Following is a summary of what the Treaty No. 6 elders have said in interviews about the nature of the treaty and the rights guaranteed to the Indian people by the treaty. Subjects discussed by the elders include mineral and other resource rights, hunting, fishing, and trapping rights, land and land surrenders, education and medicare, and economic development.

In general, it would seem that most elders view the treaty as something which guarantees the Indian certain rights in exchange for permitting the white man the use of the land for farming, and perhaps timber for making houses, and grass for feeding animals. These are the only things that were requested by the treaty commissioners and the only things given up. In exchange for these, Indians received the right to pursue a livelihood in the traditional way, to live in particular areas unmolested, to be taught farming and be given agricultural implements and animals, to be provided with free education and medicare, and to receive such services on the reserve.

The Treaty 6 elders, unlike the Treaty 7 elders, do not stress that the treaty was about establishing peace. Rather, the treaty was about land and permitting the white man to share
in the use of that land whether the ideas is phrased as "selling" or "leasing" the land. Thus, the elders elaborate more on what the Indians were promised in exchange for land use than they do in the Treaty No. 7 area when it was not felt that the Indians were giving up anything. It seems that for the Treaty 6 area, there is an implicit recognition that Indian and white cannot both make use of the same area at the same time and that the Indian is entitled to compensation if he is going to share the land, thus the emphasis upon the nature of such compensation.

Mineral and Other Resource Rights by Richard Daniel

A total of 31 interviews in the Treaty 6 area deal with treaty mineral rights. They provide the most consistent position on these rights of the three treaty areas.

No fewer than 26 elders in the Treaty 6 area explicitly stated that only surface rights to the land had been surrendered in the treaty or that Indians had retained mineral rights under all of the land. An additional four interviews imply the same by such statements as 'the white man only wanted land.' One other interview is difficult to interpret. It is significant that none of these 31 interviews gives support to the idea that the Indian people surrendered all rights to the minerals outside of their reserves.

The most common means of expressing the idea that Indians kept the minerals was to state that the land was only surrendered to a certain depth. Twenty-five elders make this point, although there is a divergence of opinion on the depth to which the land was surrendered: one foot (7 elders); six inches (6 elders); surface (4 elders); six hands (3 elders); 24 inches (3 elders); 4 hands (1 elder) and one hand (1 elder). Despite the differences in expressing the exact depth of the surrender it is quite obvious that all of these references are roughly equivalent to the concept of surface rights.

Several interviews elaborate on the reasons that only surface rights were surrendered, and indicate a resentment that the government is getting rich off the Indians' resources.

Example: Harry Janvier, 72, of Cold Lake says:
"So we know that God had provided them (Indians) with food and that he gave this country to the Indian people, where we are living now. He had put some things under the earth to live with, and he had put things on earth to make a living with. Underneath the water he had put things so the Indian could live on. Now all these things that God had given to the Indian people, today the white man takes away and destroys. Everything that God had given to us. He still owns today.... Any living creature that lives underneath the lake, the Queen did not buy from us. The land, that is good for farming, was only sold, 2 feet from the surface. The grass and timber was also
included. But today we can all see, that even our food they take away from us. Our native country, that the Creator had given to the Indian people, is only beginning to be used by the white people, to make money and get rich. All the progress that is set throughout the country, came from our native land. Yet today the white man is not ashamed, to take, or break for what is left for us, from our forefathers."

Example: Jimmy Yelloweye, 88, of Sunchild says:

"It was said half a foot was all she (the Queen) wanted to borrow so that her children could make a living on it. She said that she wasn't buying the land only borrowing it. Just so her other children could draw a living on it."

Question: "So we didn't sell the land?"

Answer: "No, she stated she only wanted to borrow six inches of the land, enough to break with a plow."

Question: "What of mineral rights the oil and gas the white man uses and minerals, etc. did we give them away?"

Answer: "No, we didn't. She only wanted the land six inches of it and nothing underneath it. She never mentioned oil and gas and now today you see wells all over the place."

A few interviews imply that minerals were explicitly discussed in the treaty negotiations, and were given to the Indian people, although a number of interviews seem to imply that minerals were not discussed and therefore they were not surrendered. The white man said that he only wanted the land for farming, so that is all that was given.

Example: When asked, "How much land in depth did we give?", Joe Peytou of Cold Lake replied, "One foot, enough for him to break and plow the land. This is what my uncle said."

Question: "What of minerals and all that lay underneath the surface of one foot?"

Answer: "Nothing, not one thing as we didn't know of that. When the whiteman came he knew of all the oil that was existent on our land and our elders were ignorant of the value of it."

Two elders from Frog Lake and another from Kehewin claim that the government representatives said that they only wanted three things: the surface of the land, timber, and hay.

Example: Fred Horse, 63, of Frog Lake heard this story of
treaty from his father, many times: "The interpreter said that the commissioner said he wanted three things. He said that he needed land, trees and grasses to live. He only wanted the pine to make houses, grass for his animals and land to a depth of one foot to break and plant crops. Anything underneath was the property of the Indian."

Several interviews make reference to other resources, particularly the mountains and timber, often in conjunction with remarks about minerals.

Of the eleven elders who mentioned the mountains, seven said that the Indians had kept them. Alex Alexander, 72, from the Thunderchild Reserve in Saskatchewan said that he had never heard if they were given away so he assumed they hadn't been. Pat Paddy, 86, also from the Thunderchild says that the elders had said that the mountains should not be given away. Two other interviews discuss the traditional use of the mountains but do not mention whether or not they were surrendered. Nobody claimed that the mountains had been surrendered.

There is not as much agreement on timber and other vegetation as there is on minerals and the mountains. Six elders state that the trees were never surrendered, while three elders say that the white man wanted the timber so that he could build houses.

Seven elders discuss traditional Indian use of minerals and the consensus appears to be that they made use of rocks that were found on the surface but were not aware of the value of minerals to the white man.

Example: Phillip Lightning, 70, of Pigeon Lake, when asked if the Indian used oil and rocks replied:
"The Indian did not use these things in the past. He did use stone for pipes and that is all and also for the sweat lodge."

Other elders mentioned flints and arrowheads.

Seven elders also mentioned uses of the mountains including hunting, seeking answers, refuge in time of war, and a source of medicinal herbs and roots.

Example: Edward Fox, 68, of Onion Lake says: "They used it (the mountains) in some way. My father says there is still many animals and medicinal herbs and roots. The mountains were regarded highly and Indians went there for answers. These answers they looked for, utilizing ceremony ages old. Sawmills are all over the place. There is much he derives from that too. My people considered the mountains clean and good."

The idea that the Indian made use of all resources that he had knowledge of is expressed by Jimmy Yelloweye:
"The Indian was given the knowledge of how to use all that he had been put on the earth with. When one was sick they took willows and made a hut. Then they heated the stone to make them hot. They put water on the rocks. The sick one sweated out the poisons of his sickness. The grasses and plants he used to make medicine to care himself when he was ill."

Hunting, Fishing, Trapping
By LYNN HICKEY

Interviews with forty elders in the Treaty No. 6 area were reviewed for references to hunting, fishing and trapping. As was the case in the Treaty 8 area, none of the people interviewed denies that Indians are guaranteed certain rights with regard to hunting, fishing and trapping. The primary distinction between viewpoints expressed in the interviews seems to be between those stating that the treaty itself guarantees these rights and those stating that the Indians neither sold the animals and fish in the treaty nor gave up their right to hunt, fish and trap them.

Fifteen of the interviews contained statements to the effect that the treaty of the Queen promised that the Indians had hunting, fishing and trapping rights, or that they were to retain their lifestyle (Mrs. Phillip Lightning, Pigeon Lake), or that these rights would last forever. Several mentioned that the animals were the Indians' to kill without fear of prosecution.

In twenty-seven of the interviews the subject of hunting, fishing and trapping rights is approached in a different way. There is simply an assumption made that the treaty in no way changed these rights. The concept is expressed in terms of ownership. The Indians did not sell the animals, fish or birds, therefore ownership of these creatures has not changed hands and the Indians' right to hunt, fish or trap them has not changed either. As Magnes Swampy (age 72, Samson Reserve) said, "As far as the wild game was concerned including the fish and any fowl like ducks for instance, none of these things were ever sold to the white man because these things were to be protected for the natives' livelihood."

Many of the same persons interviewed go even further in this line of thinking to state that the treaty itself says that animals and fish were not sold to the government because to do so would deprive the Indians of their livelihood. Two persons make the point that branded animals were to belong to the government and unbranded animals to the Indians (Dominic Jacko, Cold Lake and Pat Paddy of the Thunderchild Reserve, Saskatchewan).

Since it is felt that the Indians never sold nor gave away the game animals and fish, laws made by the white man restricting the hunting or fishing activities of Indians are
unjust or even contrary to promises made in the treaty. Ten of the interviews were concerned with the injustice of the existence of such game laws and two make the point that the government has no right to enrich itself from the sale of licenses. Example: "He's stolen that from us. We never gave that away." (John Buffalo, Ermineskin).

It was felt by most of the people who mentioned game laws at all that their basic hunting, fishing and trapping rights guaranteed in the treaty were being interfered with by the game laws. Louis P. Crier (Samson Reserve) said, "The main thing that was mentioned in the treaties what you people were given you will always have which is wild game. And this you will have at all times without any interference."

Several people specifically mentioned ducks and said they were afraid to shoot them because of the possibility of fines.

Various incidents concerning run-ins with game wardens were mentioned, e.g., Narcisse Brown (Louis Bull) says that Indians are chased out of the Louis Lake area when they trap there, and five other interviews cite examples of interference with hunting and trapping rights. Two persons, Harry Janvier and Alex Metewais (Cold Lake) mention the Department of National Defense Air Weapons Range which had been used by the Cold Lake band for hunting and trapping before being leased to the government. Harry Janvier feels that leasing this land forced many people to go on welfare since they could no longer make a living hunting and trapping without this land.

Only one interview mentions the problem inherent in defining the right to earn a livelihood, i.e., whether obtaining meat or furs for sale should be considered part of earning a livelihood. Phillip Lightning (Pigeon Lake) feels that perhaps Indians are to blame for overly restrictive game laws, although it is unclear whether he thinks game laws are consistent with rights guaranteed in the treaty. "Even our own people kill animals and sell them. That isn't the way it is supposed to be. We have done this to ourselves and the white man is always watching."

Only two interviews mention any distinction at all between hunting, fishing and trapping within the reserve boundaries as opposed to outside these boundaries. One states that the treaty says Indians can use the land on the reserve in any way they wish (George Cattleman, Montana) and the other makes the complaint that even on the reserve there are restrictions on duck hunting (James Bull, Louis Bull).

Five interviews are concerned with supplies related to hunting, fishing and trapping which the government, by the terms of the treaty, is supposed to provide for the Indians. Things promised include ammunition, fish nets and horses. Only one of the five interviews claims that these promises are not honoured. The others simply mention the fact that such things were promised.
There are five interviews which express the view that life before the white man came was very good and that even though the Indian did not work for money, he never starved. Four of these interviews place the blame for the disappearance of the good life specifically on the white man because he killed "so many buffalo causing hunger" (Henry Cardinal, Saddle Lake.)

Two final subjects which may be related to the topic of hunting, fishing and trapping as found in the interviews are:
1. The sacredness of the Indians' right to use of the land. God "had put some things under the earth to live with, and he had put things on earth to make a living with. Underneath the water, he had put things so the Indian could live on" (Harry Janvier, Cold Lake). Mrs. Phillip Lightning (Pigeon Lake) stated, "We are of the land. The land keeps us alive. We grow from the land." 2. Three interviews mentioned the mountains as a place the Indians would not have ceded in the treaty because the mountains were especially rich in game animals.

As was noted in the summary for the Treaty no. 8 area, it would be useful for further interviews to attempt to pin down the peoples' understanding of what is meant by their right to earn a livelihood. Does the treaty guarantee them the right to hunt, fish and trap only for the purpose of feeding themselves, or, by the terms of the treaty, may they do commercial hunting, fishing and trapping? It might also be a good idea to concentrate on getting the people to state exactly where and under what conditions they believe each type of hunting, fishing and trapping may be carried out.

One final suggestion is to ask whether things promised in the treaty such as ammunition and nets actually have been distributed by the government and to get details of the circumstances involved when these promises have not been carried out, for example, what exactly was not given out, who did not receive it, where was this, when?

Land and Land Surrenders

Of a total of fifty-two elders' interviews from the Treaty 6 area only three make no mention of the subject of land. As in the treaty 8 area, land is mentioned in primarily two ways, the circumstances surrounding the sale of land to the treaty negotiators, and the setting up of reserves and individual problems regarding reserves, such as loss of land, need for more land, etc. In contrast to the Treaty 8 interviews, there is occasionally an expression of sentiment towards or feeling of what the land means to the people.

In interviews in which the treaty negotiations per se are discussed, the views expressed are that the negotiations were not fair because "those people didn't understand nothing, you know the time the treaty was signed. ...there was a lot of misinterpretation given to them" (Jacob Louis, Hobbema), or that the Indians were ignorant of the value of both the land and of money (James Bull, Louis Bull). The general feeling in
these judgements of the negotiations is that the white man took advantage of the Indians' ignorance of white ways (Phillip Lightning, Pigeon Lake) in order to obtain a better deal.

Even in relatively recent times when a treaty was signed, e.g., for the O'Chiese and Sunchild bands, it is felt that the treaty negotiations were not carried on fairly. Andrew Strawberrie (O'Chiese) says, "We were more or less forced to treaty with the government. We were herded into this reserve once it was surveyed." Jim Daychief (O'Chiese) mentions that during the treaty signing, it was difficult to understand the explanation given of what the treaty meant because of interruptions, people talking at once, etc. so it would seem that even in very recent times when a treaty is made, the government may not have made a real attempt to make clear the implications involved. This is clear from Jim Daychief's inability to answer the interviewer's question as to whether the size of the reserve can be increased as population increases.

On the subject of the land surrender itself, several viewpoints are expressed. None of the elders interviewed makes a denial of the fact that the treaty had something to do with land and the obtaining of certain rights over it by the government. The opinions as to just what authority over the land was given up by the Indians are widely divergent. There is even a difference of opinion as to whether the Indians sold their land to the government or merely permitted the whites use of the land on a sort of "loan" basis. Three elders, Harry Janvier (Cold Lake), Louis S. Crier (Samson), and Jimmy Yelloweye (Sunchild) express the view that the white man only borrowed the land. Just about all of the other interviews which deal with the subject of land at all concede that the whites bought rather than leased the land. However, almost every interview, whether claiming that land was leased or sold, makes the point that only the surface of the land was leased or sold. Estimates of the depth of land sold range from six inches to four or six hands, to two feet. Several elders stress that the treaty commissioner only asked for the surface (e.g., John Buffalo, Ermineskin) and George Cattleman (Montana) even claims that the commissioner was asked by the Indians if he wanted to buy "everything" and that he said he did not. He wanted only the surface.

Several interviews mention that the whites had told the Indians that the reason they wanted to buy the Indians' land was so that farming could be carried on. Furthermore, a few elders specifically say that the commissioner only asked to buy the surface of the land because the surface was all that was needed for such agricultural activities. Thus, Dominic Jacko (Cold Lake) says the white man only bought the land "hoe deep", and Joe Peytou (Frog Lake) says that he bought land to a depth of one foot, "enough for him to break and plow the land."

The almost universal occurrence in the Treaty 6 area of the idea that only the surface of the land was sold may stem from a
linguistic problem. The fact that all interviews so far are from Cree speakers may lend support to the idea that the word "land" may not translate into Cree with the same meaning as it does in English. There is evidence that the usual Cree word for "land" corresponds more closely in meaning to the English concept of topsoil, or the black dirt on top of the ground and that other words must be used to specify anything occurring below this level. Therefore, it is almost certain that during treaty negotiations, there would have been a translation problem involved, at least for Cree speakers, when the commissioners asked the Indians to surrender their "land".

Another frequently mentioned topic with respect to what was sold to the treaty commissioners is whether the Indians sold the mountains. Seven interviews deal with this subject (as a response to the interviewer's question as to whether the mountains were sold), all denying that such a sale was made. Either the elder had not heard that the mountains were sold (Fred Bruno, Samson), or he could not conceive of the old people selling the mountains since they were a good source of game and a place where "answers" could be found (Edward Fox, Onion Lake, Saskatchewan).

This last idea about the mountains being a sacred or very special place has already been mentioned in the summary of Treaty 6 elders' views on hunting, fishing and trapping, wherein several times mention of a sacred connection between the Indian and the land was made. This feeling is expressed by Mrs. Phillip Lightning (Pigeon Lake) as, "The land keeps us alive, we grow from the land. We are people of the land." It seems obvious that because of this difference in attitude toward the land of Indian and white, the Indians would most likely have had a very different notion of what "selling" their land meant compared to the treaty commissioners' ideas. There is evidence that land was not seen as a regular "commodity" subject to buying and selling in the interview with Simon Watchmaker (Kehewin) who relates that Sasakawapisk told the commissioner, "No matter how much you pay, there will never be enough to pay for my land." The widespread confusion as to whether land was sold or leased or whether only the surface or the total depth was sold also supports this idea of differing conceptions of land.

That there was a difference at least between notions of land ownership (individual versus group) held by Indians and whites is illustrated by stories told by several elders from Cold Lake. It is not clear as to when the events in the stories took place, but they are concerned with the sale of land to the whites by Wikuskokesano or Winaskoksiyan and Jasjakskwas or Chachaiswkais. Both of these land sales were considered wrong because they had been made privately, by an individual, without the agreement of the rest of the Indians.

As to what the Indians were promised in exchange for whatever rights over the land they gave away, this is expressed in various ways. One elder feels that the Indians asked for and expected certain things in exchange for their land. These
included police protection, medicine, administrators, clerks, and an agricultural expert (James Bull, Louis Bull). Others only mentioned that in return for the land, the white man pays a mere $5.00 a year. Many elders suggest that reserves were what the Indians received for their land. The description of reserves which was presented to the Indians by the treaty commissioners is expressed typically by John Simon (Samson) as "certain portions of land were to be especially set aside for the natives' own use. They were given the right any location to choose from. These lands were to be known as Indian reserves where the natives could live and live peacefully from all encroachment from the white man or anyone else other than the natives themselves."

Many of the specific grievances expressed by the Treaty 6 elders with regard to reserves seem to be related to this latter idea, that reserves would be safe from white encroachment. For example, the people on the Louis Bull reserve had to fence their land to keep whites from bothering them and their land from being taken away, according to Narcisse Brown. Often in incidents of this sort, there is a feeling that the treaty is being broken by the very fact that land does get taken away or is somehow surrendered. Obviously, people on reserves are not free "from all encroachment from the white man" as promised, and Henry Cardinal (Saddle Lake) even says, "the white man now runs the reserve."

As compared to the Treaty 8 interviews, the elders hardly go into any detail as to how reserve lands were chosen except to make the point that the Indians were to make their own choice. Isabel Smallboy (Ermineskkin) does mention that the Hobbema Indians chose that area for a reserve because they were used to it but this is the only time the basis for choosing one area over another is mentioned. There is one elder, Louis P. Crier (Samson) who claims that a non-Indian chose reserve land (John McDougall at Hobbema), but this is the only mention made of such a case except perhaps for the case of the O'Chiese people. As has been mentioned, according to Andrew Strawberry who was present when the treaty was signed, the O'Chiese reserve had already been surveyed before the treaty, and Chuck Frencheater (O'Chiese) complains that the land on the reserve is "not suitable for making a living." It is mostly muskeg and difficult to clear.

The question of how the size of the reserves was determined is not dealt with as extensively as it was in the Treaty 8 interviews. From Isabel Smallboy's statement that the Bears Hill reserve could have been larger if father "had gone much farther out," the inference can be made that the Indians were, or believed they were, free to choose the size of reserves as well as their location. George Cattleman (Montana) and Jimmy Yelloweye (Sunchild) feel that the Indians were supposed to decided how much land was needed for a reserve. These are the only opinions expressed as to how land was chosen at the time of the treaty.
Frequently in the Treaty 6 interviews the question is asked as to whether there was any provision made for increasing the size of the reserves as population increased. Edward Rowan (Ermineskin), in speaking of the Sunchild reserve, says that when the treaty was signed there, the government promised more land when the population increased to 300 people. So it would seem that at least for those who have recently signed treaties, the government has some notion that reserve size should be based on population. Pat Paddy (Thunderchild, Sask.) mentions that a "paper" on this subject "was taken to Ottawa" by five leaders and that they were assured of more land.

The remaining interviews which discuss land deal with specific grievances about such matters as loss of reserve lands (Papaschase, Sharphead, Rabbit Hill, Frog Lake when people moved to Onion Lake, Bobtail, Louis Bull, Two Hills, Washatanow, etc.) and illegal use or non-compensation for use of reserve land (flour mill, then store at Frog Lake; bombing range at Cold Lake; Montana reserve; watchtower at O'Chiese reserve; and Rabbit Hill).

Education and Medicare

Out of fifty-one elders interviewed in the Treaty 6 area, only twenty-four make any mention of the treaty promises regarding education and medicare. Not only is less said by the elders about this area of treaty promises, but the content of their statements on education and medicare seems to be more uniform than it is on other subjects. Generally, the interviews are concerned with statements of what was promised and occasional opinions as to whether the promises were kept.

It is difficult to pin down what the elders feel was promised in the treaty in the way of educational services. Eleven simply state that "schools" or "a school" were promised, while four say only that "education" was promised. It may be that what they are saying can be translated into several different English words. Whenever an elder goes beyond these terms at all to clarify what he means by "education," he seems to equate it with a program of preparation to enable the Indian to deal with the white man on his own terms. For example, Fred Horse (Frog Lake, 64) describes the promised "school" as a place "where you people can get education, so you people can speak with the white man." Beyond this sort of description, the elders do not specify the nature of this education that was promised, whether various types of training might be included within this education, whether only grade school was meant, etc.

On the subject of whether or not Indians should have some control over what is taught in schools, there is only one comment by an elder, Fred Horse, who feels that this course of action is not proper. He says, "We are not to look after our own education. That is not what was said, that we look after ourselves."
Several elders are very clear on a different matter - where the schools were to be located. Any interviews dealing with this subject state that schools were to be located on the reserves. For example, Andrew Strawberry (O'Chiese) says, "if you have a reserve, ... and you will also have a school on the reserve." More interviews on the subject would clarify whether the elders believe that they were only promised easily accessible schools if they were on reserve, i.e., whether treaty Indians not living on reserves were entitled to local schools.

Many elders state that another promise having to do with education was that it would always be entirely free for Indians. Henry Cardinal (Saddle Lake, 78) states the Indians were promised "education will be forthcoming and you will not have to pay for it." One elder, Peter McGillivery (Saddle Lake) implies that this promise was broken when the second treaty payment was made and $10.00 out of the original $25.00 for every man, woman and child was taken out "in exchange for education that would be forthcoming."

Medicare is usually discussed in the interviews along with education and in much the same way. What was promised is variously referred to as "doctors", "medicines", "hospitals", a "medicine chest" (Margrette Quinney, LeGoff) and a "medicine bag" (Louis P. Crier, Samson), all of which may be translations of the same thing. Further clarification of what was promised in the way of medical services is only provided by James Bull's (Louis Bull) statement that a doctor was promised "to distribute medicine and take care of the sick," or that doctors "should treat people whenever they were sick" (Joe Simon, Samson).

Many elders specify, as they do for educational services, that medical services were to be available on the reserve and some complain that this is one area in which treaty promises are being broken. James Bull says that a doctor was to remain on the reserve and that, "Today it's not so. The Indian has to go to the city to receive doctor's aid." Others, e.g., Fred Horse, say rather that a hospital on the reserve was what was promised.

Any elders who discuss the subject, state that treaty Indians were promised that they would not have to pay for doctors, hospitalization, medical services, however it is stated, and feel this is the other area in which promises were broken. Again, elders claim that the second treaty payment was smaller than the first because part of the money was being set aside for building a hospital (Henry Cardinal). James Johnson (Samson, 75) feels that Indians are on their way to "being compelled to pay for our hospitalization."

One final topic mentioned by several elders is their feeling that sickness and diseases were more or less brought in by the whites and that Indians used to be very healthy. The
way Henry Cardinal phrases it, "it seems that disease is just one more area in which the whites can make a profit off the Indians. The white makes money from our sickness."

Economic Development

Of fifty-two elders interviewed in the Treaty 6 area, twenty-three make statements of some sort related to economic development. Elders were considered to have mentioned this topic when they discussed anything related to earning a livelihood in other than traditional ways or any developments, such as road building, which are conducive to changes in this area. Elders discussed primarily the promises which were made and how these were carried out.

By far the most frequently mentioned promise is that the Indians were to receive agricultural implements. Tools mentioned include "metal tools" (John Buffalo, Ermineskin), axes, rakes, plows, hoes, tillers, shovels and scythes. Usually the elder does not mention how many of each of these tools were to be given out. Whether this is because people have forgotten the amounts or because how these tools were to be distributed was never made clear is not apparent. Many elders mention that implements were not given out "until later" (Paul Snakeskin, Thunderchild) or that people were only helped "after they settled on the reserve" (Alex Alexander, Thunderchild), implying that perhaps there were conditions placed on receiving tools such as settling down on a reserve. As for the duration of these promises, some complain that tools were only given out at the beginning (e.g., Henry Cardinal, Saddle Lake, 78) and one elder, Fred Horse (Frog Lake), says the people were to get these things "forever."

The next most frequently mentioned promise is that the Indians were to receive animals. "He had promised he would give the kind of animals the white man has" (Margrette Quinney, LeGoff). Animals enumerated include horses, cows, oxen, and sows. As was the case in the discussion of tools which were promised, the elders are either unclear on or do not mention any basis on which a distribution of animals was to be made, e.g., whether so many of one type of animal were allotted to a certain number of people. Fred Horse says, "There will be cattle given to every family" and Pat Paddy (Thunderchild, 86) specifies that "three cows were given to one family of four", but these are the only two interviews stating any basis for animal distribution.

As to whether the promises concerning animals were fulfilled, the elders often say that animals were only given at the beginning. This idea is usually expressed as, "They were given cattle also to make a living from which in time some had quite a few. But now there is nothing" (Edward Buffalo, Montana, 66). Two elders, Margrette Quinney and Mrs. Phillip Lightning (Pigeon Lake), complain that the animals never were given. A few elders mention that animals were only given to
people who had gone to school (e.g., Henry Cardinal).

It is interesting that the elders do not mention rations as any sort of treaty promise. The Treaty 8 elders mention rations frequently as something that would be provided to tide them over until the harvest was in. Possibly one elder, George Cattleman (Montana) is speaking of this when he says, "Even then, there was promises held back as food was to have been stored for our use but that too disappeared."

One treaty promise that seems to be of great concern to the Treaty 6 elders is the provision of expert personnel who were to teach them agriculture and be of general usefulness to the Indians. Personnel mentioned include an Indian agent, policemen, "administrators" (James Bull, Louis Bull), agricultural experts, and clerks. A common theme running through the interviews dealing with this subject is that all these people are supposed to be working for the Indians, something in the manner of servants. It is resented when they try "to run everything." (Henry Cardinal). Fred Horse says that the Indian agent and farm instructor were there to take care of and teach the Indians, not rule them. Many elders feel that because Indian agents and agricultural experts work for the Indians, they should remain in the reserve and that it is wrong when they move to town. James Bull brings up the point that the salaries of these workers, as well as of clerks and policemen, were to be paid by the government and that the Indians have become "poor paying for these things and workers that were guaranteed us."

Many of the specific grievances mentioned with regard to promises in the area of economic development have to do with this feeling that the Indian agent should not try to rule the people, but rather do their bidding, or else stem from feelings that certain agents were dishonest in their dealings with the people. Specific instances mentioned include the return of money left over from a grant, contrary to a band resolution (Jerry Strawberry, O'Chiese) and the setting up of a flour mill on the reserve (Fred Horse, Frog Lake). However, the number of complaints about the actions of specific agents or other personnel is not that great.

In marked contrast to the Treaty 7 elders' interviews, there are only two elders who discuss the treaty promises in terms conveying the idea that the Indians would always "be taken care of." Fred Horse says they were promised, "Once the treaty is signed, you never have any more trouble for your living. As I have said before, I have a long arm to reach you," and George Cattleman says they were told, "you will not be poor. You will be given means so that you will not want of food." It is interesting to note, however, that in neither of these statements is the impression given that the Indians will not have to do anything for themselves to keep from being "poor." This attitude may represent a feeling that, at least in the Treaty 6 area, people maintain at least some control over their own economic development. Elders complain that when
they apply for grants through the Department of Indian Affairs, the full amount requested is not received. Yet, when Chuck Frencheater (O'Chiese) complains about this, saying that they should get all the money requested, it is because, "This is the only way we could help ourselves."

**Treaty 6**

Treaty number six (6) which was signed in September of 1876. The Indian people did in fact negotiate for treaties with the Queen's representative at that time.

**Medicare**

The Indians apparently had some discussions in length regarding medicare. The Indian interpretation of a medicine chest as mentioned in Treaty six includes everything in the area of medicare, medical services. A medicine bundle for an Indian at that time was everything in terms of medicare. Reason for that is: whereas that time there was not as much diseases among the Indians and what diseases there was among them, they had their own medicine for it. So when the Queens' representative negotiated with the Indians (Medical Services), that meant full coverage to the understanding of an Indian. Whereas the agent would keep the medicine chest. So as the Indian would have easy access to medicine. Where any new disease would be treaty first hand.

Quote: from Edward Buffalo.

"The people were also told that they would be given police protection, free medical services and religious teachings. These services were to be given to the people free of charge."

by Eric Stamp
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