

## CHAPTER III

### THE NEW YORK INDIAN RECORDS, WRAXALL'S ABRIDGMENT, AND ITS AUTHOR

THE abridgment here printed is based upon the records of conferences and transactions between the Indians and the magistrates of the city and county of Albany, who had control of such matters for New Netherland and afterwards for New York. Under the early Dutch régime, when the scope of these dealings seldom extended beyond matters of local importance, titles to neighboring lands and regulation of trade with near-by tribes, such minutes as were kept must have been rather informal, and not very carefully distinguished from the records of other business. But the trade in beaver was peculiar. The eagerness of the traders, as we have seen, soon exterminated the beavers in the neighborhood, and at a remarkably early date the beaver country was pushed into the interior far beyond the regular haunts even of the Five Nations. This, together with the two facts of Albany's unrivalled location near the mouth of the Mohawk, and of the supremacy of its Indian neighbors over the Indians of the interior for a thousand miles, very soon gave to the records of these Dutch traders an international and a continental importance. Before the English conquest, however, there is little indication that these important records were made on any settled plan or preserved with much care. So far as can be ascertained this began with the appointment of Robert Livingston in 1675 as Town Clerk of Albany, and also as Secretary for Indian Affairs,<sup>1</sup> but there is no definite mention of the records before the

<sup>1</sup> "The governour's residing at New-York, rendered it necessary that some person should be commissioned, at Albany, to receive intelligence from the Indians, and treat with them upon emergencies. This gave rise to the office of commissioners of Indian affairs, who, in general, transact all such matters as might be done by the gouverneur. They receive no salaries, but considerable sums are deposited in their hands for occasional presents. There are regular minutes of their

year 1677.<sup>1</sup> If records of the years before this had been preserved, apparently they were destroyed or lost before 1727, when Colden's *History of the Five Nations* was published, for his account of the relations between the Albany commissioners and the Indians, based on these records, practically opens with that year, and Wraxall's *Abridgment*, written in 1754, does the same. From 1678, however, the records must have been fairly complete. For the first few years they were in Dutch, in part at least, but later in English. They were entered upon loose leaves, a few of which had probably been lost before 1751, which accounts for occasional gaps. In 1751 they were, however, bound together in four folio volumes.<sup>2</sup> When Colonel Johnson became Indian superintendent in 1755, the records were transferred to him to be transactions from the year 1675. . . . Here all our Indian treaties are entered. The books are kept by a secretary, commissioned in England, whose appointment is an annual salary of one hundred pounds proclamation out of the quitrents. The commandant at Oswego is generally a commissioner. The office would probably have been more advantageous than it has been, if the commissioners were not traders themselves, than which nothing is more ignoble in the judgment of the Indians." Smith, *History of New York* (1814), p. 242, note.

"It is objected that there never was any office of Agent or Secretary to the Indians, and therefore no salary was allowed, but that the work was done by the Town Clerk *ex officio*. I answer that I did officiate as Secretary because I was Town Clerk, but the drawing and translating of the Indian propositions from Dutch into English was never done by any town clerk before. . . . Every Indian who comes in with intelligence has his news translated into Dutch, which is translated, transcribed and entered by me. This happens forty or fifty times a year."

Robert Livingston to the Lords of Trade and Plantations. September, 1696. *Calendar of State Papers, America and West Indies, 1696-97*, no. 236.

<sup>1</sup> N. Y. MSS., xxviii, p. 27, a mention of "an Extract out of the Records at Albany signed by Rob<sup>t</sup> Livingston Secr."

<sup>2</sup> William Smith, the historian of New York, says this was done by James Alexander, "who borrowed them for his perusal" (*History of New York*, ed. of 1814, p. 242, note), and this statement is accepted by Dr. Shea, the editor of Colden's *History of the Five Nations* (New York, 1866, p. 124). The statement of Sir William Johnson can hardly be reconciled with it, however. In 1768 he wrote to Sir Henry Moore: "I must observe that their [the Indian commissioners'] Minutes were in Genl kept on Loose Sheets of paper, not Entered fairly in Books, that many of those Entrys were so illegible & the orthography etc. so bad that some of them are at present unintelligible, & altho I collected all that I could & had them bound into volumes I have never been able to find the whole, so that there are Chasms of above a Year in some places." *Johnson MSS.*, xvi, p. 130. Governor Clinton's statement (*post*, p. xciii) would seem to support Smith's statement.

preserved and continued. On the death of Sir William in 1774, the records passed to his son-in-law, Colonel Guy Johnson, Sir William's successor as Indian superintendent, who carried them to Canada during the War of Independence. There in 1782 he transferred them to his successor, Sir John Johnson, son of Sir William, who still had them, apparently, in 1788.<sup>2</sup>

These records remained in the custody of the Indian agency. The last two of these four folio volumes are now preserved among the Dominion archives at Ottawa. The first of the remaining volumes contains the minutes of the Albany commissioners from January 7, 1722-23 to September 4, 1732. The second begins with May 28, 1732 and ends July 27, 1748, with a portion at the end covering the period from June 24, 1737 to July 2 of the same year.

These are unquestionably the original registers kept by the Albany Indian commissioners, and are still bound in the same sheep-skin bindings mentioned in the eighteenth century notices of them, retaining even the thick paper wrappers which contained the several parts before they were bound up. The first two volumes, covering the period from 1677 to 1723, cannot at the present time be traced, but as they certainly survived far into the

<sup>1</sup> He had had them before, in 1749, when Governor Clinton had put him in charge of Indian relations, as appears from an order of the governor to the Albany commissioners for their delivery. *N. Y. MSS.*, lxxvi, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> These facts appear in a transcript of proceedings in the English Court of Exchequer of June 7, 1788, formerly preserved among the *Johnson MSS.*, xxvi, p. 123.

Sir John Johnson's counsel in support of his motion for the allowance of Sir John's accounts of the expenditure of public money recited the loss of Sir William Johnson's papers and accounts during the war and then gave the following account of the Indian Records: "That shortly after the decease of the s<sup>d</sup>. Sr. W<sup>m</sup>. Johnson Gen<sup>l</sup> Gage the then Comm<sup>r</sup> in Chief directed Col<sup>l</sup>: Guy Johnson to take the Management of Indian Affairs and to Act as Superintendant thereof instead of the s<sup>d</sup>. Sir Will<sup>m</sup>. Johnson And that the s<sup>d</sup>. Col<sup>l</sup>: Guy Johnson took upon himself the s<sup>d</sup>. Office of the Superintend<sup>t</sup> accordingly and in Consequence th<sup>t</sup> of the s<sup>d</sup>. Col<sup>l</sup>: Guy Johnson with the permission of the s<sup>d</sup>. Sir John Johnson took from the Office of Indian Affairs at Johnson Hall afs<sup>d</sup>: the Book called the Book of Indian Records Containing Copies of Letters Treaties and Minutes of other Transactions with the Indians which Books of Indian Records were delivered to the s<sup>d</sup>. Sir John Johnson in Canada in the Year 1782 by the s<sup>d</sup>. Col<sup>l</sup>: Guy Johnson on the s<sup>d</sup>. Sir John Johnson being Appointed Superintend<sup>t</sup> Gen<sup>l</sup>: & Inspector Gen<sup>l</sup>: of Indian Aff<sup>rs</sup>.— in North America but such Books do not Contain any Acct<sup>s</sup> of the Rec<sup>ts</sup>: or paym<sup>ts</sup>: of Money."

nineteenth century, it is possible that they merely became separated from the other two during the many transfers of official papers prior to the final lodgment of such documents at Ottawa, and there is a probability that they may some day be found.

Before they were lost, however, some clerk or custodian made a manuscript index of their contents, part of which is preserved at Ottawa. It is entitled "Schedule of Propositions of the Indians and answers from Government," and consists of parallel columns containing (1) the date, (2) the name of the tribe, (3) the subject of the propositions, (4) the page of the original records, and (5) the answer of the Government. Frequently, also, the names of the government officials or other contracting parties are added. The index is apparently the work of a not very careful nineteenth century copyist, and in the beginning amounts to little more than a mere catalogue of conferences.

The first entry lists a transaction of December 20, 1677 with the Oneidas relative to the delivery of a young Mahikander Indian. The second, of March 20, 1677-78, also with the Oneidas, relates to a fire at Schenectady and the "running of the North Indians." The third, dated March 21, 1677-78, briefly notes a renewal of the covenant at a conference with the Senecas. This is Wraxall's first entry and he gives a much fuller and more complete account. A comparison of Wraxall's *Abridgment* with the *Index* for the remaining years of the seventeenth century seems to indicate that Wraxall, though purposely leaving out purely local or unimportant matters, has omitted practically nothing of significance which the *Index* includes, while his accounts of the transactions he chooses to give are much more detailed than those in the *Index*.

For the year 1678 the *Index* has seven items, of which Wraxall gives all the important ones. For 1679 there are twenty-two separate items noted, many of them, however, including nothing but the date and the parties. Here Wraxall omits nothing important given in the *Index*. From this point there is a break in the records until 1684, after which they become fairly continuous. For 1684 the *Index* gives thirty-eight entries, but

twenty-five of these have, instead of the subject of the conference, merely the note "Indian. no translation." Of these twenty-five items in the "Indian" language, one, the important conference of the Indians with Governor Dongan and Lord Howard of Effingham, Governor of Virginia, is given by Wraxall at considerable length with the note appended — "Translated from this Vol. of the Records from the Low Dutch Language by Peter Wraxall"! <sup>1</sup>

For the interval from 1684 to 1691, on which Wraxall is silent, many items are noted in the *Index*, and the original records themselves covered some 400 pages; but the help given by the *Index* is almost *nil*. There seems to have been one public conference on August 5, 1685 recorded in English. Most of the other transactions when given are unimportant, and for all except a few the *Index* merely notes "Indian. no translation."

Beginning with the year 1692 most of the entries in the original records were in English instead of Dutch, and the indexer's note, "Indian. no translation" becomes rarer. It occurs occasionally, however, in 1695, 1696, and as late as 1699. Up to and including the year 1699 the entries in the *Index* are very brief, though they are gradually becoming longer. For the same period Wraxall's notes are fewer but much more complete. It is impossible to say whether he has included everything of importance or not. The period from September, 1695 to July 20, 1698 which he omits entirely, contains several transactions, apparently all of secondary importance. The *Index* indicates that the original records themselves were silent from May, 1696 to January, 1699 (old style), except for two conferences in 1698 which Wraxall gives at much greater length than the *Index*. Thus far both Wraxall and the *Index* are very incomplete, the latter giving the dates of many conferences but often nothing more, while Wraxall gives satisfactory accounts of several important meetings, but passes over considerable periods without comment. With the year 1701 the *Index* becomes much fuller for some of the more important conferences, often giving considerable parts of the speeches *verbatim* from the original records, as a comparison with the

<sup>1</sup> *Post*, p. 11.

*Abridgment* shows, and in many cases much more fully than Wraxall.

The original records, Wraxall tells us,<sup>1</sup> contained nothing from July 21, 1701 to December 13, 1704. This is borne out by the *Index*, save for one entry for January 18, 1702. From the end of 1704 to the close of volume one of the original records the *Index* has detailed accounts of important conferences given at greater length than those in the *Abridgment*, from which a fair estimate of Wraxall's accuracy, impartiality, and judgment as an abridger may be made. A comparison of the two seems to give no evidence of his suppressing or distorting anything, and in general his summary appears to give a just and approximately correct idea of the Indian transactions of the period. Volume one of the original registers extended to December, 1706, and contained about 815 pages.

For the years 1701-1711 the *Index* is still available and of especial value, giving very full accounts of the principal conferences which often amount to transcripts of the original records, and seem to agree on all important points with Wraxall's briefer summary. But with 1711 the existing *Index* ends, and for the remainder of the contents of volume two of the registers, down to 1723, Wraxall's account is at present our only available source of information.

From 1723 to 1748 we have the original minutes of the Albany commissioners. These two volumes are of very great value, not merely on matters directly relating to New York and her Indians, but also in regard to the neighboring New England colonies, the Indian attacks upon them from Canada, the attitude of the New York commissioners and Government toward these questions, and the frequent irritation aroused in New England, by this attitude. The small use to which these sources have hitherto been put by historians is out of all proportion to their importance. The existence of these volumes makes it possible to test in the most thorough manner the value of this part of Wraxall's work. It is obviously out of the question, however, to attempt to set forth in detail the results of such an examination. A summary

<sup>1</sup> *Post*, p. 42.

and general estimate of results is all that is possible here. It may, therefore, be said in general that the few minor misstatements that might be pointed out in the *Abridgment*, and the occasional omission of matters that one might reasonably expect to find should not weigh against the general accuracy, fairness, and judgment with which the *Abridgment* was evidently prepared. This, of course, applies only to Wraxall's text. His notes are often extremely biassed, but they can easily be distinguished from the text, and are not the less interesting or instructive on account of their evident partiality. Comparison with the originals shows that the *Abridgment* gives in general a very just and comprehensive idea of the trend of Indian affairs for half a century and more, as well as setting forth many of their important details, and that it does in the main faithfully carry out Wraxall's avowed aim, to "exhibit a View of the Transactions of this Colony with the Indians depending thereon, as explicitly as the Nature of an Abridgment & the state of the Records would permit." <sup>1</sup>

The minutes subsequent to 1751, when the records were bound, have not survived as a collection. The *Johnson MSS.* contained transcripts from them, and many extracts were sent to England and are still available. There was also formerly preserved at Albany among the New York MSS., an important volume of *Records of the Indian Agency* covering the period from April 14, 1757, to February 20, 1759, containing important minutes of Indian conferences, letters, orders, instructions, etc., partly in Wraxall's hand. Many of these minutes of the conferences have been reprinted in the *New York Colonial Documents*, but not all—particularly some conferences in April and June, 1757 — and few or none of the letters and other documents. The partial loss of the Indian Registers is rendered somewhat less serious by the fact that transcripts of the records of conferences taken from them were sent to England from time to time, and have thus been preserved. The reports of Indian transactions outside the formal conferences, but often of great importance, were sent with far less regularity, and it is the absence of these

<sup>1</sup> *Post*, p. 4.

in any other form that makes Wraxall's abridgment of the lost registers more important.

These minutes of Indian affairs were always considered of great importance in New York. There can be no doubt that governors Bellomont, Hunter, Burnet, Clinton and others based their Indian policy upon the information they contained. Among these men, Governor Burnet took the deepest interest, and initiated the most important changes in the relation of the province with the Indians.<sup>1</sup> The source of his information is clearly indicated by Cadwallader Colden: "Mr. Burnet, who took more Pains to be informed of the Interest of the People he was set over, and of making them useful to their Mother Country, than Plantation Governors usually do, took the Trouble of perusing all the Registers of the Indian Affairs on this occasion. He from thence conceived of what Consequence the Fur Trade with the Western Indians was of to Great-Britain; that as the English had the Fur Trade to Hudson's Bay given up to them, by the Treaty of Utrecht, so, by the Advantages which the Province of New-York has in its Situation, they might be able to draw the whole Fur Trade in the other Parts of America to themselves, and thereby the English engross that Trade, and the Manufactories depending on it."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Of all our governours none had such extensive and just views of our Indian affairs, and the dangerous neighbourhood of the French, as governour Burnet, in which Mr. Livingston was his principal assistant" Smith, *History of New York* (1814), p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to Part II of the *History of the Five Nations* (1902), i, pp. 103-104. On August 30, 1751, Governor Clinton wrote to the Lords of Trade — "when we went up to Albany to meet them, [the Indians] I sent an express for the Registers, and on perusing a part thereof the Extracts now transmitted to Your Lord<sup>pp</sup>, were found, which are some proofs of the infractions of the French on the Treaty of Utrecht, & of their incroachments on the Territories belonging to the Crown of Great Brittain; and I doubt not I shall be able soon to transmit to your Lord<sup>pp</sup> many more proofs to the same purpose, and to prove the whole remarks, after a thorough perusal of the Indian Registers, which till last month were only in loose Quiers of paper, but now they are strongly bound up into four thick Volumes in Folio, and they are now perusing with care, to get what intelligence possible for your Lord<sup>pp</sup> that may be, concerning the Indian Affairs, pursuant to your Lord<sup>pp</sup> orders" *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 731.

In 1768 Governor Sir Henry Moore wrote to Sir William Johnson: "While I was at your House I ask'd for the Indian Records, but was told that they were



The importance of these registers of Indian affairs was by no means confined to the Province of New York. Even a hurried examination of Wraxall's *Abridgment* would show how large a number of conferences are chronicled there in which representatives from the other English colonies took part, and how many transactions were recorded affecting the imperial policy of the English government, particularly in its relations with the Indians of the interior, English and French, and with New France itself. This was due to the unique power and importance of the Iroquois and to the policy of the New York government in refusing to allow other provinces to deal with them, except through the medium of the Indian commissioners at Albany.<sup>1</sup> In the important inter-colonial conference held there in 1754, the importance of the Indian records is apparent. Before the commissioners could proceed to their principal business, extracts from the records were read, and the Secretary for Indian Affairs was instructed "to attend them with the Records of that Office,"<sup>2</sup> and during the

lock'd up, which I thought a little extraordinary as there were no other motives for this last excursion of mine but to transact Business with the Indians: What I desir'd to see was the Result of a Meeting which was held upon this very dispute [the title to certain lands on the Mohawk] some years ago, and beg the favor of you to let me have an Attested Copy of that Transaction. The meeting was held at Albany at the time Mr. Livingston was Secretary for Indian Affairs, whose Son (Alderman Livingston of this City) then acted as his Deputy." *Johnson MSS.*, xvi, p. 109.

<sup>1</sup> In 1721 the Council of New York wrote to the government of Massachusetts: "It is the opinion of this Board that this Government cannot consent that Commissioners from any Neighbouring Colony Should meet or Treat with the five Indian Nations, who are a branch of this Province or give presents to them in the name of any particular government." *N. Y. Council MSS.*, xiii, pp. 175 *et seq.*

In the next year the New York Council reported to the governor as follows on a request that the Five Nations should treat in New England with the Massachusetts government " . . . that it has been the constant practice for the Governours of the Neighbouring Colonys or commissioners from them to Treat with the five Nations at some place within this Government which place has usually been the City of Albany." They declare, therefore, "We are of opinion that your Excellency may Consent to a Treaty to be held by the said Government and the five Nations in presence of such Commissioners as your Excellency Shall please to appoint on the part of this Province, and that said Treaty be held at Albany upon Such proposals as shall be made by the Said Governour and approved of by your Excellency." *N. Y. MSS.*, lxv, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 854.

proceedings important differences of opinion were settled by reference to the registers.<sup>1</sup> Sir William Johnson, when he became sole Indian superintendent for all the northern colonies, based his Indian policy on a study of these records,<sup>2</sup> and in the dealings with the Indians themselves he and his predecessors lost no opportunity of impressing upon them the fact that these dealings were entered in the registers as a lasting record of their engagements, a consideration of no little weight with the Indians.<sup>3</sup>

Wraxall's *Abridgment of the Indian Records* covers practically all the materials bound up in the four folios above referred to, beginning at 1678 and ending in 1751. It was written in 1754, and sent over at once to Lord Halifax. It is possible that Wraxall's father, John Wraxall, was referring to the *Abridgment* when he wrote to Sir William Johnson in 1760 that "The Manuscript you mention" was then in Bristol in the hands of his daughter. If so, Lord Halifax had probably sent it to John Wraxall after his son's death. Soon afterward John Wraxall sent this manuscript to Wraxall's widow in New York, and in June,

<sup>1</sup> E. g., on the question whether the River Indians were dependent on New York or Massachusetts Bay, *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 865.

<sup>2</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vii, p. 714.

<sup>3</sup> In 1737 Lieutenant Governor Clarke, in a conference with the Indians at Albany, reminded them of their former engagements and said that the English had "Committed it to writing which time cannot wear out." To which the Indians replied: "You tell us you Committ Your Affairs to Writing which we do not and so when you look to your Books you knowwhat passed in former times but we keep our Treaties in our heads." *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, pp. 100, 101.

In 1735 Colonel Johnson addressed an Indian Conference at Mta Johnsona "Behold Brethren these great Books (Four Folio Volumes of the Records of Indian Affairs which lay upon the Table before the Colond) They are Records of the many solemn Treaties and the various transactions which have passed between your Forefathers and your Brethren the English, also between many of you here present and us your Bretheren now living — You well know and these Books testifie that it is now almost 100 years since your Forefathers and ours became known to each other," etc. *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, pp. 969-970. The secretary of a conference of Sir William with Pontiac and other Indians in 1766 records the fact that at the end of the conference "Sir William gave them a general admonition that he hoped all what had passed during the Congress might have a deep impression upon them all, and desired they would repeat it often amongst themselves, and hand it down to their posterity with great care, and under the strictest injunctions as on his part what was transacted could not be forgotten being regularly entered into the Records of Indian affairs." *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vii, p. 866.

1762, she forwarded it to Johnson Hall. Johnson kept it until 1766, and probably returned it to Mrs. Wraxall in that year.<sup>1</sup> If this "manuscript" was really the *Abridgment*, it got back again to England somehow, and remained there until about the year 1852; for the *Abridgment* was bought in London about that time by Mr. Charles Welford, and brought back to New York. At the sale of Mr. Welford's books in 1854, the *Abridgment* was bought for the New York State Library for \$50, and placed among the archives,<sup>2</sup> where it was burned, together with other valuable manuscripts, in the fire which destroyed a part of the State Capitol at Albany in 1911. This edition is based on a copy made from the manuscript in 1904.

The registers of Indian records are the basis of two books still in existence, Colden's *History of the Five Nations* and Wraxall's *Abridgment*. Both are *livres de circonstance*, Colden's history being first published in 1727 to influence opinion in favor of the continuance of Governor Burnet's measures to stop the trade with Canada in Indian goods;<sup>3</sup> while Wraxall's was written in 1754, to prove to the English government, by concrete examples, the importance of Indian relations, the incompetence of the then Indian commissioners, and the fitness of Colonel Johnson to supplant them. Some comparison of the *Abridgment* with its more famous predecessor is inevitable. Colden's book was intended for a wider circle, and has a more literary form. It contains much fuller accounts of Indian speeches than the *Abridgment*, but it covers only about twenty years from 1678 to 1698, while the *Abridgment* extends to 1751. Colden prefaces

<sup>1</sup> Letters from John Wraxall to Sir William Johnson, and others between Sir William and Peter Wraxall's widow. *Johnson MSSa*, v, ppa 2, 239; vi, p. 20; xii, ppa 154, 179.

<sup>2</sup> *Norton's Literary Gazette*, iii, pp. 38, 185; N.S., i, p. 133. *Memorandum Book of Trustees of the New York State Library*, iii, ppa 90, 487.

<sup>3</sup> Colden wrote in his preface to the second part of the *History*: "As this Act did in its Consequence take a large Profit from one or two considerable Merchants, who had the Trade to Canada entirely in their Hands, they endeavoured to raise a Clamour against it in the Province, and presented likewise Petitions to the King, in Order to get the Act repealed. Upon this Occasion Mra Burnet gave me the Perusal of the Publick Register of Indian Affairs, and it was thought the Publication of the History of the Five Nations might be of Use at that Time." Ed. of 1902, i, p. 105a

his transcripts from the registers with a general description of Indian life and oratory, drawn from rather obvious and not always trustworthy sources, such as Lafitau and La Hontan. He also gives some accounts of military operations. This was very useful, but the only real contribution he makes to our knowledge of Indian affairs is what he takes from the registers. While Wraxall's more concise method requires him to pass more rapidly than Colden over the twenty years they treat in common, a comparison of the two shows that he has included most of the important matters. The special object which both writers had in view possibly led them to omit things we should like to know, but we must be thankful for what they have preserved. When we consider the length of the period covered, the historical value of Wraxall's work seems not less, but rather greater, than that of its more pretentious fellow, which has passed through some six editions.

It is important not merely as an historical document. While Colden's book was unsuccessful in accomplishing its purpose of checking the tide of opposition to Burnet's Indian policy, Wraxall's principal object, the appointment of Colonel Johnson as Indian superintendent, was gained, and it can be shown that the *Abridgment* was a really important factor in gaining it.

Thomas Pownall took to himself, as was not altogether unusual with him, a considerable part of the credit for Johnson's appointment, asserting that it was due to a paper of his, offered to the Albany Congress in 1754, and afterward forwarded to England. "This paper," he says in the appendix to his *Administration of the Colonies*, "was drawn up in the year 1754, not only to suggest the necessity of the office, but to recommend Colonel, since Sir William Johnson, to be the officer. Its succeeded accordingly."<sup>1</sup> It is not unlikely that his recommendations had considerable weight, through the influence of John Pownall, his brother, but his claim is much exaggerated. I am inclined to believe that this *Abridgment* of Wraxall's had more influence in shaping the policy of the English government toward the North American Indians, in leading them to withdraw Indian relations from the provincial

<sup>1</sup> *Administration of the Colonies*, 4th ed. (1768), app., p. 35, note.

governments and concentrate them in the hands of one crown official, and in inducing them to make Colonel Johnson that official; than either Pownall's paper or even the united suggestions of the provincial representatives assembled in Albany in 1754. Wraxall's preface to the *Abridgment* is dated May 10, 1754, and it was probably sent to Lord Halifax at once.<sup>1</sup> The Albany Congress first met on June 19th.<sup>2</sup> Franklin's plan of colonial union was not adopted by the congress until July 10th, and Pownall's "Considerations" toward a Plan for Indian Management were not read until the next day.<sup>3</sup> The minutes of the Albany Congress, together with Pownall's "Considerations" and another paper on Indian affairs by Johnson himself did not start to England until July 22d.<sup>4</sup> In the meantime, on June 14th, Secretary Robinson had asked the Lords of Trade to draw up a plan of "General Concert" for the colonies, as he had asked the colonies themselves earlier;<sup>5</sup> and on August 9th, the Lords complied with this request and sent to the King a plan and a statement explanatory of it.<sup>6</sup> This plan provides for one "proper person" to be Commander in Chief "and also Commissary General for Indian Affairs." The explanatory statement suggests that "the sole direction of Indian Affairs be placed in the hands of some one single person, Commander in Chief, to be appointed by your Majesty." These recommendations were drawn up at Whitehall just eighteen days after Pownall's letter left New York, and three months from the time when Wraxall's manuscript was finished. They became the basis of the Government's subsequent policy in Indian affairs. It is true that Pownall's paper reached England before Braddock sailed for America with his instructions, and it must have strengthened the impression already existing in Johnson's favor which resulted in his appointment when Brad-

<sup>1</sup> *Post*, p. 7, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 853.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 889-892.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 908. Pownall's paper was not sent to England before it was read at Albany, for the author himself says it was delivered "to the commissioners of all the Colonies, assembled at Albany in 1754, and transmitted to government with their minutes." *Administration of the Colonies*, 4th ed., app., p. 33, note.

<sup>5</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 844.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 901-906. Pownall's "Considerations" are printed in the same volume, at p. 893, and Johnson's paper at p. 897.

dock landed. The facts remain, however, that when the Lords of Trade drew up these recommendations, Wraxall's *Abridgment* was, it is almost certain, in the hands of Lord Halifax, the President of the Board, a man of great influence, and Wraxall's personal friend; that Wraxall hints at Johnson's appointment in the broadest possible way several times in the *Abridgment*,<sup>1</sup> while Pownall's paper never mentions him; and that neither Pownall's paper, nor Johnson's paper, nor the recommendations of the intercolonial congress at Albany had yet reached England.

This disproves a large part of Pownall's claim, but it is not very strong evidence of any positive influence exercised by the *Abridgment*. That is found, however, on a comparison of Wraxall's different suggestions in the *Abridgment* with the "Representations" on the proceedings at Albany which the Lords of Trade drew up and sent to the King on October 29th.<sup>2</sup> In it the Lords decisively reject the Congress's scheme for control of Indian affairs by a board of colonial representatives and return to their own earlier plan of one crown officer. In giving their reasons, they recite a number of things mentioned by Wraxall, such as the Indians' distrust of traders, the importance of smiths, etc., and end by recommending the appointment of Colonel Johnson. "The reasons of our taking the liberty to recommend this Gentleman to Your Majesty are the representations which have been made to us of the great service he did during the late war, in preserving the friendship of the Indians and engaging them to take up the hatchet against the French; the connexions he has formed by living amongst them, and habituating himself to their manners and customs; the publick testimony they have given at the last meeting of their friendship for, and confidence in, him; and above all the request they make that the sole management of their affairs may be intrusted to him.&" All the facts here alleged in regard to Johnson can be gathered from Wraxall, and a careful comparison of this whole document with Wraxall's statements, as well as with those of other papers such as Pownall's, make me confident that these "representations" upon which the Board's suggestions are so

<sup>1</sup> E.g., *post*, pp. 246, 248.

<sup>2</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, pp. 916-920.

largely based, together with the English government's whole subsequent Indian policy, were largely those of Peter Wraxall. As a result of the Board's suggestions, General Braddock, on reaching Virginia, proposed Johnson's appointment, and it was ratified by the colonial governors at Alexandria on April 14, 1755.<sup>1</sup> The next day Johnson wrote to Wraxall to ask if he would serve as his secretary.<sup>2</sup> It was not without reason that Johnson closed his letter of acknowledgment to the Lords of Trade with the statement "My Lords, Justice and Truth, call on me to acknowledge, the faithfulness, diligence and capacity of the Secretary for Indian Affairs in the execution of his Office."<sup>3</sup> Johnson's debt to Wraxall was very great, and to his credit it can be said that he never forgot it.

Concerning the antecedents and early life of Peter Wraxall, the author of the *Abridgment*, very little is known. His father, John Wraxall, was a resident of Bristol, probably a member of the well-known Bristol family, to which the author of the famous "Memoirs" later belonged.<sup>4</sup> It was this family connection, in all probability, which opened up the prospect of a career for young Peter in the New World, and, in conjunction with the family's straitened circumstances, led him to emigrate to the depen-

<sup>1</sup> O'Callaghan's *Documentary History of New York* (Octavo Edition), ii, pp. 649-651.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar of the Sir William Johnson MSS.*, p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> Dated Albany, July 21, 1755. *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 961.

<sup>4</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, v, p. 2, a letter from John Wraxall to Sir William Johnson dated Bristol 15 September, 1760 acknowledging the receipt of Sir William's letter of condolence on the death of his son, Peter Wraxall, dated May 15th. *Calendar of Johnson MSS.*, p. 105.

"In August, 1750, the Common Council [of Bristol] appointed John Wraxall to the office of swordbearer, a comfortably endowed post, often bestowed on fallen greatness. Mr. Wraxall, who had been an extensive linen draper and a master of the Merchants' Society, long occupied a house and shop on Bristol Bridge. In December, 1778, Nathaniel Wraxall, a member of the same family, and father of the once famous Sir Nathaniel Wraxall, Bart., but who had been unfortunate in business as a merchant, was also appointed swordbearer." *The Annals of Bristol in the Eighteenth Century*, by John Latimer, 1893, p. 284. Nathaniel Wraxall, merchant, father of the Nathaniel here mentioned, and grandfather of Sir Nathaniel, was Sheriff of Bristol in 1723. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1731, p. 125, cited by Thomas Seecombe in life of Sir Nathaniel Wraxall, in *Dictionary of National Biography*. See also *Proceedings of the Albany Institute*, i, pp. 28-29.

dencies, where the connection certainly continued to be useful to him.<sup>1</sup> It is likely that he spent some time in Holland before leaving Europe, as may be inferred from his familiarity with the Dutch language and from an allusion in the *Abridgment*.<sup>2</sup> He seems also to have visited Jamaica.<sup>3</sup> The first evidence of his being in New York is found in the muster rolls of the colony for the year 1746, which include the names of men of Long Island, "realy and truly inlisted in Peter Wraxall's Company of Foot for the present expedition to Canada,"<sup>4</sup> an expedition which never went beyond the colony. It was hardly possible to live in New York at this time without being drawn into the violent quarrels which divided the colony into factions, and set Governor Clinton and his assembly against each other. Wraxall seems to have joined the governor's party, for in 1747, on his being called to England by urgent private business, the governor entrusted to him a letter to Under Secretary Stone, begging him to "permit the bearer Capt. Wraxal to acquaint you with what he knows" in relation to the quarrel. "He raised a Company in this Province on the Expedition intended last year against Canada. As he behaved well on all occasions, and is well acquainted with many transactions as well Civill as Military in this Province I am in hope he may be usefull on some occasions where it is not possible to obviate every objection that may be made, especially as he is acquainted with the men of this Province, as well as

<sup>1</sup> "Mr. Wraxall who is my Aid de Camp & Secretary & also Judge Advocate, all without pay or Perquisites takes Consequence to himself from the manner in w<sup>ch</sup> you are pleased to mention him & often thinks the improbability of his seeing you in America a real loss to him, he desires you will accept of his Salutations & best Wishes. he is well known to M<sup>r</sup>. Fox & Lord Halifax & if it falls in your way I wish you would mention him in an advantageous Manner to these Gent<sup>l</sup>ms, in my Name & as having great Merit with me." Extract of a letter from Sir William Johnson to Colonel Orme, dated 18 Sept. 1755. *Johnson MSSa* ii, p. 226. See also *post*, p. cxvii, note.

<sup>2</sup> *Post*, p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> "Capt. Wraxall my only Aid de Camp & Sec<sup>y</sup> begs you will present his Comp<sup>ts</sup> to Admiral Boscawen to whom he was personally well known in Jamaica." Letter of Sir William Johnson to Governor Charles Lawrence, dated 24 October, 1755. *Johnson MSSa* iii, p. 134.

<sup>4</sup> *N. Y. MSS.*, lxxv, p. 69, printed in *Report of the State Historian*, Colonial Series, i, pp. 626-628.



many particular things in it. As I do not doubt of his sincere intentions to serve me, I should be greatly obliged if he could be served in what he wants, which is, a Company in the Army, and if His Grace would be pleased to give a little assistance I shall take it as a great honour.<sup>1</sup> The letter is significant in several ways. There is no evidence that this appeal in Wraxall's behalf had any immediate result, and for several years he is lost to sight. The efforts of his powerful friends must have continued in the interval, however, for in 1750 he received a commission under the royal sign manual as Secretary or Agent for the Government of New York to the Indians and also as Town Clerk of the Peace, and Clerk of the Common Pleas in the County and City of Albany,<sup>2</sup> and from this time his history is involved in the devious and disgraceful muddle of New York factional politics which in the next few years so greatly lessened the prestige of the colony in the eyes of its Indian allies and so lowered its efficiency for the struggle with New France; and his part in these quarrels was no unimportant one.

The two offices of Indian Secretary and Town Clerk of Albany were, as we have seen, closely connected, and both had been held by Philip Livingston under a commission from the Crown for over twenty years before his death, in August, 1750. Wraxall received the royal appointment to both these offices on November 15th. After an unexplained delay of many months, he set out from England, where he had remained, apparently, since his mission of 1747; but on his arrival in New York, and application to Governor Clinton to be admitted to his new post, "the Governor acquainted him that the same was in possession of another person under a Commission from him and referred him to the Decision of the Law." The fact is, that the Governor on September 25th had issued a patent under the seal of the colony appointing Harme Gansevoort Town Clerk of Albany during good behavior, and now alleged that his own commission and the Albany charter of 1686 empowered him to do so.<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Dated, New York, 24 July, 1747. *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 377.

<sup>2</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 768; *N. Y. MS. Record of Commissions*, v, p. 4; *post*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>3</sup> These facts are taken from a Report of the Lords of Trade on the point dated

governor's conduct was probably not actuated by any hostility to Wraxall, but merely the result of negligence or ignorance of the law. His sale of the office to Gansevoort for £300 against the Statute of Edward VI,<sup>1</sup> which Wraxall says was proved in open court and virtually admitted by Gansevoort's counsel,<sup>2</sup> is rather damaging, but was probably not by any means unprecedented in the Province of New York.<sup>3</sup> It is true that the Lords of Trade recognized that the governor's appointment of Gansevoort was in excess of his authority, and "inconsistent with his duty to the Crown,"<sup>4</sup> but neither they nor the governor had the power, though they might have the wish, to offer any other means than "the Decision of the Law" for the removal of one who held an office during good behavior. Wraxall's only recourse, then, was the action to revoke Gansevoort's commission, but no one who was acquainted with Albany juries and the temper of provincial

November 7, 1752, in which the whole matter is reviewed. *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, pp. 768-769. The clause in Governor Clinton's commission upon which he probably relied was as follows: "And we do hereby authorize and empower you to constitute and appoint Judges, and (in cases requisite) Commissioners of Oyer and Terminer, Justices of the peace and other necessary Officers and Ministers in our said Province for the better Administration of Justice and putting the laws in execution." . . . *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 192. Governor Dongan's charter of 1686 to Albany provided "that According to usage & Custome the Recorder & Towne Clerke of the said City shall be Persons of Good Capacity & Understanding such as his Most Sacred Majesty his Heires and Successors shall in the said Respective Offices of Recorder & Towne Clerk respectively Appoint & Commissionate and for Defect of such Appointment & Commissionateing by his most Sacred Majesty as aforesaid his Heires and Successors to bee such Person as the said Governor Leivt. or Commandr in Cheife of the said Province for the time being shall Appoint or Commissionate which Persons so Commissionated to the said Office of Recorder and Office of Towne Clerke Respectively shall have hold and enjoy the said Offices Respectively According to the Tenure and effect of the said respective Commissions and not otherwise. . . . also that the Towne Clerke of the sd City for the time being shall Allwayes bee Clerke of the Peace and Clerke of the Courts of Sessions or County Courts for the said County." *N. Y. Col. Laws*, i, pp. 204-205, 215.

<sup>1</sup> *Stat. 5 and 6 Edward VI*, cap. XVI. Against Buying and Selling of Offices. Among other things it rendered null and void any sale "which shall concern or touch any Clerkship to be occupied in any Manner of Court of Record, wherein Justice is to be ministered."

<sup>2</sup> *Post*, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> The historian Smith speaks of Governor Burnet's selling no offices as exceptional among New York governors. *History of New York* (1814), p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 769.

judges could be very hopeful of the outcome. "such a Scene of Law & Appeals are laid open to me as may probably last these Twenty years, if I will carry it on," Wraxall dolefully prophesied.<sup>1</sup> The prophecy was almost realized. Gansevoort was still in possession on Wraxall's death in 1759, and Witham Marsh, the next holder of a royal commission for the office was only able to secure his rights under it after a protracted suit which finally ended in a compromise in 1764, fourteen years from the date of Wraxall's appointment.<sup>2</sup> I have been unable to find out what

<sup>1</sup> *Post*, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> The letters of Marsh in regard to the slow progress of his suit throw a strong light on certain conditions in Albany. They also exhibit a type of colonial official too common in the English colonies at this time. For this reason a few extracts of his letters are here given. Marsh was secretary of the conference at Lancaster in 1744, which resulted in the Indian treaty, and the notes of the conference, which are very interesting, were made by him. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Colls.*, 1st Series, vii.

On March 28, 1762, he wrote to Johnson: "If ever I engage in another law suit, it shall be for no less than ten thousand a year, one half of which, I'll bargain beforehand to give my Attorney for recovery of the other half. . . . My cause was to 've been tried next Term; but I don't know how it happens, my Attorney Says, *we are some how in the wrong!* For my part I think I'mán the right *upon both Commissions: but I was not born in this Province.*" *Johnson MSS.*, v, p. 222. In a letter of October 2, 1762, he refers to the Albany people as "Frogs," as in another he calls them "Van Frogs," and thanks Johnson for his favor, "w<sup>ch</sup> to my Sorrow, I am afraid I never shall be able to return, unless the D-l will take away Ganse [Gansevoort] or his precious Lawyers." *Ibid.*, vi, p. 107. On November 1 he begs Johnson to do him the favor of writing "with your approbation of staying to terminate my cursed Suit." *Ibid.*, p. 143. In February, 1763 he writes that Gansevoort's counsel offers to turn over the records to him if he will make Gansevoort his deputy and give him half the profits of the office — "Yes, and if I was fool enough, I suppose He wou'd take t'other half too — the D-l doubt his Dutch Modesty, as well as his Albany Honesty — They are both pretty much alike." *Ibid.*, p. 238. On October 24, 1763, he wrote, "Yesterday I was informed new proposals would be made me with w<sup>ch</sup> I cannot comply, as Mr. Smith, perhaps may insist on Ganse's being continued *as my Deputy*. — I know not how to act as I fear I may not live to see the action finished, and *no Small Sum will be offer'd* I'm sure, with full possession of the Records." *Ibid.*, vii, p. 205. "And God preserve Us from an Albany Jury's!" Dec. 11, 1763. *Ibid.*, viii, p. 42.

On January 23, 1764, he reported the suit as not yet ended, and exclaimed: "If the Court shou'd determine against me (w<sup>ch</sup> they cannot by law) by Heavens I'll write such a Letter to L—— H——, as shall drive 'em from the Bench; I mean *two of them*, who have no great affection for English-men." *Ibid.*, p. 120.

19th February, 1764, — the suit not ended yet. Judge S——h [Smith] refuses to give his opinion till next term. "The Independents rule all . . . I shall whilst

became of Wraxall's suit. Probably he was compelled to withdraw, as he feared, on account of the expense.<sup>b</sup> At any rate he was unsuccessful.

But Wraxall was now drawn into a wider field than the Albany clerkship through his duties as Indian secretary. A new struggle with the French was impending, and the Five Nations were

I breath, do every thing to prevent any Machinations of some Rascals, who would cutt off a Kings Head, as soon as looking upon Him." *Ibid.*, p. 160.

May 28, 1764. "This Day, or to morrow, finishes the affair ab<sup>t</sup> the Records — Ganse looks like a Devil" *Ibid.*, ix, p. 94. September 28, 1764a— "Age creeps on, and bodily disorders, as well as those of the mind multiply, particularly as a man cannot live to his own Liking. — With age, and a distemper'd Constitution, Laziness intervenes to render a man incapable of Business — Sir W<sup>m</sup> has always befriended me — A Deputy is provided for the Clerkship of Albany City, and County — Cannot one be found for Indian Affairs agreeable to Sir William's Approbation? Or can little Simon be able to enter up the records with an allowance of 20£ for the first year, and 30£ for every year afterwards, to be pd by me, with Sir William's Consent? Or can he sell? If these matters are settled I shall be happy, because I can then live according to my own Plan, and perhaps restore a broken & disordered Constitution at Bermudas or Bath. There would be no objection to part with both Offices, according to any Scheme (avec assez d'Argent) Sir William might Settle, and have — the nomination of my Successor — Yet no cursed Dutch republican, by reason He would ruin every Englishman, or at least bring the Titles of their Lands in question." *Ibid.*, ix, p. 205. On October 14, 1764, Marsh reports that the Mayor of Albany refuses to hand over the Common Council records, and the fees of the office are very disappointing — "They are too small for a Deputy's Deputy." *Ibid.*, ix, p. 220.

On November 12th he reported that the mayor had promised to hand over the records to his deputy, but had failed to do so. "What has been done since, I know not, nor care not." His lack of further interest was due to the report that a large fortune had been left to the sister of his late friend, Attorney General Bordley of Maryland — "There will be £20,000 if I can get Her." *Ibid.*, x, p. 1. On November 26th, he writes that any arrangement Sir William may make regarding a deputy will be acceptable to him — all he wants is a competency, so it could not be said a Fulcher starved — "Fulcher was Lord of People when Hengist came to England." *Ibid.*, ix, p. 16. Marsh died on Jan 12, 1765 (*ibid.*, x, p. 78) owing over £60 counsel fees "relative to the Suit between him and M<sup>r</sup>. Gansevoort which was compromised some time before his decease." *Ibid.*, xi, p. 25.

There is a letter written in 1756 by William Corry to Sir William Johnson, which further illustrates the conditions existing or believed to exist in Albany. Corry cites a case tried there between one Vanderpool, a Dutchman, and a certain Emerson, evidently a New Englander. The jury was packed, he says, and the verdict was given for the Dutchman. No verdicts are ever given there in favor of strangers. The Bostonians declare that no case should ever be tried in Albany unless one-half the jury are "foreigners." *Johnson MSS.*, iv, p. 52.

<sup>1</sup> *Post*, p. 6.

wavering. Never had Indian relations been so delicate or so important. Among other things this led to the well-known intercolonial congress at Albany, in 1754, for which Wraxall acted as secretary.<sup>1</sup> More important for Wraxall was the fact that it introduced him to Colonel William Johnson. The two were doubtless drawn together by the gravity of the Indian situation, by their common interest in it, and their common dislike and distrust of the Albany Indian commissioners. The Abridgment here printed is one long argument, with illustrations, addressed to the Earl of Halifax, urging the withdrawal of authority from men so incompetent and untrustworthy, and its lodgment in the hands of one man, and that man Colonel Johnson. Johnson, as we have seen, was appointed early in 1755, and at once chose Wraxall to be his secretary, and with this opens the last and most important phase of Wraxall's life. From this time he is in the thick of colonial politics, and an important figure in them. Johnson was not only made Indian superintendent, but was also created a major general and entrusted with the important expedition against the French at Crown Point, on which Wraxall accompanied him. The details of this expedition and of Johnson's victory over Baron Dieskau at Lake George need not be repeated, but Wraxall's part in the controversies that preceded and followed that victory is too important to be altogether passed over.

In the New York governorship, Clinton had been superseded by Sir Danvers Osborne, who committed suicide after one day of it, and James Delancey, the Lieutenant Governor and Chief Justice, succeeded as head of the government. Hitherto he had been an opponent of Johnson, who owed his advancement to Clinton, his enemy. All this was changed when Delancey became acting governor, and also under the administration of Sir Charles Hardy, who in a short time succeeded him. But Johnson had made a new enemy, no less a one than Governor Shirley, who had now become commander in chief of the forces in North

<sup>1</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 859. Bill of Peter Wraxall against the Colony of New York, dated October 31, 1754, amounting to £10 14s. for writing copies of the proceedings of the Congress. *N. Y. MSS.*, lxxxiv, p. 5.

America on Braddock's death. Though deeper causes lay behind, the immediate cause of their quarrel was the alleged activity of one Lydius, whom Johnson charged with being Shirley's agent in undermining his influence with his Indian allies, and thus attempting to weaken his expedition against Crown Point; and Shirley's conviction that Johnson was in like manner plotting against the success of his own campaign farther west.

This quarrel can be followed in its broad outlines in the official communications which were sent to England, many of which are printed in the *New York Colonial Documents*, in O'Callaghan's *Documentary History* and elsewhere. But some additional light is thrown on the controversy by letters which never found their way to England, but were formerly preserved among the Johnson Manuscripts at Albany. The destruction of many of these by fire is my excuse for including here at some length extracts from these letters which were originally made for reference rather than for publication. The letters also serve to show how important Wraxall's actions and partisanship for Johnson were in the quarrels which ultimately led to Shirley's recall.

From June 21 to July 4, 1755, William Johnson held a great conference at Mount Johnson with the Indians, of whom 1106 were present. At one of the meetings at which Colonel Lydius was present, one of the Oneida sachems rose and said: "You promised us that you would keep this fire place clean from all filth and that no snake should come into this Council Room. That man sitting there (pointing to Coll: Lyddius) is a Devil and has stole our Lands, he takes Indians slyly by the Blanket one at a time, and when they are drunk, puts some money in their Bosoms, and perswades them to sign deeds for our lands upon the Susquehana which we will not ratify nor suffer to be settled by any means."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 984. Lydius certainly bore no very good reputation in the Colony of New York. There are many unfavorable references to him in the minutes of the New York Council and in the papers printed among the *New York Colonial Documents*. As early as 1746 the Commissioners for Indian Affairs complained to the Governor of alleged actions of Lydius, whom Clinton was inclined to favor, in trying to get the Indians to go over to the French. *N. Y. MSS.*, lxxv, p. 34. Compare the statements in the Abridgment, *post*, pp. 246. 248. The whole

The next day Johnson answered this complaint in the following words: "I did promise, that I would keep this fire place free from all filth and did desire, that no snake should come into this Council room. As to Coll: Lyddius, if his coming hither was such an offence to you, I am sorry for it, he came of his own accord without any invitation from me. If Coll: Lyddius hath done as you represent and which I am afraid is in a great measure true, I think, he is very faulty, and that nobody should attempt to settle Lands upon such unfair purchases. I will endeavour all in my power that justice may be done you in this affair.<sup>1</sup> In this speech of Johnson's, Wraxall, in writing the official notes of the conference, inserted the following explanatory note:

"Col. Lydius came to Mount Johnson with an Interpreter employ'd by Gov<sup>d</sup> Shirley, & several Indians complain'd to Col. Johnson, that Lydius had been privately persuading them to go to Niagara w<sup>th</sup> him and Gov<sup>r</sup>. Shirley, and they express'd their Displeasure at this Application of Lydius's; upon w<sup>ch</sup> Col. Johnson spoke to Mr. Lydius, who shew'd him Gov<sup>r</sup>. Shirley's Orders for what he had done: Col: Johnson forbid him & the Interpreter to interfere any further with the Indians, as it had, & would occasion an Uneasiness amongst 'em, w<sup>ch</sup> might be prejudicial to the Interest in general."<sup>2</sup>

When this record reached Shirley, his state of mind may be imagined. On July 15th, he saw Johnson in person and demanded that the offending explanation be altered, to which

matter is very much tangled with the crooked politics of the time. Apparently, Clinton distrusted the commissioners and employed Lydius in their place, as he had formerly employed Johnson himself. Their complaints of Lydius are therefore by no means disinterested, and the endorsement of them by a council hostile to the governor should not be taken too seriously. Lydius's general reputation, however, was bad, and Johnson expressed himself in no uncertain terms about him long before the trouble with Shirley arose. A long letter of complaint of Lydius from the commissioners was formerly in *N. Y. MSS.*, lxxv, p. 40, in which they brand him as a traitor and refuse to serve longer unless Clinton will forbid Lydius to interfere with Indian affairs. There were other letters of complaint in *N. Y. MSS.*, lxxv, pp. 29, 41. On these letters the Provincial Council of New York reported on May 14, 1746 "That it is advisable for his Excellency to forbid M<sup>r</sup>. Lidius & all other Persons (except those in Commission) to intermeddle or treat with the Indians Concerning Publick Affairs." *N. Y. Council MSS.*, xxi, p. 92.

<sup>1</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, pp. 986-987.

<sup>2</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, ii, p. 31.

Johnson agreed; and in the official record all mention of Governor Shirley and his orders is omitted, but the statements regarding Lydius remain in other respects exactly as before.<sup>1</sup> But Shirley was not appeased. On July 17th, he wrote from Albany to Johnson: "I must desire you to order your Secretary for Indian Affairs to let me have a Copy of the Proceedings at the late Conference between you and the Indians at Mount Johnson, as soon as conveniently may be, and that you would favour me with attested Copies of the Letters I sent you by Col. Lydius, sometime in June last, and of another which I wrote to you by Lt. Colonel Ellison in the Same Month.

"I am favour'd with your Letter of the 15th Instant, wherein you acquaint me that upon the Conversation w<sup>ch</sup> had pass'd between us that forenoon, your Secretary for Indian Affairs had expung'd my Name out of the Note then talk'd of: and send me a Copy of that Note as it now stands recorded. I can't avoid repeating, Sir, that I look upon the Secretary's foisting in that Note, as a very gross Affront upon me; and notwithstanding the Excuses, you offer'd to me for him, I can't but be of Opinion that his inserting false Facts in the Records, by way of explanatory Notes, in order to ground personal Reflections upon them w<sup>ch</sup> is evidently the Case here, is an Abuse of his Trust.

"The Note is introduc'd in the following manner: The Indians tell you pa. 27 'that you had promis'd them you would keep the Place clean from all Filth, and that no *Snake* should come into the Council Room, that the man, pointing to Col. Lydius was a Devil and had sold their Lands &c.

"In page 29 you acknowledge you made 'em that Promise, and that you did desire that no *Snake* should come into the Council Room, that if Col. Lydius had done as *they represented*, and w<sup>ch</sup> you 'was afraid was in a great Measure true' & C<sup>a</sup>.

"On pretence of explaining this Complaint of the Indians your Secretary subjoins the Inclos'd Note: You can't but observe, Sir, how foreign & impertinent the Subject matter of this Note is to what it pretends to explain; that it hath not the least connec-

<sup>1</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, ii, p. 80. The note is given in the amended form in the record of the conference sent to England, and printed in *N. Y. Col. Docs*, vi, pp. 986-987.



tion with it; that the only Intent of it is to raise a Reflection upon me; and every word in it is pointed for that purpose.

"As to the Orders which it is asserted Colonel Lydius shew'd you from me, directing him to do what he is charg'd with in the Note, you must be sensible from the whole Tenour of my Letter to him, in w<sup>ch</sup> it is pretended, those Orders are contain'd, that there is no Colour for the Assertion; on the Contrary, my Letters to yourself shew that he was order'd by me to act under your Directions in the Affair:

"You assure me, Sir, this Note was inserted without your Direction or privity, I verily believe it was; But I can't avoid saying, if you had been so good as to have order'd it to be struck out, when you first discover'd it; it would have been more consistent with the Regard, w<sup>ch</sup> I flatter'd myself, you had for me, and I think is due to me on every Acc<sup>t</sup>

"This Note hath put me upon a more strict Inquiry into Colonel Lydius's Behaviour in this Affair, than I had before made; the Acc<sup>t</sup> he gives me of it is inclos'd <sup>1</sup> & he offers to verify it upon Oath: If he is not mistaken in it, I can't think him so blameable, as you seem to do; especially considering, I had given him an Officer's Commission, for the Indians, w<sup>ch</sup> should join in the Expedition ag<sup>st</sup> Niagara." <sup>2</sup>

From this correspondence it is evident that Shirley suspected that Johnson was privy to, if not responsible for Wraxall's offensive note. There can be no doubt that it at least expressed Johnson's own sentiments. On July 31, he wrote to Thomas Pownall, who was no friend of Shirley's: "He [Shirley] wrote me

<sup>1</sup> It was entitled "Memorandum of what passed at Mount Johnson between the Indians of the Six Nations and myself," a statement signed by John H. Lydius, which made all Lydius's actions seem very innocent indeed, and him a very much abused man. It was in *Johnson MSS.*, ii, p. 84. In strong contrast with this is the report of Lydius's conduct when asked for his orders, purporting to be given by several of the persons present at the conference — "Then Lydius reply'd that he could produce his own Orders (which was his Commission) and was better the [sic] Gen'l Johnsons & a Seal to it better than the Kings, which by saying so it was took to be meant Gov<sup>r</sup> Shirleys, as he said Gen'l Johnson's Commission was only a Provincial one & by his Commission he was the Third Man in America and if he Had the Presents to divide which Gen'l Johnson divided he would have more Ind<sup>s</sup> than Gen'l Johnson has." *Johnson MSS.*, ii, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, ii, p. 100.

a verry long angry Letter reproaching menacing me & grossly abusing M<sup>o</sup> Wraxall. . . . I make no doubt he will endeavour to wreak his Malice upon me & poor Wraxall, who has wrote to Mr. Fox to get quit of his Military Commission so I hope he will be clear of the thunder in that Quarter.<sup>1</sup> It is clear that this antagonism went much deeper than the Lydius affair.

Soon after this Johnson and Wraxall left for Lake George, where Wraxall was employed as secretary, aid de camp and judge advocate, and proved himself of great value. It is evident from Johnson's letters, written after the battle at Lake George, that he expects Shirley to take vengeance on Wraxall, and is trying to prevent it as well as to secure Wraxall's advancement. In all his letters he enlarges on Wraxall's services, and the fact that he receives no compensation.<sup>2</sup> Johnson now conceived the idea of sending to the different governors an account of the progress of his campaign, with a request for their suggestions. As bearer of these papers, first to the governor of New York at Albany, and then to the governor of Massachusetts, he chose Wraxall, possibly with the idea of getting him out of harm's way for the time, and for other reasons of a different character. On October 3d, Wraxall set out from the camp at Lake George for Albany, and Johnson sent a letter by him for Shirley to inform him of these matters, saying among other things: "oMr. Wraxall, My only Aid de Camp & Secre<sup>ty</sup>. & who has also acted as Judge Advocate to this Army carries this Letter to Albany to forward from thence to Y<sup>r</sup> Excellency. I Thought it necessary to send

<sup>1</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, ii, p. 140. See also *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, p. 994.

<sup>2</sup> *E. g.*, in a letter to Col. Orme of 18 September, *Johnson MSS.*, ii, p. 226; one to Governor Hutchinson dated 11 October, *ibid.*, iii, p. 78; one to Governor Fitch, *ibid.*, iii, p. 85; one to Governor Hopkins dated November 1, *ibid.*, iii, p. 163; and others. His general letter to the several governments which raised troops for the campaign may be taken as a fair sample of all these. It is dated December 2, 1755. He mentions three persons as deserving especial credit for the success of the campaign, naming Wraxall first and in the following words: "Cap<sup>a</sup> Peter Wraxall during my Command has without even the Prospect of any Pay, without taking any Fee or Perquisite whatsoever, acted as my only Aid de Camp & Secretary and also as Judge Advocate to the Troops under my Command. I think he has distinguished himself in these Departments, with that Fidelity Capacity and unremitted Application as deserves the Esteem of the public, full well. Am convinced it deserves my Grateful Acknowledgment." *Johnson MSS.*, iii, p. 265.

some Person to lay before S<sup>r</sup> Char<sup>s</sup>. Hardy the present Scituation & state of Affairs relating to my Command & to proceed forward to do the same to the Gov<sup>rs</sup> & Commanders in Chief of the several Gov<sup>ts</sup> who have troops on this Expedition and I did not know a more capable or proper Person I could send than Mr. Wraxall, tho' I very unwillingly part with him as his Assistance has been and would be very useful to me, but my reasons for dis-patching him are more prevalent than those for keeping him still with me.

"He is to endeavour to obtain & carry on with him the Opinions of the Several Gov<sup>rs</sup>. relative to this Expedition & to proceed from Albany to Boston, and also to desire the several Gov<sup>rs</sup>. to transmit their Opinions to Y<sup>r</sup>. Excellency w<sup>th</sup> all possible Dispatch." <sup>1</sup> Shirley, however, had evidently prepared for something of this kind before setting out on his campaign to Oswego. On October 3d, Wraxall wrote from Albany to Johnson: "oThis afternoon Stevenson gave me a letter from Shirley's Aid de Camp ordering me positively up to Oswego to my Camp. I handed it to S<sup>r</sup>. Charles [who] told me to write 3 lines to him, that I was engaged to you & public Service would suffer by my abandoning you & the Cause I was engaged in & he would settle it with Gov<sup>r</sup>. Shirley says unless Shirley shows him powers equal to Braddocks, he shant command Indep<sup>t</sup>. Comp<sup>s</sup>." <sup>2</sup> Hardy also advised Wraxall not to go to the other governors, as the papers he carried might only stir up trouble and defeat the Expedition. "I believe it would be the natural Consequence of their perusing these Papers," wrote Wraxall to Johnson on October 4th, "but then I told Sir Charles the Cloud must burst very soon, & that unaprizd of it as they were at present they might reproach you for keeping them in the Dark, & by that means give your Enemies if you had any (as was probable) an advantage over you." <sup>3</sup> He therefore writes for further instructions. On the next day, however, without waiting for them, probably because he and Hardy concluded that Lake George was a safer place than Albany, he set out to rejoin Johnson, bearing a letter from Hardy setting

<sup>1</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, iii, p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, p. 39.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, p. 36.

forth his views against the circular letter.<sup>1</sup> Shirley in the meantime was fuming at Oswego. "He 's much embittered at you," wrote Banyar, deputy secretary of the province of New York, to Johnson on October 9th. "He complains that you did not send him an Account as early as anyone of the Battle. His Wings will soon be clip'd. I believe and if you don't give him a lift out of the Stirrup as far as in your Power I shall wonder at it."<sup>2</sup> By October 13th, Shirley had received Johnson's letter of September 30th, telling of Wraxall's mission. It was not pleasing news, and probably would never have been sent had not Shirley been too far away to do anything in time to prevent it. On receipt of it Shirley wrote to Johnson, in part as follows:

"You Inform me you have sent your Secretary to the Several Governments for their respective Opinions upon the present Situation of affairs under your Command, and propose they shall be transmitted to me, so that my directions are to be followed upon their Opinions; Your Secretary's Tour, and the Return of the Opinions of the Governments to me, will probably take up to the End of Nov<sup>r</sup>. w<sup>ch</sup> will be Extream late for me to send your Directions.

"The time for your desiring my Directions should have been as soon as possible after your Action with the French on the 8th Instant, at w<sup>ch</sup> time you Inform'd by the Way of Albany, all the other Governors concern'd in the Expedition under your command, of it.

"You must have however received Sir, by this time, all the directions, I could properly give you at this Distance, and w<sup>ch</sup> I thought it my Duty to send you unask'd; w<sup>ch</sup> then was to proceed to Ticonderoge.

"You well know my Opinion concerning the Serviceableness of your Secretary; that is a very different one from what you Express, in your Letter of the 30th of Sept<sup>r</sup>., of him. Some of your officers wou'd have been in my Opinion more proper to have been Dispatch'd to their respective Governments for their Opinions; w<sup>ch</sup> might in that way have been more Expeditiously and Effectually Obtain'd than by sending him."<sup>3</sup> But, as we

<sup>1</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, iii, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, p. 62.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, p. 87.

have seen, Wraxall was already back at Lake George by this time and the circular letter was abandoned as Johnson's letter to Governor Wentworth of October 10th explains.<sup>1</sup> On the same day he wrote to Governor Hardy, and also another letter to Shirley explaining the change of plan. To Governor Hardy, he said, in part, "Mr. Wraxall informed me Gen<sup>l</sup>. Shirley had ordered him up to Oswego, & that y<sup>r</sup> Excellency had taken that matter under your Management, w<sup>ch</sup> I am extreemly glad of & very much obliged to you for. I soon found myself distressed by his Absence; he has always been a most necessary & useful person to me & he will remain so as long as my Military Connexions last. The loss of him would not only be a private one to me, but I think an essential to the public relative to this Expedition. I wrote M<sup>r</sup> Shirley before he set out for Oswego that Mr. Wraxall was my Secretary & Aid de Camp. the Affairs which have passed thro him & the Papers which are in his hand & under his Management make it absolutely necessary, that he should not be taken from me to a Scituation w<sup>ch</sup> must rob me of that Assistance without which I cannot give such an Account of my Conduct to the Gov<sup>ts</sup> concerned, w<sup>ch</sup> they will reasonably expect & may probably demand, and I cannot but think Gov<sup>r</sup>. Shirleys abrupt & peremptory orders to him, an unkind Intention towards me. It is not meerly upon my private but on the public Interest that I must thank y<sup>r</sup>. Excellecy for y<sup>d</sup> Interposition and claim the continuance of it in regard to this Gentleman, who has no pay who reaps no Perquisites for all his Labours & the Dangers to w<sup>ch</sup> he has exposed himself in this Service."<sup>2</sup> The letter to Governor Shirley explains Wraxall's return to Lake George and the abandonment of the circular letter. "Your excellency," it goes on, "will please to consider or be informed, that I have no writers but my Secre<sup>ty</sup>. Mr. Wraxall, & a Deputy Secre<sup>ty</sup> — & they have no pay or perquisites for what they do in this way, & that no Establishment was made for me of this kind, M<sup>r</sup> Wraxall has been & is my only acting Aid de Camp. In this Scituation I think

<sup>1</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, iii, p. 69. He says he is preparing a letter and some papers for Governor Phipps "w<sup>ch</sup> I shall desire him to communicate to the several Gov<sup>ts</sup> concerned in this Expedition as it is impossible for me to send them separately."

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 70.

myself excusable if I cannot be so punctual & diffusive in my Advice as might otherwise have been expected from me.<sup>δ</sup><sup>1</sup> So far as can be ascertained, Wraxall was not afterward interfered with in his attendance on Johnson, and he continued in that capacity until Shirley was superseded. When Johnson was created Indian Superintendent under the Crown a short time later, Wraxall was promoted to a captaincy in return for his services in the campaign at Lake George,<sup>2</sup> and Lord Loudoun told him, as he reported in a letter to Johnson, that he, Wraxall, had been<sup>δ</sup> recommended in the warmest manner to him by M<sup>r</sup>. Fox, Calcroft, &c. that he should be disposed to do me any Service in his Power.” He also reports that Pownall “told me I must write a letter to My Lord Hallifax for he had appeared for me with regard to the Indep<sup>t</sup>. Commission.”<sup>3</sup>

These extracts show more clearly than could any comment how important Wraxall's services were to Sir William Johnson, and how highly they were regarded by him. “To the panegyric pen of Mr. Wraxall, and the — *sic volo, sic jubeo* — of Lieut. Gov. De Lancey, is to be ascribed that mighty renown, which echoed thro' the colonies, reverberated to Europe, and elevated a raw unexperienced youth into a kind of second Marlborough.<sup>δ</sup> So wrote in 1757, the author of *A Review of the Military Opera-*

<sup>1</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, p. 71. The quarrel between Johnson and Shirley became hotter when Shirley returned from Oswego, and may be traced in their letters to each other and Johnson's complaints to the Lords of Trade. See *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vi, pp. 993, 1022-1027; vii, pp. 3, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 29, 35, 40, 76. It was only ended by the news that Shirley had been superseded by Lord Loudoun in February, 1756. In the documents here referred to, much additional light is thrown on the affair of Lydius, and the reader is referred to them in further explanation of the letters given above from the Johnson manuscripts. Wraxall's paper referred to below (p. cxvii) was written in the heat of this controversy, at Johnson's request, and forwarded to England. In an appendix to it Wraxall has included the minutes of an Indian conference held at Mount Johnson in August, 1755, in which the Indians make some very damaging statements against Shirley. *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vii, pp. 29-31. Before his recall Shirley was thinking of appointing Conrad Weiser in Johnson's place as Superintendent of Indian Affairs. See his letter to Sir Thomas Robinson on the subject, dated December 20, 1755. *Correspondence of William Shirley*, edited by C. H. Lincoln, ii, p. 362.

<sup>2</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, iv, pp. 62, 66.

<sup>3</sup> Letter of Wraxall to Johnson, dated New York, July 23, 1756. *Johnson MSS.*, iv, p. 74.

tions in North America, sometimes ascribed to William Livingston,<sup>1</sup> an author too violent in his partisanship for Shirley to have much weight, perhaps, but a keen if biased observer of all that went on in New York at that time. The same author also asserts that it was Wraxall's influence which had reconciled Johnson and Delancey,<sup>2</sup> a very important statement if true; and one by no means improbable, for Wraxall during Clinton's last years as governor had apparently been more friendly to Delancey than to Clinton. His counsel in the Albany clerkship case was Joseph Murray, one of Clinton's bitterest enemies.<sup>3</sup>

After the events of 1755 and 1756, Wraxall's life was less eventful. He continued as Indian Secretary, but the duties of this office sometimes conflicted with those of his captaincy, and he probably saw no very active service in the field. He seems to have disliked military service, for which ill health unfitted him,<sup>4</sup> though his marriage may have had something to do with this disinclination.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 95.

<sup>2</sup> P. 65.

<sup>3</sup> *Post*, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> MS. letters of Wraxall to Johnson at different times.

<sup>5</sup> Letter of Johnson to General Abercrombie dated September 16, 1757, in which he says Wraxall has orders to proceed to Albany at once, but he takes the liberty of keeping him a day or two as he is surrounded with Indians. *Johnson MSS.*, iv, p. 153. A letter from Johnson to Lord Loudoun dated Fort Johnson, December 10, 1757. Extract, "I should be glad your Lordship would please to let me know whether I am to look upon Mr. Wraxall as Secre<sup>y</sup> of Ind<sup>a</sup> Affairs any longer, if not I beg Leave to assure Your Lordship that I shall be very much put to, and cannot get any so well qualified for that Office, he having had the Ind<sup>a</sup> Records in his Keeping several Years read them thro, and is very well acquainted with their Customs Farms, E<sup>co</sup>. besides he has a peculiar Turn that Way, which is a great Advantage. Indeed I know not where I could find a Man in the least fit for that Office. I hope y<sup>r</sup> Lordship will please to consider of it, being sensible that his holding two Commissions (especially at this Time) would not answer, and knowing his Constitution not equal to the Fatigues of a military Life. I often advised him to quit the Army, which he seemed very willing to provided he had Y<sup>r</sup> Lordships Leave to sell out. If I did not think he could do His Majesty more Service as Secretary of Ind<sup>a</sup>. Affairs, than as a military Man, I would by no Means offer to say so much to your Lordship about it So hope you will excuse me." *Johnson MSS.*, iv, p. 168. Lord Loudoun's answer, written from New York on December 25, 1757, was in part as follows: "As to Captain Wraxall, I have in no Shape interfered, with his executing his Office as Secretary to Indian Affairs; You know he remained here all last Winter, absent from the Execution of that Office; as soon as the Campaign began he desired to return to his office of Secretary, and when the Winter began to approach, he left

For the last year or two of his life, he and Mrs. Wraxall lived in the city of New York, but he attended Sir William Johnson as usual at the most important Indian conferences.

The last record of an Indian conference in Wraxall's hand was dated April, 1759.<sup>1</sup> His last letter to Johnson was written from New York, on June 8th.<sup>2</sup> He died on July 11, 1759,<sup>3</sup> and was buried in Trinity Burying Ground in the city of New York.<sup>4</sup> Besides the Abridgment printed here, Wraxall, at Johnson's request, drew up in 1756 an important paper entitled "Some Thoughts upon the British Indian Interest in North America, more particularly as it relates to The Northern Confederacy called the Six Nations," in which he refers in several places to this Abridgment. This paper is printed in the *New York Colonial Documents*, vii, p. 15.<sup>5</sup> At his death he left unfinished

You and returned here, With a plan of remaining for the Winter and as I found by the leave you had given him, that you did not want him at present, I thought it but reasonable, he should Assist in Compleating his Company, which wanted a great many Men; and the whole difference that could be to him was, — whether he was to live in one Town in the low country during the Winter, or in another, which We, as Soldiers, do not consider a Point of any great Consequence, and were I to go into that way of thinking, that every officer who has a Wife, must live where She Choses, we should have a strong army presently, and nerve to do Duty. — As to allowing him to Sell, it is so contrary to the King's Inclinations<sup>a</sup> that it is not fit for me to agree to it; if by his Friends in England, he can bring that about, I have no Objection to it." *Johnson MSS.*, iv, p. 171. In December, 1756, Wraxall married Miss Elizabeth Stilwell. Biographical Sketch of Wraxall by Mr. Daniel J. Pratt, in *Proceedings of the Albany Institute*, i, pp. 28-33. Letters from Wraxall to Johnson in *Johnson MSS.*

<sup>1</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vii, p. 386. Apparently the last known letter of Johnson's written in Wraxall's hand was dated Fort Johnson, May 17, 1759. *Johnson MSS.*, iv, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> *Johnson MSS.*, iv, p. 189.

<sup>3</sup> *N. Y. Col. Docs.*, vii, p. 433. Several letters in volumes iv, v, and xxiv of the *Johnson MSS.* The following entry occurs in Sir William Johnson's accounts<sup>a</sup> "To Peter Wraxall Esq. Sallary as Secretary for Indian Affairs from y<sup>e</sup> 1st Nov<sup>r</sup>. 1758 to the day he dyed w<sup>h</sup> was July 11th, 1759 216.17 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>." *Johnson MSS.*, xxvi, p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> *Proceedings of the Albany Institute*, i, p. 274.

<sup>5</sup> "This," says Professor Alvord, "is unquestionably the ablest and best paper on the Indian question written during this period, in spite of the author's partiality to Sir William Johnson; and its influence may be traced in all later communications and in the final construction of a definite policy." *Genesis of the Proclamation of 1763*, pp. 12-13 (*Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, 1908).



another papero—"Some General Thoughts upon the Security, the Cultivation, and the Commerce of the Northern Colonies of America," written in answer to some queries propounded to him by Dean Tucker. Unfortunately, this manuscript cannot now be traced.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Mrs. Wraxall to Sir William Johnson dated New York, April 10, 1762. *Johnson MSS.*, v, p. 239. Also other letters in the same collection, vi, p. 20; xii, pp. 154, 179.