

SPECIFIC CLAIMS TRIBUNAL

SPECIFIC CLAIMS TRIBUNAL		
TRIBUNAL DES REVENDEICATIONS PARTICULIÈRES		
F I L E D	January 28, 2014	D E P O S E
Guillaume Phaneuf		
Ottawa, ON	28	

BETWEEN:

KAWACATOOSE FIRST NATION, PASQUA FIRST NATION
PIAPOT FIRST NATION, MUSCOWPETUNG FIRST NATION,
GEORGE GORDON FIRST NATION, MUSKOWEKWAN FIRST NATION,
AND
DAY STAR FIRST NATION

Claimants

v.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA
(as represented by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada)

Respondent

AMENDED DECLARATION OF CLAIM
Pursuant to Rule 41 of the
Specific Claims Tribunal Rules of Practice and Procedure

This Amended Declaration of Claim is filed under the provisions of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act* and the *Specific Claims Tribunal Rules of Practice and Procedure*.

January 27, 2014

Guillaume Phaneuf

(Registry Officer)

To: Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Litigation, Justice, Canada
234 Wellington Street East Tower
Ottawa, ON K1A 0H3
Fax: (613) 954-1920

I. Claimants (R. 41(a))

1. The Claimants, Kawacatoose First Nation, Pasqua First Nation, Piapot First Nation, Muscowpetung First Nation, George Gordon First Nation, Muskowekwan First Nation and Day Star First Nation (the “First Nations”), confirm that they are First Nations within the meaning of s. 2(a) of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act*, located in the province of Saskatchewan.

II. Conditions Precedent (R. 41(c))

2. The following conditions precedent, as set out in s. 16(1) of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act*, have been fulfilled:
 - 16(1)(a) The claim was previously filed with the Minister and the Minister has notified the First Nations in writing of his decision not to negotiate the claim, in whole or in part.
3. The Last Mountain Reserve No. 80A 1918 surrender claim was submitted to the Specific Claims Branch on June 7, 2008 on behalf of Piapot, Day Star, Kawacatoose, Muskowekwan, Star Blanket, Pasqua and George Gordon First Nations.
4. On March 31, 2009, Anik Dupont, Director General, Specific Claims Branch, advised the First Nations that a review of the claim had been completed and that it was filed with the Minister as having met the minimum standards pursuant to the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act* and as set out in the *Specific Claims Policy and Process Guide*.
5. On December 8, 2011, Senior Assistant Deputy Minister Patrick Borbey advised the Piapot, Day Star, Kawacatoose, Muskowekwan, Muscowpetung, Star Blanket, Pasqua, George Gordon and Little Black Bear First Nations (the last of which had later joined as a party to the submission) that some of the allegations raised were accepted for negotiation. With respect to the surrender, Canada’s position was

- that it did not breach its pre-surrender fiduciary duty and had complied with all *Indian Act* requirements for the taking of the surrender. The improper surrender allegation was not accepted for negotiation.
6. The December 8, 2011 letter noted that the issue of who the proper beneficiary First Nations were remained outstanding and that, prior to commencing negotiations, the beneficiary issue had to be resolved. Canada pointed out that determining the proper beneficiaries would impact on all aspects of the negotiations, including whether the surrender pursuant to provisions of the *Indian Act* was required from certain First Nations. Canada advised it would inform all First Nations of its position on the beneficiary question by February 2012.
 7. On February 28, 2012 Acting Senior Assistant Deputy Minister Joelle Montminy determined that of the nine First Nations who submitted the specific claim, the Day Star, Pasqua, Piapot, Muscowpetung, Muskowekwan, George Gordon and Kawacatoose First Nations were proper beneficiaries. Canada was prepared to negotiate with the beneficiaries identified only aspects of the submission accepted for negotiation.
 8. On February 28, 2012 a letter from Acting Senior Assistant Deputy Minister Joelle Montminy was sent to the Star Blanket First Nation and Little Black Bear First Nation stating that, although they were two of the nine First Nations that submitted the claim, they were not proper beneficiaries and therefore Canada would not engage in negotiations with them.
 9. On February 28, 2012 a letter from Acting Senior Assistant Deputy Minister Joelle Montminy was issued to the Standing Buffalo First Nation advising that the Last Mountain Reserve No. 80A 1918 Surrender claim had been submitted by a number of First Nations. It was Canada's position that the Standing Buffalo First Nation had an interest in 80A and the settlement of the claim. Canada therefore extended an invitation to the Standing Buffalo First Nation to participate in the process to settle the claim.

10. By way of a letter to Canada dated March 12, 2012 the Peepeekisis First Nation asked to be considered a claimant in the Last Mountain Reserve 80A claim. In a letter dated April 12, 2012, Anik Dupont, Director General, Specific Claims Branch advised the Peepeekisis First Nation they would not be added as a claimant and it was Canada's position the First Nation was not a proper beneficiary to the claim.
11. At a meeting of the First Nations with an interest in the claim, on April 17, 2012, instructions were given to inquire of Canada whether negotiations could proceed on those aspects of the claim accepted for negotiation while determining the validity of the surrender proceeded by way of a Declaration before the Tribunal.
12. In July 6, 2012 e-mail correspondence from Lyle Henderson, negotiator for Canada, advised that it was Canada's position it would not be appropriate to "split" the claim for purposes of both negotiating and litigating the same issues, the same facts and the same transaction concurrently.

III. Claim Limit (Act, s.20(1)(b))

13. Although the First Nations have not considered what the potential compensation might be, for purposes of these proceedings the First Nations do not seek compensation in excess of \$150 million.

IV. Grounds (Act, s.14(1))

14. The following are the grounds for the specific claim, as provided for in s.14 of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act*:
 - 14(b) a breach of a legal obligation of the Crown under the *Indian Act* - pertaining to lands reserved for Indians;
 - 14(c) a breach of a legal obligation in its administration of reserve lands, or other assets of the First Nations, including unilateral undertaking that give rise to a fiduciary obligation in law;

- 14(d) an illegal lease or disposition by the Crown of reserve lands; and
- 14(e) a failure to provide adequate compensation for reserve lands taken by the Crown or any of its agencies under legal authority.

V. Allegations of Fact (R. 41(e))

15. Last Mountain Indian Reserve 80A, on the Little Arm River, on the south side of Long or Last Mountain Lake in the Qu'Appelle Valley, Saskatchewan, composed of 2.2 sq. miles (1,408 acres), was surveyed by Nelson in 1885 and confirmed on May 17, 1889 by Order in Council 1151 as a "Fishing Station for the use of the Touchwood Hills and Qu'Appelle Valley Indians..."
16. In 1907 the Department of Indian Affairs instructed Agent Graham to take up the question of the surrender of IR 80A. Graham inquired whether, in order to obtain a surrender, he was required to approach Piapot, Muscowpetung, Pasqua, the Sioux of Qu'Appelle Agency, Gordons, Muscowekwan, Day Star and Poormans or whether he could simply obtain a surrender from those living on IR 80A.
17. Secretary McLean responded that it was:
sufficient, under provisions of the Indian Act, to take a surrender of this reserve from the Indians resident on or near the same and interested therein, but of course the Indians for whom the reserve was set aside would be entitled to share in the distribution of the moneys received therefore.
18. On February 24, 1908, Graham wrote to Secretary McLean returning the surrender forms and stating "the Indians interested in this reserve would not consider the proposition."
19. In 1913, there was a request by CPR Engineer Daniels to acquire 40 acres of 80A to lay a pipeline for the purpose of erecting bottle works from a spring on the reserve. Agents Murison and Nicol arranged for an "ad hoc" surrender signed by Chiefs and Councils from Poorman, Day Star, Gordon and Muskowekwan.

Despite this Secretary McLean wrote to Daniels that, because the Indians were quite adverse to the surrender, the Department could not consider the request for the land.

20. In 1913 Secretary McLean inquired of Agent Murison which bands were interested in IR 80A “of the five bands in the Touchwood Agency and four bands in the Qu’Appelle Agency”. Agent Murison reported the File Hills Agency included Muscowequons, Gordons, Day Stars and Poormans. In the Qu’Appelle Agency he said “old Indians” claim Piapot had no claim to the Fishing Station; Pasqua and Muscowpetung had fishing privileges on Qu’Appelle Lake and were not mentioned when the Fishing Station was set aside; and Peepeekesis was the only Band to have a right to share in the Fishing Station.
21. In February 1918, Deputy Superintendent General Scott requested surrender forms be sent to Inspector Graham so a surrender could be taken simultaneously from the Qu’Appelle and Touchwood Hills Agency Bands. This followed a number of events concerning IR 80A: permission being granted to use spring water on reserve to provide water to Regina Beach in 1915; frequent usage of the reserve by campers in the summer starting in 1916; a request to build a hotel on the reserve in 1916; concern raised in 1917 about sanitation conditions on the reserve; and a request in January, 1918 for permission to graze and produce hogs.
22. By letter dated May 17, 1918 Commissioner Graham forwarded a surrender document to Deputy Superintendent General Scott, dated March 23, 1918, for the surrender of 1,408 acres of IR 80A, in trust to sell, signed by the Touchwood Agency Chiefs from George Gordon, Poorman, Day Star and Muscowequon and the Qu’Appelle Agency Chiefs from Muscowpetung, Pasqua and Piapot.
23. The affidavit in support of the alleged surrender dated March 23, 1918 was signed with Agent Murison by Chief Gordon, Chief Kinequon, Chief Tawekesiquape and Chief Desjarlais from the Touchwood Agency. The second affidavit in support of the alleged surrender dated May 9, 1918 was signed with

- Agent Christianson by Chief Cappo, Chief Pasqua, and Chief Musqua from the Qu'Appelle Agency.
24. On May 27, 1918, Secretary McLean requested Inspector Graham provide information "as to the number of Indians of these bands entitled to vote, the number present at the meetings, the number voting for the surrender, and the number voting against."
 25. On June 13, 1918, Inspector Graham provided certificates from Agents Christianson and Murison certifying that from Qu'Appelle Agency: Muscowpetung 18 for, none against, 6 absent; from Pasqua 19 for, none against, 6 absent; and from Piapot 31 for, none against, 21 absent. From the Touchwood Agency: Poorman 30 for, none against, 8 absent; from Day Star 18 for, none against, 1 absent; from Gordon 42 for, none against, 6 absent; and from Muscowequon 38 for, none against and 4 absent.
 26. On July 20, 1918, Order in Council P.C. 1813 was passed pursuant to s.49 of the *Indian Act* approving the "duly authorized surrender" by Muscowpetung, Pasqua and Piapot bands from the Qu'Appelle Agency and Poorman, Day Star, George Gordon and Muscowequon bands from the Touchwood Agency.
 27. On June 4, 1919, 33 lots were sold by auction. Later, in July 1919, an additional 51 lots were sold. In August 1919 an additional 18 lots were sold. Some additional lots were sold in September, October and November 1919. However, by January 1938 it was reported there were 58 unsold lots.
 28. Despite the surrender stipulation that the surrendered land be sold, on April 7, 1922 the Department and the Village of Regina Beach entered into a 21-year lease of nine acres of lakefront property for recreational purposes with a right to renew for another 21 years. On August 15, 1923, a lease was entered into between the Department and the Regina Beach Golf and Country Club for a quarter section of land to develop a municipal golf course. On June 18, 1928, a renewal of the lease was granted to the Village of Regina Beach, who had received the lease by assignment. On June 16, 1928, a grazing lease covering 160 acres was granted

- for five years with Florence Dufree, with a right to renew for further five years. Another five-year grazing lease, of approximately 450 acres, was granted to F. Wollatt on October 10, 1930, with a right to renew for another five years. Finally, on May 22, 1935, the Department entered into a lease with the Village of Regina Beach for 1,207.5 acres for a term of 20 years.
29. When it came to the distribution of the sale proceeds, Chief Surveyor Bray, in a memo dated September 23, 1919, wrote to the Department that IR 80A was set apart for the Touchwood Hills and Qu'Appelle Valley Indians and the surrender was made by Muscowpetung, Pasqua, Piapot, Poorman, Day Star, George Gordon and Muskowekwan Bands to whom the settlement funds should be distributed.
 30. On June 30, 1924, Commissioner Graham wrote to Deputy Superintendent General Scott regarding claims by the File Hills Indians who claimed to be entitled to a share in the proceeds, which in his opinion "is well founded, that they are Qu'Appelle Indians". He referenced elders who said the fishing station 80A was for bands who had no access to fishing lakes which excluded Pasqua and Piapot but included Poorman, Day Star, Muscowequan, Gordons, File Hills Bands and Muscowpetung.
 31. Chief Surveyor Robertson reviewed the matter. In a memorandum to the Deputy Minister he reported the survey by Nelson was for the Touchwood Hill and Qu'Appelle Valley Indians which for Touchwood were Poorman, Day Star, Gordon, and Muscowequan Bands, and for the Qu'Appelle Bands he was inclined to consider as being intended to include Piapot, Muscowpetung, Pasqua and Standing Buffalo. He could not understand why Standing Buffalo was excluded unless it was because it bordered on the Fishing Lake (but, he mentioned, so did Pasqua) or because it was an "American Sioux" band.
 32. Although the File Hills Bands could be considered part of the Qu'Appelle Valley, Surveyor Robertson further reported that, had the File Hills Bands been considered at the time of the survey, Surveyor Nelson would have specifically mentioned them in his report and the obvious site for their fishing station would

- have been Fishing Lake. Surveyor Roberson eliminated other more easterly bands, who could be considered part of the Qu'Appelle Valley, since they bordered on Crooked and Round Lakes, and Kakewistahaw was given a special reserve at Crooked Lake.
33. Deputy Superintendent Scott wrote to Graham on July 19, 1924 that, although the File Hills reserves of Little Black Bear, Okanese, Peepeekeesis and Star Blanket could geographically be included under the term Qu'Appelle Valley Indians, this would also include the Assiniboine reserve, as well as the Kakewistahaw, Cowesses, Sheseep and Sakimay reserves. In his view Qu'Appelle Valley Indians was a "misnomer" since Qu'Appelle reserves, with the exception of Standing Buffalo (described by him as American Sioux Indians), were known as those around Fort Qu'Appelle as Piapot, Muscowpetung and Pasqua. Although 80A might not have been intended for Pasqua, he was reluctant to exclude them from sharing in the proceeds, since the correspondence at the time of the survey did not exclude them. This finding, as to who were the Touchwood and Qu'Appelle Indian Bands, Scott considered was consistent with those bands Graham had considered were eligible to vote in the surrender.
34. The distribution of the settlement proceeds up until 1937 were made proportionately to the seven bands that allegedly participated in the surrender. However, on August 29, 1938, a lawyer for the Touchwood Agency Bands stated that the four bands he represented asserted that the Qu'Appelle Bands had no interest in IR 80A since they were located next to a lake or close to one, that the fishing station was intended only for them and that the Qu'Appelle Bands should not receive the benefits of the settlement proceeds. The Director of Indian Affairs responded, that according to the Order in Council confirming the reserve in 1889 for the Touchwood Hill and Qu'Appelle Valley Indians, the Indian Bands who had an equal interest in IR 80A were Piapot, Muscowpetung, Standing Buffalo, Pasqua (from Qu'Appelle Valley) and Gordon, Muscowequan, Day Star and Poorman (from the Touchwood Hills district).

35. Later in March, 1949, the Regional Supervisor of Indian Agencies inquired of the Department as to which bands were entitled to share in the surrender proceeds, since some Indians claimed specific areas of the reserve were allocated to them while others mentioned they had rights to the reserve. In response Superintendent Allen, Reserves and Trusts, in a letter dated April 2, 1949, stated IR 80A was set aside for the benefit of Pasqua, Piapot, Muscowpetung, Gordon, Day Star, Poorman and Muskowekwan Bands.
36. On February 25, 1954, Mr. Wang, Member of Parliament for Qu'Appelle, forwarded to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration a letter dated February 9, 1954 from Piapot Chief Ball and Councillors Crowe and Watetch alleging that the signatories to the surrender were approached individually over three months by Inspectors Murison and Christianson to sign the surrender; that no meeting was held; and that Chief Ball was interpreter at the time and was therefore aware of the repeated requests. He also identified the bands for which the reserve was set apart. Chief Ball wrote, in part:
- The signatories to the surrender were approached individually and were all illiterate and the last on the list was Masqua who was the Chief of Piapot Reserve at the time. While the signature of Masqua was on the surrender, in March 1918, he was approached time and again for three months after that, by the then Inspectors Murison and Christianson and was asked to sign the document.*
- When Piapot asked for a fishing reserve for his band and six other bands, namely; Muscowpetung's, Gordon's, Poorman's, Day Star, Muscowekwan and Little Black Bear, from Hayter Reed, who as the Indian Commissioner, he was allotted the 80A reserve bordering on Last Mountain Lake. The Pasqua Reserve had a lake bordering their reserve, so they had no share in 80A...*
37. In support of this was a statement enclosed with the letter from Chief Ball which stated:

This is to certify that as a private member in 1918, during the summer months of May, June, July, I was asked to act as an interpreter for Inspector Christianson to explain to Chief Masqua that his signature was necessary to finish the deal or surrender. Masqua replied to the Inspector that he did not have the right without the Band's permission to sign any document. He never signed or put his mark as far as I knew.

38. On May 21, 1954, Chief Ball and Councillor Watetch wrote a follow up letter to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stating that until recently no one at Piapot knew of the surrender; that Piapot, Muscowpetung and Little Black Bear had specified portions of IR 80A set aside for them; that Pasqua had no interest in 80A since their reserve bordered a lake; that the Touchwood Bands did not have an interest in 80A since they had their own Fishing Stations; that a list of Piapot members could verify there was never a surrender meeting; and that Inspector Christianson persisted over three months to get Chief Masqua to sign the surrender.

39. On May 25, 1954 Director Jones replied to the Piapot Chief and Councillors "there was no evidence uncovered that would indicate that the surrender was not given in accordance with the provisions of the then Indian Act" and that the consent of a majority of the members was obtained. Furthermore, he stated that while Pasqua was to share in the reserve Little Black Bear was not, having been allocated a reserve in the File Hills area.

40. However, in a memorandum dated June 17, 1954, Mr. Jones acknowledged:

...It is very difficult to comment on this case because the Indian Affairs Branch file or files covering the period at which the surrender was taken have been lost for some years and we have no records concerning the surrender which would indicate whether it was properly taken or was taken in the manner suggested by Chief Ball, that is, by merely having the Chiefs of the respective Bands sign the surrender. There is suspicion in the minds of our officials that the claim by the Indians may be only too

true but it seems next to impossible to substantiate this from our records for, as stated above, we have none that are material...

41. On December 1, 1954 Superintendent Brown wrote to Jones that he had reviewed the matter of IR 80A and could not confirm or discount the allegations made by Chief Ball. He suggested another interview with Chief Ball stating that a further investigation was fruitless until they discovered something more to go on.

As mentioned, there is some uncertainty as to what Bands were entitled to have an interest in this Reserve. The Reserve was set aside as a fishing station "for the Indians of the Touchwood Hills and Qu'Appelle areas" and our first records on the subject show that Poorman's, Day Star, Muscowequan, Gordon's, Piapot, Muscowpetung and Pasqua were the Bands falling within the general nomenclature of the establishment. Who decided this is not clear and it is always possible the decision was wrong, but until someone can establish this fact, we have no alternative but to assume these were the proper Bands....

As was pointed out, there is no definite evidence to show either that the surrender was improperly taken or that the wrong Bands have been sharing the land, and until we have something more definite to go on, it is not seen what further Investigation can be made by the Department....

42. Following an interview with Chief Ball by Mr. Jones, Mr. Brown indicated in a memorandum dated February 4, 1955 that, although Chief Ball was not completely satisfied with the investigation, there was no point in making a further investigation or inquiries into the propriety of the surrender and who had an interest. He realized it was next to impossible to prove otherwise so he was prepared to let the matter drop.
43. In December, 1956, Mr. Forier wrote to Mr. Tallant, Barrister and Solicitor, regarding the claim by Peepeekeesis that they had an interest in IR 80A. According to Forier, although Peepeekeesis was part of the Qu'Appelle Agency at

- one time, its reserve was not located in the Touchwood Hills or the Qu'Appelle Valley and therefore Peepeekeesis never had an interest in IR 80A.
44. When the question of a long term lease of the remaining lands on IR 80A came up in February 1958, Colonel Jones wrote that, when discussion about this was raised with the Piapot Band, they were opposed to the lease and the only question discussed was "to the effect that the surrender, away back in 1918, was obtained under false pretenses, and that Masqua, who was then Chief of the Piapot Band, did not sign the surrender."
 45. Later in March 1958, Assistant Regional Supervisor Warden reported on a visit he had made to Piapot concerning the lease of IR 80A where he met with the Chief and Council, as well as three elders. He reported little progress was made because of "their attitude with respect to their contention that the surrender taken in 1918 was not a legal one. They still state the Band members never voted on the surrender as stated in the copies of the documents in our possession."
 46. Warden reported Elder Kiaswatum "stated that a Sports Day held on the Piapot Reserve in July 1916 or 1917, officials from the Regional office endeavored to hold a meeting with the Indians to discuss a surrender of Reserve #80A, but the Indians left the meeting without anything having been accomplished. He said he never voted on any surrender of the land in 1918, nor can he recall a meeting being held for any such purpose."
 47. In a letter dated August 15, 1958, Mr. Jones responded to a letter from Colonel Jones which referenced similar arguments raised by Piapot where Pat Cappo from Muscowpetung maintained no meeting was held and no vote was taken when the purported surrender of IR 80A occurred in 1918.
 48. The lease that the Department had entered into on May 22, 1935 with the Village of Regina Beach for 1,207.5 acres for a term of 20 years came up for renewal in May, 1955. It was renewed by the Department for two successive one-year periods, at a rental of \$1,000 per year expiring on May 31, 1957, even though

- representatives at a meeting from Piapot, Muscowpetung, Pasqua, Gordons, Day Star and Muscowequan had suggested a renewal for one year at a rental of \$3,000.
49. The lease to the Village of Regina Beach was again renewed in 1958 for a 10-year period, expiring on March 31, 1968, at a rental of \$1,000 per annum, even though the bands with an interest had not reached a consensus on how to proceed. The action by the Department was justified by the Deputy Minister on the basis that “Legal authority exist for the leasing of this Reserve under a sale surrender given in 1918, without further consent from the Indians.”
50. When the question of lease renewal came up in September 1967, Vergette, Head of Land Surveys and Titles, said legal counsel representing various Indian bands having an interest in IR 80A was challenging the surrender. But on April 30, 1968, Regional Director Clark advised the Department the several bands were in the process of developing the Kinookimaw Beach Association with the intention of leasing the land from the Department for the purpose of developing and subleasing it out in the best interest of the Indians concerned.
51. The Kinookimaw Beach Association was incorporated on April 21, 1970 by Poorman, Day Star, Gordon, Muskowekwan, Muscowpetung, Piapot and Pasqua. On June 23, 1971, a lease by Kinookimaw Beach Association of the sold portion of IR 80A which had been formerly leased to the Village of Regina Beach, was developed and signed by the Corporation and sent to the Minister for his signature.
52. By letter dated March 23, 1972, Assistant Deputy Minister Ciaccia advised that the lease of IR 80A might be *ultra vires* because the surrender of those lands was a surrender for sale not lease. He recommended that a new surrender for lease be obtained. A new surrender would also clear up any dispute regarding ownership of the reserve.
53. The surrender for lease was achieved by obtaining Band Council Resolutions dated June 6, 7 and 8, 1972, passed by the Councils from each of the seven Bands,

requesting the surrender of IR 80A be amended to permit Her Majesty to lease the unsold portion of the reserve to the Kinookimaw Beach Association.

This amendment to the 1918 surrender was confirmed by Order-in-Council PC-1973-1731 dated June 19, 1973.

54. On August 10, 1973, a lease was finally signed between the Department and the Kinookimaw Beach Association to commence July 1, 1973 and continue until June 12, 2023.

55. The Claimants raise the following additional allegations:

- a) Canada permitted the unauthorized construction of a roadway across IR80A;
- b) Canada failed to obtain compensation from non-Indians hauling water from IR80A;
- c) Canada permitted squatters to trespass on IR80A
- d) Canada failed to obtain compensation from campers who enjoyed free camping privileges and who caused damage to the beach and trees;
- e) Canada failed to arrange adequate leasing arrangements of IR80A and failed to act in the best interests of the First Nations by authorizing nominal lease arrangements, without consultation and the consent of the First Nations;
- f) Canada entered into grazing leases with two individuals at questionable rental rates without consultation and approval of the First Nations; and
- g) Canada allowed gravel to be removed without compensation and without consultation and approval from the First Nations.

VI. The Basis in Law on Which the Crown is said to have failed to meet or otherwise breached its lawful obligations.

56. The alleged surrender of Last Mountain Indian Reserve 80A on March 23, 1918 was not obtained in compliance with the surrender provisions under s.49 of the *Indian Act*, R.S.C. 1906, c.81, namely, without approval obtained from all Indian bands who had an interest in IR 80A; without approval obtained from the eligible voting members of the signatory Indian bands who were habitual residents on or near 80A; and without compliance with the surrender provisions of the *Indian Act*.
57. The alleged surrender was not obtained in compliance with Treaty #4 which required the consent of the “Indians entitled thereto” before reserve lands could be “sold, leased or otherwise disposed of.”
58. Canada breached its fiduciary obligation by obtaining the surrender of Last Mountain Indian Reserve 80A on March 23, 1918 which was not in the best interests of those Indian bands that had an interest in the reserve.
59. Canada breached its fiduciary obligation by entering into lease arrangements with third parties, contrary to terms of the surrender on March 23, 1918 of Last Mountain Indian Reserve 80A. These terms stipulated that the surrendered lands were to be held by the Crown in trust to sell.
60. Canada breached its fiduciary obligations by permitting the construction of a road over IR80A without lawful authority and with securing compensation;
61. Canada breached a lawful obligation by permitting the removal of water from a spring that was located on IR80A without lawful authority and without securing compensation.
62. Canada breached its fiduciary obligations by permitting squatters to trespass on IR80A;
63. Canada breached a lawful obligation by failing to obtain compensation from campers who enjoyed free camping privileges and who caused damage to the beach and trees;
64. Canada breached its fiduciary obligations by entering into various lease arrangements of land in IR80A that were inadequate, nominal in terms of rates,

questionable in duration, contrary to terms requested by the First Nations, and contrary to terms of the surrender, all without consultation and approval of the First Nations and contrary to their best interests.

65. Canada breached its fiduciary obligation by failing to prevent the removal of gravel from IR80A without compensation and without consultation and consent of the First Nations.

Dated this 27th day of January, 2014.

David Knoll

David Knoll
Knoll & Co. Law Corp.
201-1678 128th St.
Surrey, B.C. V4A 3V3
Tel: (604) 538-9893
Fax: (604) 538-9848
dknoll@knollandco.com