

Copy

Office Superintendent Ind Affairs

Dayton OH December 29<sup>th</sup> 1854

Sir

Your letter of the 9<sup>th</sup> inst, by the hand of Mr Churchel upon the subject of the Indian Reserve has been duly received and in reply would state, that I regret exceedingly that I did not better understand your views before signing the ~~fact~~ that the district designated as a Reserve for the Unkqua Indians should interfere with the claimants in that vicinity. I had supposed from the information <sup>derived from the letters of the</sup> ~~obtained~~ that ~~no~~ boundaries of this Reserve would not interfere with any claimant in the country.

And I am yet inclined to that opinion. It is possible you may misunderstand the precise boundaries ~~on the east~~ <sup>it is</sup> ~~as follows~~ <sup>concerning</sup> ~~beginning~~ on the south side of "Unkqua River" at a point three miles due south of the mouth of a small creek entering into the Unkqua River near the western boundary of John Churchels Land Claim at the lower end of Coles Valley; thence north to the middle of the channel of "Unkqua River"; thence up said River to a point due south of the highest peak of the ridge immediately west of Allen & Abbotts Land Claim; thence to said Peak; thence along the summit of the ridge dividing the waters, to its termination at or near the mouth of Little Kenion Creek; thence crossing the Unkqua River in a westerly direction to the highlands opposite the mouth of said creek; thence following the divide until it reaches a point where a line drawn to the place of beginning will run three miles south of the

extreme southern end in the Wabigoon River between these two points; and thence to the place of beginning.

The only boundary which can at all interfere with claims is that mentioned by ~~you~~ <sup>him</sup> ~~between~~ the mouth of <sup>Chushup</sup> the Little Caek ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~South~~ <sup>and</sup> the starting point, and it must be greatly desired if a south direction would strike any settlers claim. The extreme foggy weather at the time of examining its boundaries may have misled me. The limited amount of agricultural land embraced in the Reserve induced me to approach the settlers as near as possible but I had no intention of encroaching upon theirs or of ~~preventing them~~ <sup>cutting off from</sup> obtaining their contemplated supply of fencing and building material. It is not likely the Reserve now selected will ~~require~~ <sup>require</sup> such ~~suggest~~ <sup>require</sup> length of time, as I have good reason to hope that we may be able, ultimately, to remove them entirely from the settlements. Had I the authority to change the line <sup>as you propose</sup> ~~proposed~~ I would readily do so but the boundaries are defined in the Treaty and no alteration can be made short of opening all the bands, <sup>so as to</sup> obtain their consent and signatures. This would not only cause delay, but <sup>would be</sup> attended with great expense, and <sup>create</sup> ~~cause~~ doubts and confusion in the minds of the Indians.

Mr. Churchill informs me that it has been the design of some persons to erect a mill on the creek some ten or twelve miles below the western end of Caledonally. I doubt not such an ~~arrangement~~ <sup>arrangement</sup> may be entered into, as will enable the parties to do so notwithstanding it is included in the Reserve, and



Copy of Letters

of A. March, Chancellor

of the in reply to

Politeness upon the subject

of the paper and a new

document 29<sup>th</sup> 1854

Memorandum B 3 p. 89-91