

Treaty No. 9 and the Question of “Unceded” Land South of the Albany River in Subarctic Ontario, Canada

Stephen R.J. Tsuji¹ and Leonard J.S. Tsuji²

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE S1. Representative quotes from First Nations leaders with respect to non-Indigenous perceptions of land use in northern Ontario.

Speaker	Comments
George Hunter, Chief Weenusk First Nation (2009:956)	“The far north is First Nations land...the land looks after us. We have an abundance of fish, wildlife, waterfowl, and stuff, and as a result, the land is our social welfare system, and we would like to keep it that way...A lot of people say it’s our last frontier. What the government instead should be doing is congratulating all of the First Nations and NAN territories for keeping the land in its natural state: the way it is. We have not contaminated and harmed our land.”
Jonathon Solomon, Chief Kashechewan First Nation (2009:954)	“We live in the north. The land up north is our home. It’s our lifeline, it’s our bloodline of who we are. The land up north is not an untouched land. Our people, my ancestors, travelled that land. All over the area of my land, you can see sacred burial grounds, where my people died, where they lost their loved ones during the winter months. So it’s not an untouched land; it’s not a land that has been discovered. We’ve been there for thousands and thousands of years. We were very nomadic people. We are still closely tied to the land. Like I said, that is our bloodline, our lifeline. Without land, we will [not] be Cree people of James Bay... Where there are footprints all over the place in my territory, that signifies that my people were out in the land.”
Frank Beardy, Special Envoy Nishnawbe Aski Nation, a Tribal Council of 49 First Nations in northern Ontario (2009:953)	“We are the north. It is our land, and we govern and protect by our inherent right given to us by the Creator. We have protected and governed the lands for thousands of years. The legacy of our care is that our use has been next to invisible. To you, the lands look untouched. They aren’t. They’ve just been touched by the Anishnawbe in accordance with Anishnawbe laws and customs. That’s why the lands are in the condition they are in. We will continue to protect and govern the lands for future generations. There is a story that was conveyed to me by a number of elders...a story that reflects on the care that we have given the land. They talked about the days when they used to move from area to area within their lands and camped, using spruce boughs for bedding. They said that as they were growing up, it was their task that was given to them by their grandmothers to gather up the spruce boughs after, when they were breaking camp, and make sure they were burned in one area, and that the land they had camped on for two or three weeks or two or three months would be taken back to its natural form. That was how they looked after the land. He said that now, today, Ontario is penalizing us because they’re saying that that land is untouched by us.”
David Babin, Chief Wahgoshig First Nation (2009:955)	“We protect our lands. They’ve been protected for thousands of years. European people have come here, and look what they’ve developed; they’ve developed a land of disaster...Then we have to do the cleanup...Our people are getting sick from all these industries that are coming around our territory...You’re [Government of Ontario] only thinking about what’s happening today. We’ve got to think about tomorrow. We’ve got to think about our kids, our children who are coming...the hydro dams and the damage they’ve done...You took us off our land.”

¹ Corresponding author: School of Environmental Studies, Queen’s University, Kingston, K7L 3N6 Ontario, Canada; 20srjt@queensu.ca

² Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough, 1265 Military Trail, Toronto, Ontario M1C 1A4, Canada

TABLE S2. Representative quotes from First Nations leaders with respect to their perspective in the context of Treaty No. 9 and the surrendering of their homelands.

Speaker	Comments
Stan Louttit, Grand Chief Mushkegowuk Council (undated; Slide 23, Grand Chief Mushkegowuk Council)	“The [Treaty No. 9] Commissioner’s Diaries record many Oral Promises that were made to the First Nations at Treaty [No. 9] time, which were not recorded in the official written document [Treaty No. 9]. The Diaries support the Elder’s understanding that they never gave up their land.”
Pauline M.R. Rickard, Councillor, Moose Cree First Nation (2010, cited in Long, 2010:379)	“It must be noted that since time immemorial our leaders never yielded or surrendered any lands occupied by the Moose Cree First Nation...our gift of sharing the vast resources within the Moose Cree Homeland.”
Norm Hardistry Jr., Chief Moose Cree First Nation (2009; cited in Long, 2010:231–232)	“We ask that the intent of the treaty be respected and honoured. We never surrendered our lands—how could we? We do not own it—we are the caretakers and stewards. We agreed to share peacefully, and we have upheld our side of the treaty.”
Keeter Corston, Chief Chapleau Cree First Nation (2009:955–956)	“These people [Chiefs of the Far North of Ontario] are here to protect their homelands that belong to them. It doesn’t belong to Ontario. The land was never surrendered.”
Theresa Hall, Chief Attawapiskat First Nation (2009:98)	“We still have our language, our culture and we are still able to go out on our land and to engage in our traditional aboriginal practices. We still have aboriginal title and this includes the land, the water and the minerals because we never signed on to Treaty 9.”

TABLE S3. Evolution of some James Bay Treaty-Treaty No. 9 (1905) in-text stipulations.

Date and source	Iterations of Treaty No. 9 in-text terms (excluding treaty boundaries)
<p>30 April 1904</p> <p>F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General, Indian Affairs letter to E. Davis, Commissioner of crown lands, Government of Ontario</p>	<p>“It is proposed to offer the Indians a maximum annuity of \$4.00 a head and a gratuity at the first payment of the same amount once and for all. It is further proposed to set apart reserves of sufficient area in localities chosen by the Indians with special regard for their needs, which reserves should be held in trust by this Department [Indian Affairs], free of any claims by the Province for timber upon, or base or precious metals in upon or under the soil. These Reserves should be surveyed and confirmed by the Ontario Government within one year after selection by the Indians, or at any time after the expiry of one year upon request of this Department. It is proposed to provide the ordinary educational facilities afforded by day schools to be established upon reserves. It is contended that as the entire area of the land will, by this treaty, remain with the Province free of all Indian claims, the financial responsibility, as well as the provision of reserves, should rest with the Province of Ontario...I beg to ask that the [treaty] question be reviewed by your Government without delay and a decision arrived at as soon as possible in order that the preliminary steps may be taken to provide for the negotiation [with the Indians]. It is desired to meet the Indians sometime during the approaching Autumn [1904]” (Pedley, 1904:1-2).</p>
<p>5 May 1905</p> <p>E. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, Government of Canada, letter (with revised draft Order-in-Council for Treaty No. 9) to Pedley</p>	<p>“The considerations to be offered, and, in the event of a treaty being signed, to be granted to the Indians may be as a maximum.</p> <p>1st – An annuity of four dollars per head to themselves and their descendants forever, and a gratuity at the first payment once for all of four dollars per head.</p> <p>2nd – The setting apart and location of reserves at points to be chosen by the Indians of an area not greater than one square mile or each family of five or in like proportion.</p> <p>3rd – The provision of day schools when it is thought necessary to establish them upon reserves.</p> <p>In view, however, of the provisions of clause six of the agreement of the 16th April, 1894, above quoted under which any further treaties to be made in respect of territory in Ontario require the concurrence of the Government of Ontario, the undersigned recommends that the authority to so negotiate and to conclude any such treaty be subject to the passage of an Order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council [i.e. a provincial Order-in-Council] expressing the concurrence of the Government of Ontario and its consent to the conclusion of a treaty upon the above terms” (Newcombe, 1905a:2-3).</p>
<p>8 May 1905</p> <p>Pedley letter (with draft Treaty No. 9, joint Order in Council) to J. Foy, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Government of Ontario</p>	<p>No change in wording from the revised draft Treaty No. 9 Order-in-Council prepared by E. Newcombe (Pedley, 1905a).</p>
<p>1 June 1905</p> <p>A.J. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, letter (with enclosure of revised draft Order-in-Council) to Pedley (Matheson, 1905a)</p>	<p>Change in item 2 by the Government of Ontario to the revised draft Treaty No. 9 Order-in-Council prepared by E. Newcombe (1905a).</p> <p>“2nd – The setting apart and location of reserves not greater than one square mile for each family of five, or in like proportion, at points to be chosen by the Commissioners negotiating the said Treaty, one of said Commissioners to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario in Council, and said selection to be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario in Council” (Government of Ontario, 1905a:2).</p>
<p>2 June 1905</p> <p>Pedley Memorandum (with the Government of Ontario’s Order-in-Council attached) to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Department of Indian Affairs (Pedley, 1905b)</p>	<p>The Government of Ontario’s Order-in-Council was a revision of the joint Order-in-Council sent 8 May 1905 by Pedley (1905a), and returned 1 June 1905 by Matheson (1905a).</p> <p>“The considerations to be offered, and, in the event of a treaty being signed, to be granted to the Indians may be as a maximum.</p> <p>1st – An annuity of four dollars per head to themselves and their descendants forever, and a gratuity at the first payment once for all of four dollars per head.</p> <p>2nd – The setting apart and location of reserves not greater than one square mile for each family of five, or in like proportion, at points to be chosen by the Commissioners negotiating the said Treaty, one of said Commissioners to be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario in Council, and said selection to be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario in Council</p> <p>3rd – The provision of day schools when it is thought necessary to establish them upon reserves.</p> <p>In view, however, of the provisions of clause six of the agreement of the 16th April, 1894, above quoted under which any further treaties to be made in respect of territory in Ontario require the concurrence of the Government of Ontario, the undersigned recommends that the authority to so negotiate and to conclude any such treaty be subject to the passage of an Order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council [i.e. a provincial Order-in-Council] expressing the concurrence of the Government of Ontario and its consent to the conclusion of a treaty upon the above terms” (Government of Ontario, 1905a:2).</p>

TABLE S3. Evolution of some James Bay Treaty-Treaty No. 9 (1905) in-text stipulations – *continued*:

Date and source	Iterations of Treaty No. 9 in-text terms (excluding treaty boundaries)
9 June 1905 Government of Canada, Order-in-Council #: 1905-1065 (LAC, 1905a)	The Government of Canada Order-in-Council (#1905-1065) approved terms of Treaty No. 9 that included Government of Ontario input to gain concurrence (see Government of Ontario (1905a) Order-in-Council dated 1 June 1905).
12 June 1905 Pedley letter to Matheson	Enclosed with the letter was a copy of a draft of the proposed Treaty No. 9, which included the terms specified in the Government of Canada Order-in-Council (#1905-1065; LAC, 1905a) that included Government of Ontario input to gain concurrence, for Government of Ontario final approval (Pedley, 1905c).
23 June 1905 Matheson letter to Pedley	<p>“I regret that there has been some delay in the matter of the Indian Treaty to be negotiated...the advice of counsel...strongly advised that in order to prevent future litigation an agreement should be made between the Dominion and the Province defining the liability of the Province in respect to the Treaty.</p> <p>I enclose herewith draft of amended Order-in-Council and draft of agreement between the Province and the Dominion” (Matheson, 1905b:1).</p> <p>“As to the draft treaty with the Indians, I do not see any objections to it, except that it [Treaty No. 9] might be well to refer to the agreement between the Province and the Dominion in it” (Matheson, 1905b:2).</p>
26 June 1905 S. Stewart, Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, letter to Undersecretary of State, Government of Canada	<p>“I beg to enclose herewith [a paper] copy of Treaty No. 9. Would you kindly cause this to be engrossed on parchment at as early a date as possible? You will observe that there are certain omissions [such as, the actual date the Agreement between the Government of Ontario and the Government of Canada was signed, because the Agreement had not yet been signed] for which blanks should be left to be afterwards filled in” (Stewart, 1905:1).</p>

TABLE S4. Chronology of “an agreement dated the third day of July between the Dominion of Canada and Province of Ontario.”

Date and source	Timeline of the “third day of July” Agreement between the Dominion of Canada and Province of Ontario (excluding discussion of Treaty No. 9 boundaries).
<p>23 June 1905</p> <p>A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, Canadian Pacific Railway Company’s Telegraph to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General, Indian Affairs</p>	<p>“Am mailing you tonight an agreement in connection with treaty...counsel advises to get executed” (Matheson, 1905c:1).</p>
<p>23 June 1905</p> <p>Matheson letter to Pedley</p>	<p>“I regret that there has been some delay in the matter of the Indian Treaty to be negotiated...the advice of counsel...strongly advised that in order to prevent future litigation an agreement should be made between the Dominion and the Province defining the liability of the Province in respect to the Treaty.</p> <p>I enclose herewith draft of amended Order-in-Council [Government of Canada #1905-1065] and draft of agreement between the Province and the Dominion” (Matheson, 1905b:1).</p>
<p>23 June 1905</p> <p>Government of Ontario (1905b)</p>	<p>“As to the draft treaty with the Indians, I do not see any objections to it, except that it [Treaty No. 9] might be well to refer to the agreement between the Province and the Dominion in it” (Matheson, 1905b:2).</p> <p>The enclosure described in the 23 June 1905 letter (Matheson, 1905b): Draft Agreement between F. Oliver (Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Government of Canada) and F. Cochrane (Minister of Lands and Mines, Province of Ontario).</p> <p>1905 Draft Agreement</p> <p>“AND WHEREAS by the agreement made the 16th day of April 1894, entered into between the Government of the Dominion of Canada...and the Government of the Province of Ontario...by the sixth clause of the said agreement ‘that any future treaties with Indians in respect of territory in Ontario to which they have not before the passing of said statutes surrendered their claim aforesaid shall be deemed to require the concurrence of the Government of Ontario’” (Government of Ontario, 1905b: 2).</p> <p>“IT IS THEREFORE AGREED by and between the Governments of Canada and of Ontario as aforesaid, as follows:</p> <p>That subject to the provisions contained in the hereinbefore recited agreement of 16th April, 1894, and also the agreement made on 7th July, 1902, by Counsel on behalf of the Governments of the Dominion and Ontario, intervening parties, upon the appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the suit of The Ontario Mining Company v. Seybold et al. (Ont. S.P., 1904, No. 93), a copy whereof is hereto attached; and the surrender of the Indian title within Ontario to the entire territory herein defined and described, duly obtained.</p> <p>The Government of the Province of Ontario hereby gives consent and upon the following conditions concurs in the terms proposed to be entered into, made and agreed by the said Treaty, in so far, that the said Government of Ontario, on and after the payment to the Indians of the above mentioned present of eight dollars, and thereafter the payment annually of four dollars to each Indian, forever, as above specified, promises and agrees to pay the said sums to the Government of Canada, upon request when and as the same are paid to the Indians, upon proof, when required, of such payment—such payments to be free from any expenses at the cost of Ontario attendant upon distribution of the said sums of money.</p> <p>And the government of Ontario, subject to the conditions, aforesaid, further concurs in the setting apart and location of reserves within any part of the said territory, as surrendered or intended to be surrendered, in area not greater than one square mile for each family of five, or in like proportion, at points to be chosen by the commissioners negotiating the said treaty, one of the said commissioners to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario in Council, and the selection of the said reserves to be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council...</p> <p>And the government of Ontario stipulates, no part of the expense of survey and location of the said Reserves to be at any time at the cost of the Government of Ontario;</p> <p>And further, that no site suitable for the development of water-power exceeding 500 horse-power shall be included within the boudaries [sic] of any reserve.</p> <p>It is also agreed between the parties hereto that no part of the cost of negotiating the said Treaty is to be borne by the Province of Ontario” (Government of Ontario, 1905b:3-4).</p>

TABLE S4. Chronology of “an agreement dated the third day of July between the Dominion of Canada and Province of Ontario” – *continued*:

Date and source	Timeline of the “third day of July” Agreement between the Dominion of Canada and Province of Ontario (excluding discussion of Treaty No. 9 boundaries).
24 June 1905 Pedley letter to E. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, Government of Canada	<p>“The Province of Ontario now proposes to enter into an agreement with the Dominion Government in respect of Treaty No. 9. The effect of the agreement as expressed by Mr. Matheson in his letter is satisfactory to the Department [of Indian Affairs], but I think it wise to submit to you the document [enclosed] which shall bind the parties in order that you may advise me whether it is effective” (Pedley, 1905d:1).</p> <p>SPACE FOR THE DATE LEFT BLANK IN THE AGREEMENT</p>
26 June 1905 Newcombe letter to Pedley	<p>“and now return the draft agreement submitted by the Ontario Government with regard to the proposed new treaty...I have suggested in pencil certain verbal changes in the draft [enclosed], and I think the Dominion Government, from a legal point of view, may properly enter into an agreement in the form of the draft as so changed” (Newcombe, 1905b:1).</p> <p>SPACE FOR THE DATE LEFT BLANK IN THE AGREEMENT</p>
26 June 1905 F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General, Indian Affairs, Memorandum RE Treaty No. 9	<p>“The amended Order-in-Council [terms James Bay Treaty] has already been passed by the Dominion Government. As for the agreement [with the Government of Ontario] I am pleased to report it contains no provisions that should not in my opinion meet with the approval of the Dominion Government. By it the Province of Ontario assumes without question a liability for the payment of gratuity of \$8.00 per capita at the first payment and all future annuities at the rate of \$4.00 per capita and agrees to setting apart of reserves...The only restricting stipulation being that ‘no site suitable for the development of water power exceeding 500 horse power shall be included within the boundaries of any reserve’”(Pedley, 1905e:1).</p> <p>“I beg to recommend that they [the changes] be accepted and the agreement entered into” (Pedley, 1905e:2).</p>
27 June 1905 F. Oliver, Minister of the Interior, and Superintendent General, Indian Affairs, submission to the Governor General in Council, Government of Canada	<p>The agreement specifies “the maximum terms and condition” of the governments (Oliver, 1905:2).</p> <p>“In view, however, of the provisions of clause six of the Agreement of the 16th April, 1894, above quoted under which any further treaties to be made in respect of territory in Ontario require the concurrence of the Government of Ontario, the undersigned recommends that the authority to so negotiate and to conclude any such treaty be subject to the passage of an Order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council expressing the concurrence of the Government of Ontario and its consent to the conclusion of a treaty upon the above terms” (Oliver, 1905:3).</p>
29 June 1905 D.C. Scott, Accountant, Indian Affairs, Memorandum to Pedley	<p>“When the Order-in-Council based on our Memo. of the 27th June passes, it will be necessary to have the Agreement itself engrossed by the Secretary of State [Government of Canada] and then signed. This will be afterwards attached to the treaty and form part of the original document” (Scott, 1905:1).</p>
3 July 1905 Order-in-Council #1905-1262 (LAC, 1905b) Clerk of the Privy Council (typed copy) Wilfred Laurier (written copy)	<p>Government of Canada Order-in-Council (#1905-1262) approval related to June 27 memorandum/submission about the Agreement between Governments of Canada and Ontario related to concurrence.</p> <p>“The Minister recommends...the concurrence of the Government of Ontario,—that the authority to so negotiate and to conclude any such treaty be subject to the passage of an Order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council expressing the concurrence of the Government of Ontario and its consent to the conclusion of a treaty upon the above terms. The Committee submit the same for approval” (LAC, 1905b:3).</p> <p>AGREEMENT DATE LEFT BLANK</p>
14 July 1905 Pedley letter to Matheson	<p>Also, the previous Agreement between the Government of Ontario and the Government of Canada dated July 7, 1902, included with the Order-in-Council material, as specified in the draft 1905 Agreement.</p> <p>“inform you that an [Order-in-Council #1905-1262]...has been passed, dated the 3rd instant, authorizing negotiations for the cession of territory in what is known as Treaty No. 9, on the terms and conditions set forth in the draft agreement, which will be engrossed in due time and submitted for signature” (Pedley, 1905f:1).</p>
16 October 1905 Pedley letter to F. Cochrane, Minister of Mines and Works [should be Minister of Land and Mines], Government of Ontario	<p>“I beg to send you under separate registered cover the agreement in duplicate between the Government of the Dominion of Canada...Frank Oliver...and yourself as Minister of Mines and Works [should be Minister of Land and Mines] for the Province of Ontario. This agreement forms a part of Treaty No. 9 which, when properly executed, will be attached to the Treaty one copy of which will be transmitted in due course to your Government” (Pedley, 1905g:1).</p>

TABLE S4. Chronology of “an agreement dated the third day of July between the Dominion of Canada and Province of Ontario” – *continued*:

Date and source	Timeline of the “third day of July” Agreement between the Dominion of Canada and Province of Ontario (excluding discussion of Treaty No. 9 boundaries).
17 November 1905	“I beg to enclose herewith the agreement in duplicate...and seal attached.
Matheson letter to Pedley	Would you kindly have your departmental or other seal affixed to Hon. Mr. Oliver’s signature, and the dates filled in, and return one copy with the Treaty attached. I think it would be proper in this case to make the date of the agreement some day previous to the date in the Treaty” (Matheson, 1905d:1).
25 November 1905	“If this agreement has been executed, as requested, I shall be glad if you will kindly return both copies. This Department [of Indian Affairs] will be the custodian of the agreement until the Treaty [No. 9] is completed when one copy will be sent you” (Pedley, 1905h:1).
Pedley letter to Cochrane	
29 November 1905	“I have you letter of November 27th [actually 25th] in reference to the Agreement...and would say that almost two weeks ago this Agreement was executed in duplicate and handed to Honourable Colonel Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, to forward to your Department [Indian Affairs] as he had been dealing with the matter before I took charge of this Department. He understood that the Agreement had been duly forwarded to you on the 17th instant, but found that through an oversight this was not done. You have, however, no doubt received both copies of the Agreement by this time” (Cochrane, 1905:1).
Cochrane letter to Pedley	
1 December 1905	“The copy of the agreement...was duly received...The date has been filled in as of the 3rd of July [1905] and the official seal has been affixed to Hon. Mr. Oliver’s signature” (Pedley, 1905i:1).
Pedley letter to Matheson	

REFERENCES

- Babin, D. 2009. G35 Standing Committee on General Government, Hearings, Bill 173 (Mining Amendment Act, 2009). <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/committees/general-government/parliament-39/transcripts/committee-transcript-2009-aug-12>
- Beardy, F. 2009. G35 Standing Committee on General Government, Hearings, Bill 173 (Mining Amendment Act, 2009). <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/committees/general-government/parliament-39/transcripts/committee-transcript-2009-aug-12>
- Cochrane, F. 1905. F. Cochrane, Minister of Mines and Works, Government of Ontario, letter dated November 29, 1905, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty—Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Corston, K. 2009. G35 Standing Committee on General Government, Hearings, Bill 173 (Mining Amendment Act, 2009). <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/committees/general-government/parliament-39/transcripts/committee-transcript-2009-aug-12>
- Government of Ontario. 1905a. Draft Order-in-Council for Treaty No. 9 enclosed with letter dated June 1, 1905, from A Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty—Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905b. Draft Agreement was enclosed with the A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, letter dated June 23, 1905, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Hall, T. 2009. G36 Standing Committee on General Government, Hearings, Bill 173 (Mining Amendment Act, 2009). https://www.ola.org/sites/default/files/node-files/hansard/document/pdf/2009/2009-08/committee-transcript-1-EN-13-AUG-2009_G036.pdf
- Hardistry, N. 2009. Cited in Long, J.S., 2010. Treaty No. 9: Making the agreement to share the land in far northern Ontario in 1905. Montreal, Quebec: McGill–Queen’s University Press.
- Hunter, G. 2009. G35 Standing Committee on General Government, Hearings, Bill 173 (Mining Amendment Act, 2009). <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/committees/general-government/parliament-39/transcripts/committee-transcript-2009-aug-13>
- LAC (Library and Archives Canada). 1905a. Order-in-Council #1905–1065. Treaty negotiated with Indian tribes to obtain extinction of titles to lands in northern part of Province of Ontario – S.G.I.A. [Superintendent General of Indian Affairs], 1905/06/05. Ottawa: LAC. <https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/politics-government/orders-council/Pages/item.aspx?IdNumber=124770>
- . 1905b. Order-in-Council #1905–1262. Indian lands, northern part of Ontario, extinction of Indian titles to and negotiations with Indians of those territories re. [regarding] – S.G.I.A. [Superintendent General of Indian Affairs], 1905/06/27. Ottawa: LAC. <http://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/discover/politics-government/orders-council/Pages/item.aspx?IdNumber=124967>
- Louitit, S. nd. The Real Agreement as Orally Agreed to: The James Bay Treaty No. 9. PowerPoint Presentation at the Mushkegowuk Senior Management and First Nations Senior Management Meeting. Mushkegowuk Territory, Ontario: Mushkegowuk Territory. https://www.oise.utoronto.ca/deepeningknowledge/UserFiles/File/jamesbaytreaty9_realoralagreement.pdf
- Matheson, A. 1905a. A Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, letter dated June 1, 1905, and enclosure (draft Order-in-Council) to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905b. A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, CPR Co Telegraph dated June 23, 1905, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905c. A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, CPR Co Telegraph dated June 23, 1905, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905d. A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario, letter dated November 17, 1905, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Newcombe, E. 1905a. E. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, Government of Canada, letter dated May 5, 1905, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).

- . 1905b. E. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, Government of Canada, letter dated June 26, 1905, with the revised draft Agreement enclosed, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Oliver, F. 1905. F. Oliver, Minister of the Interior, and Superintendent General Indian Affairs, submission of the Agreement on June 27, 1905, to the Governor General in Council, Government of Canada. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Pedley, F. 1904. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, letter dated April 30, 1904, to E. Davis, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Government of Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905a. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, letter dated May 8, 1905, and enclosure to J. Foy, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Government of Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905b. F. Pedley Memorandum dated June 2, 1905, to Sir Wilfred Laurier, Department of Indian Affairs, Ottawa [Ontario, Canada]. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905c. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, CPR Co Telegraph dated June 15, 1905, to A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905d. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs letter dated June 24, 1905, to E. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, Government of Canada. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905e. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, Memorandum dated June 26, 1905, RE Treaty No. 9. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905f. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, letter dated July 14, 1905, to A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905g. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, letter dated October 16, 1905, to F. Cochrane, Minister of Mines and Works, Government of Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905h. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, letter dated November 25, 1905, to F. Cochrane, Minister of Mines and Works, Government of Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- . 1905i. F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, letter dated December 1, 1905, to A. Matheson, Provincial Treasurer, Government of Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Rickard, P.M.R. 2010. Cited in Long, J.S., 2010. Treaty No. 9: Making the agreement to share the land in far northern Ontario in 1905. Montreal, Quebec: McGill–Queen’s University Press.
- Scott, D.C. 1905. D. Scott, Accountant, Indian Affairs, Memorandum dated March 18, 1905, to F. Pedley, Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Solomon, J. 2009. G35 Standing Committee on the General Government, Hearings, Bill 173 (Mining Amendment Act, 2009). <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/committees/general-government/parliament-39/transcripts/committee-transcript-2009-aug-12>
- Stewart, S. 1905. S Stewart, Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, letter dated June 26, 1905, to Undersecretary of State, Government of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. Treaty No. 9 The James Bay Treaty – Reports, Correspondence, Drafts, Memorandums, Order in Council (MIKAN No. 2082958 or R216–244–6–E; Volume 3033; File 235,225 Part 1).
- Treaty No. 9. 1905. James Bay Treaty No. 9. Government of Canada’s vellum copy (MIKAN No. 3987469 or R216–79–6–E; Volume 1851/IT436; GAD Reference number IT 436). http://ao.minisisinc.com/scripts/mwimain.dll/144/ARCH_DESCRIPTIVE/DESCRIPTION_DET_REP/SISN%2022970?SESSIONSEARCH