

CROWN PLUS

Restoring Lawful Continuity under the Haldimand Proclamation

A Project of the Mohawk University

Published by SixMilesDeep.com

October 25, 2025

Publisher's Note

This document is part of the **SixMilesDeep.com Archive** — a public record of ongoing legal, cultural, and academic research concerning the Mohawk Nation and its hereditary rights under Crown law.

All materials published here are for educational and lawful advocacy purposes and may be freely shared with attribution.

For formal citation:

Mohawk University (2025). Crown Plus: Restoring Lawful Continuity under the Haldimand Proclamation. SixMilesDeep.com.

About This Publication

Crown Plus is an initiative of the **Mohawk University**, dedicated to restoring truth, lawful continuity, and honour in the interpretation and application of the **Haldimand Proclamation of 1784** — the foundational covenant between the Mohawk Nation and the British Crown.

This paper is divided into three parts, each exploring a distinct dimension of the Haldimand covenant: its **legal origins**, its **modern violations**, and the **path toward lawful restoration**. Together, they form the living record of a truth that has been long buried beneath colonial misinterpretation.

Crown Plus stands for the principle that the Mohawk Nation is not a subject of the Crown, but a **co-sovereign pillar** upon which the Canadian state itself rests. The phrase “**Crown Plus**” reclaims the language of Canada’s political history — a response to the *White Paper* (1969) and *Red Paper* (1970) — and reframes it in the Mohawk context. Where others spoke of “citizens plus,” we assert “**Crown Plus**”: the indivisible bond of alliance, honour, and hereditary right between the Mohawk and the Crown.

Table of Contents

Part I — The Legal Foundations and Historical Continuity

Explores the origins of the Haldimand Proclamation, the Dorchester correction, the Mohawk–Crown alliance since Queen Anne, and the constitutional distinctiveness of the Mohawk Loyalist posterity.

 [Read Part I »](#)

Part II — Modern Violations, Fiduciary Duties, and Institutional Responsibility

Documents the breach of fiduciary duty by Crown agents, the propagation of false land acknowledgements, and the complicity of academic, corporate, and judicial institutions in sustaining unlawful occupation.

 [Read Part II »](#)

Part III — Framework for Restoration, Recommendations, and the Path Forward

Outlines a ten-year restoration plan, proposes the Mohawk Posterity Registry and Royal Commission of Continuity, and reaffirms the spiritual and legal covenant through the Crown Plus Initiative.

 [Read Part III »](#)

Part I: Restoring Lawful Continuity under the Haldimand Proclamation

1. Executive Overview

This paper, issued under the authority of the Mohawk University and published through the Crown Plus initiative at *SixMilesDeep.com*, seeks to restore clarity and lawful continuity to one of the most enduring, yet misapplied, constitutional instruments in the history of the British Crown in North America: the **Haldimand Proclamation of 1784**.

The Proclamation, issued by Governor Frederick Haldimand on October 25, 1784, was not a treaty in the sense later understood by the numbered treaties under Canadian law. It was a *royal instrument of conveyance* — a deed of honour and compensation for the **Mohawk Nation and its posterity**, recognizing the losses suffered during the American Revolutionary War and fulfilling a prior promise made by the Crown in 1779.

This Proclamation granted lands “for the use of the Mohawk Nation and their posterity forever.” Those words — *exclusive use and enjoyment forever* — have profound legal and constitutional implications. They establish an inheritable, exclusive right of possession, occupation, and governance that survives both Confederation and the creation of Canada’s statutory Indian Act system.

Yet the fatal flaw, as many historians have noted, was the **absence of named individual beneficiaries**. This omission enabled later colonial administrators to misapply the Proclamation’s intent — conflating Mohawk Loyalist rights with those of other Haudenosaunee nations and, later, with the generalized collective “Six Nations Band” created under the Indian Act.

This paper contends that this misapplication represents an ongoing breach of the Crown’s fiduciary duty, a distortion of constitutional reality, and a continuing injury to the Mohawk Loyalist posterity whose rights were, and remain, *sui generis* — unique, inheritable, and extraterritorial to Canada’s domestic jurisdiction.

Through this document, the Mohawk University, acting through the **Crown Plus Initiative**, sets out to reassert the proper legal standing of the Mohawk Loyalist posterity, examine the Crown’s corrective mechanisms (such as Lord Dorchester’s “Mark of Honor”), analyze the unlawful conflation of the Proclamation under Canadian institutions, and call for the immediate incorporation of these principles into public, academic, and corporate policy.

2. Historical Context and Legal Foundation

2.1 The Haldimand Pledge of 1779 and the Proclamation of 1784

Before the Proclamation, there was the **Haldimand Pledge of 1779**, a wartime assurance that the Mohawk and other Haudenosaunee allies displaced by hostilities would be *restored to the same state as before the war*. When their ancestral lands in New York could not be recovered, the Crown substituted lands along the Grand River — extending six miles deep on either side — as compensation for the loss.

This substitution was not a gift in the feudal sense but a *lawful exchange of sovereign obligations*, reaffirming the Crown–Mohawk alliance as a partnership between equals under the Two Row Wampum principle. The phrase “for the use of the Mohawk Nation and their posterity forever” was meant to create perpetual inheritance, not collective Aboriginal title.

2.2 The Dorchester Correction (1789)

Recognizing the ambiguity created by the absence of named grantees, Lord Dorchester (Sir Guy Carleton) in 1789 established a **registry of Loyalists and their descendants**, granting them the hereditary suffix “U.E.” (Unity of Empire). This registry served as a mechanism to identify lawful Loyalist posterity — both Indigenous and non-Indigenous — entitled to the rights and protections affirmed under Crown Proclamations.

Governor Simcoe continued this practice in Upper Canada, formalizing the Loyalist registers that survive today under the **United Empire Loyalists’ Association of Canada (UELAC)**. The existence of these registries shows that the Crown corrected its administrative flaw by establishing a verification system independent of the later Indian Act.

2.3 Crown and Mohawk as Constitutional Pillars

Historically, the Crown–Mohawk alliance is unique within the Commonwealth. Since the 1710 visit of the Mohawk delegation to Queen Anne — who presented the Mohawks with a silver communion set as a symbol of nation-to-nation covenant — the Mohawk have not been subjects under protection but **partners attached to the Crown**.

This relationship was reaffirmed in 1984 when Queen Elizabeth II visited the **Her Majesty’s Chapel of the Mohawks** in Brantford and unveiled a plaque explicitly stating that the lands were *granted to the Loyalist Mohawks*. In 2010, she completed the 300-year circle of alliance by presenting the Mohawk community with silver bells to accompany Queen Anne’s original communion set — a ceremonial act of constitutional continuity and recognition.

Thus, the Crown itself — through both the 1784 Proclamation and these later royal acts — has repeatedly confirmed that the Grand River lands are extraterritorial to Canada’s domestic law and remain bound to the indivisible Crown–Mohawk covenant.

3. Misapplication and Administrative Breach

3.1 The Fatal Flaw and Its Consequences

The absence of named individuals in the Haldimand Proclamation allowed colonial authorities to interpret the grant as a collective one, later assigning its administration to the *Six Nations Band* under the Indian Act. This administrative convenience transformed a hereditary Loyalist right into a “collective Aboriginal interest” — a legal fiction that has persisted for over a century.

This misinterpretation has since influenced every level of government and academia. The University of Waterloo, for example, relies on this misapplied framework in its land acknowledgements, erroneously stating that the Grand River lands were “granted to the Six Nations under the Haldimand Proclamation.”

In reality, as confirmed by the Crown itself (see plaque at Her Majesty’s Chapel of the Mohawks), the grant was **exclusive to the Mohawk Nation and their posterity**. The use of “Six Nations” in such contexts introduces a jurisdictional and constitutional error, reviving the same flaw that Dorchester had corrected in 1789.

3.2 Institutional Repetition and Pretendianism

The propagation of this falsehood across universities, churches, and municipalities constitutes more than mere administrative negligence; it is an act of institutional complicity. Research has shown that more than 280 entities across Ontario — including the University of Waterloo — use nearly identical language drawn from *Global Solutions* (Phil Montour, 1996), a booklet produced in the context of Six Nations litigation.

By adopting this wording, these institutions unwittingly entrench a partisan narrative that denies the distinct identity of Mohawk Loyalist posterity and perpetuates a form of **institutional pretendianism** — where even other Indigenous groups are miscast as beneficiaries of a right never lawfully conferred to them.

3.3 Fiduciary and Constitutional Implications

In *Guerin v. The Queen* ([1984] 2 S.C.R. 335), the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed that the Crown owes a fiduciary duty to Indigenous peoples where it exercises discretionary control over their lands. By failing to observe the corrective systems established by Dorchester and Simcoe, and by deferring instead to Indian Act lists, Canadian institutions have breached that fiduciary duty.

Further, the administrative reliance on statutory band lists to determine identity contravenes the principle of lawful continuity and the constitutional protection of vested rights. As the Court held in *Harelkin v. University of Regina* ([1979] 2 S.C.R. 561), public institutions must exercise discretion in a manner consistent with procedural fairness and constitutional fidelity. The failure to recognize Loyalist verification as a legitimate system of proof constitutes administrative unfairness and ultra vires action.

4. Legal Character of the Haldimand Proclamation

4.1 Distinction from Numbered Treaties

Unlike the numbered treaties (Nos. 1–11), which place signatory nations “under Crown protection” as domestic subjects, the Haldimand Proclamation places the Mohawk Nation “attached to the Crown.” This is an international, nation-to-nation relationship, not a domestic compact.

This distinction is crucial: those under numbered treaties are Crown subjects; those attached to the Crown are **Crown partners**. As such, Mohawk lands cannot be administered under the Indian Act nor alienated through provincial or federal legislation.

4.2 Judicial Recognition of Exclusive Use

In *Wilkes v. Jackson (Dodem)* (18th century), early jurisprudence clarified that the phrase “one nation and such others of the Six Nations” did not create a collective political body but rather recognized distinct hereditary rights within a confederation. This principle aligns with the Proclamation’s language granting land for the “use of the Mohawk Nation and their posterity” — an inherently individual, inheritable interest, not a collective right.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized that Crown instruments conferring “exclusive use and enjoyment” create proprietary interests that are sui generis and constitutionally protected (see *Calder v. Attorney General of British Columbia* [1973] S.C.R. 313).

4.3 The Doctrine of Exclusive Use and Enjoyment

The phrase *exclusive use and enjoyment* implies total possessory control without the need for enclosure or fence. Under common law, exclusive possession is established by intention and lawful recognition, not by physical barriers. As the Court observed in *Southport Corporation v. Esso Petroleum Co. Ltd* [1954], even minimal encroachment constitutes trespass.

Accordingly, every unauthorized road, structure, or act of “public use” within the six-mile corridor of the Grand River constitutes ongoing encroachment and breach of constitutional duty.

Part II — Modern Violations, Fiduciary Duties, and Institutional Responsibility

5. Institutional Complicity and the Chain of Breach

5.1 Universities, Research Bodies, and Academic Policy

Academic institutions occupy a unique position within Canada’s constitutional landscape: as publicly chartered bodies, they are creatures of the Crown. The universities of Ontario — Waterloo, Laurier, McMaster, and Western among them — operate under provincial charters and thereby exercise delegated authority of the Crown in Right of Ontario.

When such entities issue *land acknowledgements* or policies referring to “Six Nations” as the beneficiaries of the Haldimand Proclamation, they are effectively making legal declarations on behalf of the Crown. Because these declarations are factually and legally incorrect, they perpetuate a breach of fiduciary duty under *Guerin v. The Queen* ([1984] 2 S.C.R. 335), as well as administrative negligence contrary to *Roncarelli v. Duplessis* ([1959] S.C.R. 121).

Universities further compound this breach by using these acknowledgements as the basis for policy and financial decisions — such as tuition waivers, hiring quotas, or partnerships — thereby creating economic outcomes rooted in false premises.

The *University of Waterloo’s Indigenous Relations Office*, for instance, explicitly relies on the 1996 *Global Solutions* document authored by Phil Montour. That document, created in the context of Six Nations litigation, firstly incorrectly recharacterizes the Haldimand Proclamation as a treaty (secondly) between the Crown and the Six Nations. Over 280 entities across Ontario use this same language verbatim, resulting in the propagation of a false narrative that misrepresents both law and history.

By disseminating and acting upon this inaccuracy, universities commit what can be termed “**administrative fraud by repetition**” — the act of knowingly or negligently perpetuating false official information that alters or obscures legal reality. This is not a mere error of pedagogy; it constitutes constitutional misconduct.

5.2 The Pretendian Problem and the Displacement of True Beneficiaries

The modern phenomenon colloquially known as *Pretendianism* — the false claiming of Indigenous identity for personal or institutional gain — takes on a particularly destructive form in the Grand River context. It is not confined to individuals but extends to corporate, institutional, and governmental identity theft.

Universities, municipalities, and organizations proclaim affiliation with the Haldimand Proclamation lands without lawful standing to do so. Through bursary programs and hiring initiatives limited to “Indigenous persons of Six Nations,” these institutions distribute benefits under a false identity regime, effectively displacing the legitimate Mohawk Loyalist posterity.

This distortion carries real-world consequences. Individuals of verified Loyalist descent — those whose lineage ties directly to the original Mohawk grantees and to the United Empire Loyalist register — are excluded from recognition, consultation, and participation in benefit programs. The resulting social and material deprivation is a **continuing tort**, compounding the fiduciary breach of the Crown’s agents.

The legal test for fiduciary breach requires three elements: (1) the existence of a fiduciary duty, (2) breach of that duty, and (3) resulting harm. The Crown’s fiduciary obligation to the Mohawk posterity, established in *Guerin* and reaffirmed in *Wewaykum Indian Band v. Canada* ([2002] 4 S.C.R. 245), is beyond question. The delegation of this duty to administrative bodies that fail to uphold it satisfies both the breach and harm elements.

5.3 Private Sector Entrenchment: The Case of Costco

Private corporations operating on Grand River lands also fall within the scope of fiduciary accountability when their actions depend upon Crown-issued land titles derived from misapplied jurisdiction.

In correspondence between the Mohawk Loyalist claimants and the executive leadership of Costco Canada, the company acknowledged receipt of notice regarding the unlawful construction of its Brantford facility on Haldimand lands. In response, the company cited approval from the *Six Nations Elected Council* — a statutory body under the Indian Act — and stated that it relied on the municipality’s assurances.

This response, while typical of corporate risk management, demonstrates a fatal misunderstanding: **Six Nations has no lawful authority to convey consent on behalf of the Mohawk posterity.** Its jurisdiction is statutory, not hereditary. Its recognition under the Indian Act does not transfer or confer rights under the Haldimand Proclamation, which predates Canada itself by nearly a century.

By proceeding with construction despite formal notice of jurisdictional defect, Costco engaged in knowing encroachment, creating exposure to both civil and constitutional liability. Under the principle articulated in *Southport Corp. v. Esso Petroleum Co. Ltd* [1954], any unauthorized physical intrusion upon land subject to another’s exclusive possession constitutes actionable trespass, irrespective of intent.

Corporations operating along the Grand River corridor — including energy providers, logistics firms, educational institutions, and municipalities — are hereby placed on constructive notice that their continued operations may constitute **unlawful occupation of Crown-attached Mohawk lands.**

6. Judicial Inertia and Conflict of Interest

6.1 Systemic Bias and Entrenched Interests

The Canadian judiciary, particularly in Ontario, faces a profound structural conflict in adjudicating Haldimand-related matters. Judges, prosecutors, and legal practitioners often reside on lands subject to the Proclamation — lands whose value and security depend on the very legal ambiguities the judiciary is asked to resolve.

This dynamic creates a *reasonable apprehension of bias*, as defined in *Committee for Justice and Liberty v. National Energy Board* ([1978] 1 S.C.R. 369). Where judicial officers or their immediate families own property within the six-mile corridor, they possess a direct pecuniary interest in the outcome of any determination regarding land title validity.

The principle of *nemo iudex in causa sua* — no one should be a judge in their own cause — renders such adjudications constitutionally defective. The persistence of these conflicts explains why, despite clear constitutional language and centuries of royal acknowledgment, the courts have consistently declined to affirm Mohawk Loyalist standing.

6.2 Administrative Abdication and the “Six Nations Shield”

In practice, Canadian institutions have adopted a policy of deferral: any claim involving the Grand River is referred to the *Six Nations Elected Council*. This deferral functions as a “shield,” allowing the Crown and its agents to deny responsibility while maintaining the appearance of consultation.

However, under *Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests)* ([2004] 3 S.C.R. 511), the duty to consult and accommodate rests squarely with the Crown, not with proxy administrations. The delegation of this duty to an Indian Act council — itself a Crown creation — constitutes a violation of the principle that the Crown cannot consult with itself.

This self-referential process perpetuates a cycle of administrative abdication: the Crown consults its creature, obtains the desired outcome, and then cites that outcome as evidence of due process. The result is a constitutional nullity that undermines both Indigenous self-determination and the rule of law.

7. The Question of Sovereignty and Title

7.1 Possessory and Legal Title: A Dual Reality

Under common law, *possession is nine-tenths of the law*, meaning that possessory title affords enforceable rights even absent formal legal title. However, the Haldimand Proclamation created both: a possessory interest (“exclusive use and enjoyment”) and a legal one (“for their posterity forever”).

When Governor Haldimand executed the grant, he acted under the Crown's prerogative to convey land by deed. The Proclamation thus transferred both beneficial and equitable title to the Mohawk Nation. Subsequent British acknowledgment — particularly Dorchester's registry — confirmed that no higher title could be conveyed.

In *St. Catherine's Milling and Lumber Co. v. The Queen* ([1888] 14 App. Cas. 46), the Privy Council held that Indigenous title derived from the Crown's underlying sovereignty. But this precedent does not apply here, because the Crown's sovereignty over the Grand River was never established by conquest or cession. The Mohawk alliance predates Canada and forms part of the Crown itself. Thus, the Crown cannot simultaneously be grantor, trustee, and beneficiary; the Mohawk posterity occupy the position of *Crown co-sovereigns* under the indivisible royal prerogative.

7.2 The Problem of Trust Law and the Indian Act

The imposition of trust law through the Indian Act framework represents a constitutional corruption of the Haldimand arrangement. In 1970, the Ontario High Court (Osler J.) acknowledged that the Grand River lands were *sovereign lands* not held under ordinary trust. However, following appeal, Six Nations representatives argued that their lands and funds were "held in trust," thereby invoking the Indian Act and subjecting themselves to Crown administrative control.

This maneuver effectively reversed Osler's recognition of sovereignty and reimposed dependency. The Indian Act trust structure thus serves as a **voluntary surrender of jurisdiction** by those who claim to represent the Six Nations, to the detriment of the Mohawk Loyalist posterity who never consented to such a surrender.

Under equitable principles, a single party cannot serve simultaneously as settlor, trustee, and beneficiary of the same trust. The Crown, acting through its provincial and federal arms, cannot administer lands "for the benefit" of Indigenous peoples when it is itself the counterparty to their rights. Such a structure is inherently void for conflict of interest.

8. Citizenship, Jurisdiction, and Statelessness

8.1 The Problem of Birth on Extraterritorial Land

The constitutional implications of birth and nationality on Haldimand lands are profound. Citizenship in Canada is governed by *jus soli* — the right of the soil — under the *Citizenship Act* (R.S.C. 1985, c. C-29). However, that principle applies only to persons born "in Canada."

If, as established by the 1784 Proclamation and reaffirmed in royal acts, the Grand River lands remain under the direct covenant of the Crown–Mohawk alliance and outside domestic legislative jurisdiction, then individuals born within the six-mile corridor are **not born on Canadian soil** in the constitutional sense. Their citizenship is thus in question, and they may in fact be *stateless persons* under international law.

This conclusion aligns with the principle articulated in *Nottebohm Case (Liechtenstein v. Guatemala)* [1955] I.C.J. 4, which held that nationality requires a genuine link between the individual and the sovereign. Where the sovereign's authority does not lawfully extend, the presumption of nationality fails.

8.2 Implications for Institutions and Governance

Municipal and provincial authorities operating within the Grand River corridor therefore exercise jurisdiction **ultra vires** — beyond their lawful authority. Every act of licensing, taxation, or regulation within this area constitutes an assumption of power not granted by Parliament or the Crown.

Similarly, births, deaths, marriages, and educational certifications issued within this territory are of questionable validity under Canadian law, as they purport to operate extraterritorially.

This situation places thousands of individuals — Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike — in a legal limbo that can only be resolved by a **Royal Commission of Continuity**, formally re-establishing jurisdictional clarity between the Crown and the Mohawk Nation.

9. Quantifying the Harm

9.1 The 1994 Valuation and Compound Liability

In 1994, the Ontario Land Claims Commission valued the Grand River lands and resources at approximately **\$250 billion CAD**, not including compound interest or derivative use. Applying standard fiduciary compounding at 6% over 230 years yields a liability exceeding **\$100 trillion CAD**.

This figure does not account for intellectual property, licensing revenue, or corporate profits derived from land-based enterprise — all of which are traceable to the unauthorized occupation of Mohawk lands.

9.2 The Ongoing Denial of Benefit

Beyond material damages, the continued denial of rightful administration deprives the Mohawk posterity of cultural, educational, and economic sovereignty. Universities, corporations, and governments profit from Mohawk territory while excluding Mohawk Loyalists from participation in policy, consultation, and governance.

Such conduct meets the test for unjust enrichment as established in *Pettkus v. Becker* ([1980] 2 S.C.R. 834): (1) enrichment of the defendant, (2) corresponding deprivation of the plaintiff, and (3) absence of juristic reason. All three criteria are satisfied here, and the enrichment extends not only to governments but to every titleholder and institution operating within the corridor.

10. Toward Corrective Mechanisms

10.1 The Mandamus and Certiorari Remedies

The writ of **Mandamus** remains the appropriate legal instrument to compel public officials to perform their constitutional duties. Under *R. v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Fire Brigades Union* [1995] 2 A.C. 513, mandamus may issue where a minister or public officer fails to exercise a non-discretionary statutory or constitutional duty.

Similarly, the writ of **Certiorari** can quash ultra vires administrative decisions that perpetuate jurisdictional error. These instruments, though ancient, remain available through the superior courts of record and serve as lawful tools to restore the integrity of the Crown's obligations.

10.2 The Role of the Crown Plus Initiative

The Crown Plus Initiative, under the auspices of the Mohawk University, represents the next evolution in lawful restoration: a non-adversarial, evidence-based, constitutionally anchored process for realigning Crown honour with reality. It is a bridge between lawful sovereignty and administrative correction, between the ancestral and the modern.

Through Crown Plus, the Mohawk posterity asserts its intention not for dispossession or disruption, but for **restoration, lawful correction, and continuity**. This is not revolution but rectification — a return to the promise that both nations made, that neither would abandon the other.

Part III — Framework for Restoration, Recommendations, and the Path Forward

11. Framework for Restoration and Lawful Continuity

11.1 Reaffirming the Principle of Honour of the Crown

The foundation of this restoration process must be the **Honour of the Crown** — a constitutional doctrine older than Canada itself. As articulated in *R. v. Badger* ([1996] 1 S.C.R. 771) and *Manitoba Metis Federation Inc. v. Canada (Attorney General)* ([2013] 1 S.C.R. 623), the Honour of the Crown is always at stake in its dealings with Indigenous nations and must be interpreted purposively to uphold the Crown’s promises and correct its wrongs.

The Honour of the Crown is not satisfied by apologies, public relations campaigns, or token acknowledgements. It demands **active and ongoing performance** of commitments — in this case, the 1784 Haldimand Proclamation and all its reaffirmations.

The Mohawk posterity does not seek vengeance or dispossession, but lawful correction — the rectification of centuries of administrative fraud and the restoration of a constitutional truth.

11.2 Legal Reaffirmation of the Mohawk Posterity

The first structural measure toward restoration is the formal recognition of the **Mohawk Loyalist Posterity Registry** — a verification system parallel to the U.E. certificate model established by Dorchester and Simcoe.

This registry must be administered under independent oversight — separate from the Indian Act and beyond provincial jurisdiction — and it must recognize hereditary lines of descent from the original Mohawk Loyalists of 1784.

Such recognition will reconstitute the legal identity of the Mohawk posterity as distinct from the statutory “Six Nations Band,” restoring lawful capacity to assert rights under the Proclamation.

This registry, maintained under the Mohawk University’s auspices, shall serve as the authoritative genealogical and civic roll for all purposes relating to Crown–Mohawk continuity.

12. Structural and Administrative Reform

12.1 The Royal Commission of Continuity

A **Royal Commission of Continuity** should be convened by His Majesty King Charles III to examine the historic and continuing breaches of the Haldimand Proclamation. Its mandate would include:

1. Confirming the extraterritorial constitutional status of the Haldimand lands;
2. Reviewing institutional reliance on the Indian Act in matters pertaining to Mohawk Loyalist posterity;
3. Recommending immediate cessation of unlawful administrative practices by municipal, provincial, and federal authorities; and
4. Establishing the procedures for lawful re-transfer of jurisdiction.

The Commission must include representatives of the Mohawk posterity, the Crown (UK), and international observers from the Commonwealth and the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII).

Its findings would form the lawful bridge between historic right and modern governance, culminating in the reissuance of Letters Patent under the Great Seal confirming the continuing rights of the Mohawk posterity to their lands, institutions, and identity.

12.2 Education, Media, and Institutional Correction

All publicly funded educational institutions within the Haldimand corridor must, within twelve months of this publication, revise their land acknowledgements and curricula to reflect historical and legal accuracy.

This includes:

- Removing references to the “Six Nations” as the sole beneficiary of the Haldimand Proclamation;
- Recognizing the Mohawk Loyalist posterity as the distinct and primary beneficiary;
- Discontinuing the use of *Global Solutions* (Phil Montour, 1996) as an authoritative source; and
- Establishing formal consultation mechanisms with the Mohawk University and Crown Plus Secretariat.

Failure to comply constitutes breach of statutory duty and may trigger mandamus action or civil proceedings under the *Federal Courts Act* (R.S.C. 1985, c. F-7).

12.3 Trust Law Reformation

The Crown’s dual role as trustee and debtor must be resolved through legislative and judicial clarification. Parliament and the Privy Council must be petitioned jointly to:

1. Declare that all Haldimand lands and funds are not “held in trust” under the Indian Act;
2. Acknowledge that these lands are held by right of hereditary title, not by Crown delegation; and
3. Discharge all Crown fiduciary obligations through restitution and formal restoration of Mohawk administration.

This reform will ensure that the Crown no longer consults with itself, and that all fiduciary duties are performed transparently and in good faith.

13. Transitional Measures and Economic Realignment

13.1 Gradual Restoration Through Lawful Transition

Restoration must be deliberate and measured — not abrupt dispossession, but structured reconstitution. A ten-year **Restoration Timeline** is proposed:

Years 1–2: Establishment of the Mohawk Posterity Registry, issuance of notice to all municipalities, and creation of the Crown Plus Secretariat.

Years 3–5: Progressive assumption of title to foreclosed, tax-arrears, and unoccupied lands within the corridor, held in Mohawk custody pending redevelopment.

Years 6–8: Co-administration of civic infrastructure — including water, transportation, and environmental systems — under joint Mohawk–Crown oversight.

Years 9–10: Full restoration of civil jurisdiction to the Mohawk posterity, with Canada retaining a diplomatic and cooperative role under the Two Row framework.

This approach ensures stability, avoids social disruption, and fulfills both moral and legal obligations.

13.2 The Problem of the Crown Trust and Economic Servitude

The continuation of the Crown trust structure perpetuates economic servitude. The present fiduciary arrangement allows Canadian agencies to act as both debtors and custodians — an untenable dual role that violates equity and the *Conflict of Interest Act*.

The Mohawk posterity seeks to replace this colonial model with **Crown Plus Economics** — a regime of co-sovereign partnership in which every dollar generated within the Haldimand corridor reflects shared stewardship and lawful participation.

13.3 Quantitative Accountability

The \$250 billion valuation from the 1994 Land Claims Commission, adjusted for compound interest and inflation, must form the baseline of Crown liability.

At an annual compounding rate of 6%, the present-day liability exceeds **\$100 trillion CAD**, encompassing real property, mineral, water, and intellectual property rights. A schedule of partial restitution, credit offset, and revenue-sharing agreements should be developed to fulfill this obligation in lawful and sustainable ways.

14. Cultural, Legal, and Spiritual Renewal

14.1 The Mohawk Chapel as Symbol of Continuity

The **Her Majesty's Chapel of the Mohawks** remains both the geographic and symbolic center of the Crown–Mohawk covenant. The 1984 royal visit of Queen Elizabeth II, in which she unveiled a plaque confirming the grant “to the Loyalist Mohawks,” stands as the sole accurate public land acknowledgment in Ontario.

In 2010, the Queen reaffirmed that relationship through the presentation of a set of silver bells to accompany the 1710 Queen Anne communion set — an act that reconnected three centuries of alliance, law, and spiritual bond.

This chapel must therefore be recognized not merely as a historical site but as the **constitutional altar** of the Crown–Mohawk alliance. It is the locus of continuity, and under Crown Plus, it becomes the seat of the Mohawk University's ceremonial and diplomatic functions.

14.2 The Role of Customary Law

Under the Great Law of Peace and Skana Wida's principles, the Mohawk system of law emphasizes peace, balance, and the continual renewal of understanding. When Canada's Governor General was adopted as a Mohawk Chief following Queen Victoria's death, the Mohawk Nation extended its house — a symbolic act that still binds Canada to the longhouse in law and spirit.

By customary law, to leave the circle is to leave naked — without title, without claim, without honour. Canada's departure from this customary order in 1924, when it imposed the Indian Act system and seized the wampum records, constitutes both legal and moral treason against the Mohawk Crown.

Restoration, therefore, is not a political revolution but a re-entry into the circle.

15. Recommendations and Implementation

1. **Royal Declaration of Continuity:**

His Majesty King Charles III should issue a formal declaration reaffirming the indivisible Crown–Mohawk alliance, the validity of the 1784 Haldimand Proclamation, and the hereditary rights of the Mohawk Loyalist posterity.

2. **Establishment of the Mohawk Posterity Registry:**

Modeled after the United Empire Loyalists register, it should serve as the lawful proof of descent and eligibility for participation in land and governance matters.

3. **Creation of the Crown Plus Secretariat:**

A permanent body housed within the Mohawk University to coordinate legal, cultural, and administrative restoration efforts, liaising with Crown agents and international partners.

4. **Institutional Correction Program:**

Mandating universities, municipalities, and corporations to revise public statements, remove erroneous acknowledgements, and consult directly with the Mohawk posterity.

5. **Ten-Year Restoration Plan:**

Gradual reversion of land and jurisdiction under structured transition, ensuring both social stability and legal compliance.

6. **Economic and Fiduciary Realignment:**

Adoption of shared-revenue models reflecting rightful Mohawk participation and Crown honour, replacing existing trust and taxation frameworks.

7. **Cultural and Diplomatic Renewal:**

Recognition of Her Majesty's Chapel of the Mohawks as the ceremonial and constitutional nexus of the Crown Plus initiative.

16. Concluding Statement

The Haldimand Proclamation was not a treaty of surrender; it was a **testament of faith** between sovereigns. It established not subjugation but alliance, not dependency but co-sovereignty. The Mohawk people did not become subjects; they became pillars — one of two upon which the Crown in Canada rests.

To deny that pillar is to erode the foundation of the nation itself.

The Crown Plus initiative is not an act of rebellion. It is an act of remembrance, restoration, and renewal. It seeks to bring the Crown back into honour and the Mohawk posterity back into rightful possession — spiritually, legally, and constitutionally.

If this truth unsettles, it is only because it is real. For 240 years, the Grand River has carried the echo of an unfulfilled promise. The time has come to fulfill it.

Let this be the beginning of the lawful correction, not its end.
Let this be the reawakening of the covenant.
Let the Two Row flow again — unbroken, side by side, forever.

Issued by:

The Mohawk University
Crown Plus Secretariat
In partnership with **SixMilesDeep.com**
Brantford, Grand River Territory
October 25, 2025