoria Daily Colonist, 2 July 1906, p.6. DM - FN #52.
Document #97	"Indians to Leave This Afternoon", Vancouver Province, 5 July 1906, p. 1. DM-FN #52.
Document #98	"Indians Petition to King Edward", Victoria Daily Colonist, 6 July 1906, p.8. DM FN #53.
Document #99	"Indian Chiefs Leave Vancouver", Vancouver Daily World, July 4, 1906, p.2.
Document #100	"Indian Parliament. Convention at Kamloops of Chiefs Various Parts of Province.", Victoria Daily Colonist, 13 July 1906, p.6. DM - FN #51.
Document #101	"Indians Ask More Compensation", Vancouver Province, 14 July 1906, p. 1. DM-FN #55.
Document #102	"Indian Chiefs Speak Good Words", The World, Vancouver, B.C. Monday, July 16,1906.
Document #103	"Big Chiefs To Seek The King. Two British Columbia en Route to England.", Montreal Gazette, July 20,1906. AWI R2077 QUE. 17 1906 July-Aug. MCR
Document #104	"Big Chiefs Meet King", Vancouver Daily World, Aug. 13, 1906, P 1
Document #105	"Indian Chiefs Are Received By King", Victoria Daily Times August 13, 1906, p. 1.
Document #106	"King Receives Indian Chiefs", Vancouver Province, 13 th , Aug. 1906, p. 1. DM-FN #58.
Document #107	"Indians Before King", Victoria Daily Colonist, 14 August 1906, p.2. DM-FN #58.
Document #108	"Charmed With King", Victoria Daily Times, Aug. 14,1906, p.2.
Document #109	"Chief Capilano Is Interviewed", Vancouver Province, Aug. 14, 1906, p.;8. Very poor original microfilm.
Document #110	"Chief Joe Fools London Reporter. Tells Him How He Misses Buffalo That Used To Roam in North Vancouver", Vancouver Daily World, Aug. 14,1906, p.3.
Document #111	The Daily Province, Vancouver, August 15, 1906.
Document #112	"Gives Capilano Souvenir of Visit", Vancouver Daily Province, Aug. 16, 1906, p.1.
Document #113	"Indian Chiefs Return in Triumph", The World, Aug. 20, 1906, p.1.
Document #114	"More About Indians Visit To King Edward", Victoria Daily Colonist, 31 Aug. 1906, p.6.
Document #115	Duncan C. Scott, Report on the British Columbia Indian Question, March 30, 1927, Sto:lo Nation Archives, RG10, 3820, 59,335.
Document #116	Letter (SD) S. Stewart, Assistant Secretary Indian Department to Colonel Hanbury Williams, Ottawa, 7 th Nov. 1906.
Document #117	Letter (SD) J. Hanbury Williams to Secretary Indian Dept., Government House, Ottawa, 10 th Nov. 1906.

Document #118	Strathcona to Sir Montagu Ommanney, Aug. 1,1906. Author: Lord Strathcona, Can. High Comm. To London, August 1, 1906, p.1 (467), Public Record Office, Britain, Call #CO 42/908, Collection/RG: CO 42, Vol. 908, File #28358.
Document #119	Indian Chiefs, August 4 - 9, 1906, Repository: PRO, Britain, Call # CO 42/907 28637, Collection/RG CO 42, Vol. #907, File #28637.
Document #120	Correspondence Gov. Gen. Earl Grey to Earl Elgin, November 1906, p.6 (509-514), Repository PRO, Britain, Call #CO 42/907, Collection/RG CO 42, Volume #907, File #43507
Document #121	Memorandum, Ottawa, Feb. 16,1906, Repository Sto:lo Nation Archives, Collection/RG RG10, Volume #3820, File #59,335, Reel # part 2
Document #122	Draft reply, Cardwell to Seymour, No. 28,1 August 1864, No. 7, (6959, CO 60/18, p. 273, received 22 July)
Document #123	Certification of leave of absence for Joseph William Trutch, signed by Seymour, 25 August 1864, No. 25 (9648, CO 60/19, p. 52; received 20 October)
Document #124	Seymour to Cardwell, No. 37 (10601, CO 60/19, p. 149; received 17 November)
Document #125	Seymour to Cardwell, 21 November 1864, No. 69 (1374, CO 60/19, p. 386; received 13 February 1865)
Document #126	"Return showing the ordinary Current expenses of the Assay, Melting and Coining Department of British Columbia; the weight, and value of the gold dust assayed; and the receipts during September 1864." No. 56 (10955, CO 60/19, p. 298; received 29 November)
Document #127	Draft reply, Cardwell to Seymour, No. 44, 26 November 1864, No. 39 (10603, CO 60/19, p. 210; received 17 November)