

Our education system will be complete when our children know the 78 turns of Halley's comet and the history associated with that. If our children can recount that then we actually know our education. Otherwise we're not learning our own education system what our children are learning is the colonizer's system.

One of the main components or parts of a nation is the ability to make agreements with other nations. Prior to the arrival of other nations, we had extensive treaties, treaties made amongst our people. How many people know where the treaty was made between the Cree and the Dene? Peace River. What about the Cree and the Blackfoot? Wetaskiwin. Do you know the meaning of the treaties and what that means? They are to be able to live side by side in peace and to travel in their territory. We were making treaties well before the settlers arrived here. Treaty making was not something that was brought to us. That is a part of our inherent right to make treaties and we can still make treaties. We are not prohibited from making treaties as nations we can still do that. If you know where your territory is, having a city on your territory doesn't do anything to your territory because that land underneath the city is still our land, is still our territory. What they've tried to instill in you is to believe that by putting a town or city in your territory that it is no longer your territory. But it is still our territory. We still have the responsibility based on the inherent right of who we are to that territory. In the spring time when the ice is breaking up, I go down to the river and do a ceremony because that is our responsibility. That is what they try to do within colonization is to make us feel that we are not responsible.

I'm married into the Blood tribe. My son when he was growing up, I didn't teach him about Alberta and Saskatchewan, that was not part of his framework. I told him about the Treaties between the peoples. All the Treaties right up to the arctic. This is the way I taught him the territories. When he first went into school at the Bloods, the teacher said something about Alberta and he said this was our territory and the teacher said no, this is Alberta and he said no, this is our territory.

The kinds of things we have to think about to undo in our minds of how we've been indoctrinated on a daily basis. It is especially important if you're teaching the future generations. How you use the language to transmit information about who you are. Like, last year I was in Australia and I was meeting with a bunch of women and they had a situation where they blocked a uranium mine. They didn't want the uranium mine in their territory. The government cut off their money. So the women took their kids and they went out into the bush and were living there in the bush. The company, Haliburton, Dick Chaney, wanted to meet the women who went out on the land with their children in protest of the uranium mine. The company came out there with their computers and power points and they wanted to plug in somewhere in the middle of the bush. The women were all sitting on the ground. They told the guys to sit on the ground, close to the mother, and they finally sat down after much effort. One woman who spoke 7 languages stated English is a baby language it is the last language to be created. When the English come into our territories, they put their name on everything. When they put their name on all the territories that spirit is there behaves like we're forgetting the spirit of the land. We are responsible for all that is on the land, if our children don't remember their names, how will the land help us? She said, that is our inherent right to know this. When

she was talking with the mining companies she spoke in her language, and told them to translate find their own translator because I'm talking to the land and talking about the land. She is living the inherent right of the people and was speaking to the land. The colonizers want us to forget our heart and come from the mind. We have to connect to the heart and when we do we connect to the land. This is our Turtle Island. Everything we had was there the day before we made the treaties.

I never say 'signed' Treaties. Why? Signing refers only to the written document. Our Treaties are based on the oral understanding of our Elders. When these people came across the big waters and they were coming here, there was a Crown. The Crown is governed by their own legal system; just as we are governed by our own legal system. Where did the Treaties get made? When they made Treaty Six, where was it made? Fort Pitt. Fort Carleton. Treaty Seven was made at Blackfoot Crossing and Treaty Eight was made. We didn't have to go to London to make Treaties because the Crown had to make the treaties. The 1763 Royal Proclamation (RP) was issued by the King of England. This RP was given to the settlers and subjects of the King. It said that they could not enter into territories of the Indian Nations and allies without a treaty. The only one that could make the treaty was the Crown or its representative. No individual could make a treaty. If you were on Indian Territory without a treaty then you were known as a squatter, you didn't have authority to be in the territories of the Indian Nations without a treaty. The RP included instructions from the Crown, 'if the Indians so desire' to enter into treaty with the Crown. The power to make Treaties was with our people. It was not on the other side. We were in control. It was the chiefs from this area that sent letters to the Queen's people and stated they were prepared to enter treaty, ready for negotiations. The RP is part of

their Constitution of Canada. A lawyer claimed that the RP was an Indian Bill of Rights. I told him, it was written instructions for the settlers.

They came here to make Treaties, under the Vienna Convention on Treaties, Article 3, an oral and written treaty has the same standing in international law. Under the RP a treaty has to be made with Indians to allow settlers to come into the territory. It also made Canada. Canada is not a nation-state, Canada is a state. It is an artificial state created in the minds of Westminster. It was created in 1867 and it (Canada) was small place on the east coast. The rest was not Canada in 1867. Canada was created through the BNA Act that also created 4 provinces. In 1905, Alberta and Saskatchewan were created.

Canada did not have the ability to make international agreements until 1932 under the Statute of Westminster. Our treaties were made with the Crown; it was Great Britain, Ireland, and Scotland. In 1979, Trudeau called it repatriation of the constitution. This was a lie because it was never in Canada; it was always in Great Britain. In the time period of 1979-80, they tried to create an independent country called Canada. Elders, particularly in Alberta, were concerned with what Canada was up to at this time; particularly in the time following the 1969 White Paper that was to do away with our reserved lands and do away with sec 91(24) and do away with Treaties. When they were talking about the constitution, the old people were concerned.

In Alberta, the Indian Association was very powerful at that time and we were directed. I was working as a lawyer in BC as one of the first Indian lawyers to graduate from law school. The late Sam Bull called me to ask me to work in Alberta on the treaties and this constitution. I said no. He came back and said we really want you to. I said, "I will come work with you for six

months but I'm coming back to work in Vancouver in my law practice". I'm still here. Sam was a good negotiator.

At that time, there was a big War Chest that was put together. Sam and I went from community to community to inform the people and they contributed money to the War Chest. We had about \$250,000.00 and in 1979-80, that was a lot of money. We wanted to go to work in England to protect the Treaties. Sam and I went to a number of different lawyers in Vancouver, Calgary, Montreal, Toronto; big law firms to tell them we want to go to court in England to protect the treaties. Every law firm we asked turned us down. They said we couldn't go to court in England because we were Canadian citizens. We said, 'No, we are not citizens; we are the other half of the Treaties'. We had a big meeting at Camp He Ho Ha. There were a lot of Elders there. We told them what the lawyers said. The Elders said it doesn't matter; we made a treaty with the Crown so you go to England and you go to court over there.

I had read this book written by James Fawcett, a Commonwealth law professor at Cambridge; I got a hold of him. I visited him and told him about our history. I said that Elders think we should go to England to protect the Treaties. Then he said, yes, possible. Then he said you have to see Clive Perry who was also a Cambridge treaty expert. We mounted a court case in England on the Treaties. I worked with Clive, James and Blue Cooper who was a barrister in England.

We could not let Canada or Great Britain know how organized we were. They said that Canada will do everything they can to put their stamp on it. We organized a lobby, hired a solicitor named Richard Story whose name was on the documents. We filed documents differently for the purpose of not having Canada or Great Britain know how well we were organized. We could

not file the litigation until the bill was in its first reading of the Canada Act 1982 and not before it was in its second reading. We had to have them think that we were not organized, it was very important.

At 10 o'clock it was in its first reading and its 3 o'clock in the morning in Canada. I called Sam Bull at 3 am to say we are going to court at 10:30 am and at 11:30 the three old guys and I were sitting in Cooper's office. The clerk came in and said to Cooper, the Foreign Commonwealth Affairs Minister is on the phone and wants to talk to you. He asked us how he would know? He talked to him on the phone right in front of us. He said to the caller, yes, I'm representing them. When the government got the documents at 10:30 a.m. they realized the wealth of our case, they phoned Cooper, who was their foremost expert in Commonwealth litigation, to represent them. We had already hired him. That was the first time the government knew what we did. The second reading was supposed to be in at 2:30 pm and the government stopped it because of the treaties.

In this whole process of Canada becoming a new state, the Commonwealth Convention, when you are emerging as a new state, there was supposed to be an Imperial Conference in England. At the conference were to be the Treaties representatives, the Crown and Canada; a tri-partite government to discuss how the Treaties would be dealt with when the new state emerges. Prime Minister Trudeau and International Affairs Minister, Chrétien did not want this Imperial conference to happen in England because then they would have to explain to Canada why it was happening. In the court case, what we wanted was this Imperial Conference to happen in England. That was our right as treaty peoples. Canada then gave 6 or 7 million to AFN, Inuit

Tapirisat and the Metis Council of Canada and said let's have constitutional conferences in Canada and they agreed. Trudeau told Thatcher there was no need to hold Imperial Conferences in England; we'll take care of it in Canada.

Lord Denning's decision in the Indian Association case said two very important statements about the Treaties:

1. the Treaties are as good as the day they were made (Canada was not a signatory to these and they were made between Nations) and
2. no parliament or legislature can change the terms of the treaty, unless the Indians so request it.

Canada and the provinces have no control of the Treaties. Our leaders do not understand the significance of how much power they have. People are afraid to talk about the Treaties.

This relationship is between Nations, our Nations and Great Britain. Canada is not a signatory; that is very important to understand. We used this relationship to go to the UN. We went there in 1977 because of the 1969 White Paper. Even though in 1971 it was supposed to be shelved, the old people did not believe them. They said, they (government) would still go after our Treaties. In 1977 Geneva held a convention; and it was the first time since 1923 that there was a large delegation of Indigenous nations. There was an attempt in 1923, Daskeha (sp?) tried to go to speak to the League of Nations in 1923 because they had a treaty trade agreement with the Dutch and they got on the agenda. Canada was not a member of the League of Nations, Great Britain was. Canada threw a fit and pressured England to stop him from speaking in 1923. People at the UN thought we were all dead in 1977; they thought the Indigenous Nations of the

Americas had been wiped out; they were surprised to see us. There was a huge education process that had to take place within the UN. At that time we didn't use the term Indigenous. It means coming from the land. It is the same word in English, French, Spanish and Dutch. It was a matter of elevating the treaty discussion.

In 1983, we introduced the first resolution to deal with treaties. We had two votes. A Commission on Human Rights was set with 52 countries. 27 votes were needed to move a resolution. It had to be signed by the states to enter into as a resolution. Two countries, Cuba and Libya supported us – Fidel and Omar. We were way shy of the required number of votes. I was working with a Kickapoo Indian; he said to me, we have work to do. In 1989, after six years of lobbying, we had a vote, 50 votes and two voted against us, Canada and U.S., for a Study on Treaties. It happened at quarter to 12 at night, the vote. When you lobby, you are there from early morning. At 11:45 pm, the vote came up. The significance of the vote was this because the whole six years we were lobbying, Canada and U.S., lobbied against us by saying we were not really Indians and the Treaties were not real Treaties. In the media, Canada says, 'Our Indians.' It's so demeaning. I got up on the floor at the UN and said this is a Commission that is supposed to deal with racism and racial attitudes, I said, I want Canada censored for saying we are their Indians, it is demeaning to us and it is racism. We are not their Indians, we are our own people.

If you want to lobby a country you need to connect with them. When we had this vote to accept this treaty study, it was no longer a question whether Treaties are international agreements. The UN only studies internationally significant things and the vote signified that these were international agreements and the study was to determine responsibilities of a



successor state, like Canada, and the Crown and what the UN can do to assist Indigenous Peoples. This is very important. You are not learning this anywhere. Even in international law class, they will not teach this because they don't want people to know this. If you do away with the Treaties and there is no legitimate reasons for settlers to be in our territories. If they are there without the treaty then they are called squatters and have to be removed. It is very clear and that is their own legal system.

In 1972 Western Sierra case, it was determined that there is no such thing as discovery or terra nullius or no conquer. The only way for people who are not Indigenous is through a treaty. If Canada discounts the treaty, I say go ahead. Tomorrow we will appear before the Decolonization Committee to get your ass out of here. That is the importance of Treaties. I will talk about how Canada is taking apart the Treaties domestically right after the break.

### **EDUCATION – How Canada is doing away with your right.**

When we made treaty, our people asked the Crown what they wanted. They want to use the land for the settlers to farm, to the depth of the plow. At the time, our people were not farmers and asked what do you mean? The depth of the plow is two hands together. They were not buying our land. The chiefs did not have the authority to sell the land. Why? The women are the land owners. We own the land because women give birth as the land gives life. At the time of the treaty, the women were sitting there and the men were sitting there doing the job of men, talking about peace and friendship. The land was only to use it. Mrs. Quinney asked how come our women never touched the treaty. If you were non-Indigenous you would say women had no rights. But our women own the land. We never touched the treaty because we never gave

up the land. The old people understood our laws. Women own the land and resources. Men are our helpers. Men cannot alienate the land. Do not sit on council as women or sit as chiefs because you can deal with the land and territory. I'm not equal to any Indian man. That's an important thing to know. The land and resources still belong to us. They only asked for the depth of the plow. [Question: What about the dead, didn't we bury them six feet deep?] They only got the depth of the plow. They didn't want our animals because they were bringing their own. There are a lot of things in the treaty that were told to our people and passed down to us orally. Can you imagine what kind of people would enter into treaty the day before treaty, would go to the table and say take us over?

The old people knew that they wanted to understand more of these people. As part of the treaty our people will learn about your people and your people would learn about us. In the treaty it is stated that we would have access to education, there is no limit on what that would be. These children going to schools were learning but still being Indian and going home at the end of the day. The government, working with churches, decided to create Indian Residential Schools. The purpose was to take the Indian out of the child so the child would no longer think or be Indian. Separate the child from its own territory and the laws of the people, knowing the Treaties, the history.

I was the first female negotiator for the NWT Dene and the government didn't know what to do with me. They tried to change the relationship with the women right away. A Dene Elder told me that they wanted a woman negotiator. At a meeting, a woman was speaking and a young man told her she had no right to speak. The Elder grabbed the young man and took him outside

when the young man told a woman she could not speak. He asked him to hold out his hand and make something grow from his hand. The young man said he couldn't. The Elder told him, that's right but women can make life. They are our land owners and you cannot speak against them. That is our laws. That is what Residential School did, they taught the men to oppress women.

The Indian Residential Schools were designed to break us. In 1972, after the Indian Residential Schools were stopped in 1969, there was a document called, *Indian Control of Indian Education*. The old people said to re-teach these things to our people so that we can understand this so the treaty can be properly used to educate. The government got really worried about Indians learning about their rights. Canada came up with this idea called ITEP. The graduates were not real teachers; you could help in the classroom. But what you should have is a B.Ed. degree then you can teach, create school boards. Then incorporate school boards under provincial laws. Contribution Agreements should not be signed by provincially incorporated school boards. Where in the treaty making did we say that a body incorporated under the province has the authority to do this? How can that province have any jurisdiction related to Treaties? The government encouraged this process of Indian Control of Education by saying that people are the experts and have more knowledge than the Chief and Council. CAs should only be signed by Chief and Council. Analogy of the boiled frog starting off in a warm bath and then having the heat turned up slowly until it is cooked.

What Canada is doing is what under International Law is called, manufacturing the consent. They are trying to give the impression that Indians want this. There was a National Panel on

Education created last year by AANDC and AFN to study First Nations education on reserve. The mandate of the Panel was to study delivery of education on reserve and discrimination therein. They didn't study discrimination in off reserve schools. On the 30<sup>th</sup> of September, the provincial school board gets money for Indian students even if that child drops out and that is discrimination but they didn't look at that. The National Panel looked at schools on reserve only. They were very secretive. Even to this day, you cannot get a list of sessions they held or who appeared before them. They were like a little bubble floating across the land and went to places where they knew they would be received. There was no press, no public hearings. At the end, the report was tabled.

The report says to create a National Educational Commission to draft education for First Nations on reserve legislation that will be introduced into parliament. I have given you two documents, *First Nations Jurisdiction over Education in BC Act*, passed in 2007 by the federal parliament. What is the purpose of this legislation? What does it do? It's very important to understand this act. On the first page, it says, an Act to have provincial jurisdiction on First Nations LANDS in BC has already been passed into law in British Columbia. This National Panel recommended drafting legislation in First Nations education. You don't need to draft legislation, the legislation is already passed in Ottawa; all you have to do is amend this legislation. If you make the amend it you just have to remove, in BC, and say, on Indian Lands, it will apply across the country.

If you read the legislation it says, in the BC Act, 'Authority' is defined. In BC, they established a First Nations Education Panel. This panel worked with the province of BC and the federal

government. They created a tripartite group and an MOU of how this is going to work. Section 11 says, “there is hereby established in BC the First Nations Education Authority to be managed by a board of directors including six Directors, a President and Vice President, that have rights and authority of an actual person, including the capacity to enter into contracts, acquire, hold, and dispose of property to raise and invest money and to sue and be sued. The Authority is not an agent of her Majesty”. This legislation has been in place since November 22, 2007, five years this November. When they passed this legislation, the reserve school was lifted, the land once protected under 91(24) and school, was passed to the province. It now became section 92 lands. The First Nations Education Act in provincial law which came in effect November 29<sup>th</sup>, seven days after the federal government act was passed, after the land was transferred to the province. That is the effect of this legislation.

What they are doing in Alberta now and I don't know how advanced it is because I'm not working in this area, is what they created in BC. There is a BC First Nations Education Agreement, FN Education Steering Committee and the province. I'm of the understanding that there was an MOU on First Nations Education signed by chiefs, the province and feds. There is an education jurisdictional framework agreement which means there are negotiations going on between the province, federal government and First Nations. That framework agreement is designed to craft the provincial legislation in Alberta to accept these lands once they are transferred. What the government is doing....I don't know our people are aware of what is happening. They think this is good for the children. What is going to happen is that you are taking education and they are manufacturing consent and moving education out of the treaty area underneath Canada. As they do that, the program of education will be delivered by the

province. No two societies in Canada should have two service deliverers providing services in Canada there should be one service deliverer; this is said in the White Paper 1969. They want one service deliverer.

The BC legislation says how it will work. It states how it is going to work if there is disagreement that it is the authority of the province to deal with it. It has nothing at all in here about a treaty or a treaty relationship. The whole thing is listed here, it tells you how it's going to work, the legislation says in the terms of conflict this is how it will be resolved. It says nothing at all about a treaty relationship.

**If this goes through, there is no way of reversing it? No**

**Question about Kahnawake education.**

Kahnawake education was taken over by an elected Chief and Council last month. I'm going there to meet with them because the people are really concerned. Their whole traditional council on education was taken over; the elected Chief and Council appear to be maneuvering to put this in place. People have to understand this. They can't say this is going to be better for our children. In the future our children will have nothing. There will be no schools that are not under the province. The legislation says, acquire and dispose of property... what if they say, we don't need this school in SL because all the students are in St. Paul or Ashmont. They could sell the school to raise money for these other schools. The committee can sell it and raise money for school off reserve. What is to prevent them from doing that? Nothing. They will be creating checker boards. I was a little girl and I was told about the land disappearing. My grandmother put lard into a frying pan and she watched it melt first by sticking together like small islands in

the pan and then melting altogether. If we're not careful in the future that is what is going to happen to our land. I didn't understand that until I went to law school and then I understood how that could happen.

**Is anybody challenging them for changing or misrepresenting the treaty?**

The Chiefs are not using the treaty. The treaty is a tool the elders left for us. I think a lot of Chiefs don't understand the treaty. Because they are not taught anywhere about the treaty and the old people are passing on. When old people say don't take this. The younger people say well I need the job.

When they are talking about that they say you should look at these things. Take that National Chief as an example. A National Chief is not our concept. He's President of AFN I say. He said, let's get rid of the Indian Act. I heard him in Winnipeg, "Let's get rid of the Indian Act in five years." I told him in the hallway afterward, "When we made the treaty, here is our territory; within the territory we reserved lands for ourselves for the future. If we were hunting in our territories and we needed to rest we could go to the reserve, to be home. These lands were not shared. The government took those lands and made them reserves, they took out the 'd' and made them reserves under the Indian Act. Let's get rid of the Indian Act? In 1978, I indexed the Indian Acts from 1864 until 1970, I know it by heart. I said the problem with us treaty people is they put the reserved lands under the Indian Act. We reserved lands under the treaty and now they're under the Indian Act. What is your plan to protect our reserved lands? Then all the lands are gone, people are still living there, if you get rid of them and if they melt into the

province what is going to happen to our people, how do you maintain your relationship to your government, laws, language?”

The AFN has no plan. He said that it was identified in resolutions, in 2010; it was said in Winnipeg, 2011 in New Brunswick, 2012 it was said in Toronto. The AFN has no plan at all about our reserved lands and they are still pushing to get out of the Indian Act.

**Question: Wouldn't the lands still be protected under the treaty?**

That is a good question. Under the treaty we said we would share our territories with them and we reserved lands for ourselves, to protect our lands. Does that do away with the whole treaty? What is Canada's legal reason for being here? That is a question I've asked some Chiefs. Chiefs are stunned by that question. We have been told throughout history that the treaty means nothing, like during residential schooling. There's a lot of propaganda. Trying to get them to shift back to think, 'How you are going to do this?' Chief Fox from Onion Lake has a good understanding of this problem. What we are trying to do is we are raising the consciousness of our own people to say how are we going to protect these lands?

**Question: If you look at AFN, does he need permission from Chiefs across the land?**

I wanted to know the resolution to do that. He says that it's an accumulation of resolutions over the years. I tell Chiefs, don't pass resolutions.

**Question: AFN being representatives of chiefs? We don't have say as women. Could it be said they are not representing the people?**



I think what you have to do if you want to go into that direction; you have to tell your chiefs to get out of AFN. It's a corporation. You should not go down that road to be voting in the AFN, it's the wrong road to go down and I'll tell you why.

Take for example, the Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) in Australia.

Aboriginals in Australia never made treaty with anybody. Terra nullius ruled. The Australians launched an effective lobby in Geneva. They had land councils all over Australia, a group called NAILLS wrote a series of reports, 'Stolen Generations', a book called, 'Deaths in Custody'. The group was very effective. Australia was getting beat up big time at UN. Australia legislated through federal legislation created this ATSIC commission and said every Aboriginal person should vote for this. A majority were urban, voted in the people in ATSIC who made decisions about where the money would go because the federal government transferred money into this commission. All the problem people, NAILLS, didn't get funding. This operated for 15 years. When these guys complained, the government said, we didn't make decisions, it's your organization, don't complain to us. After 15 years ATSIC were disbanded. Be careful about saying we should vote for one organization, i.e. AFN.

AFN is not a government of our people. So, you cannot have AFN be in control of funding. Don't go into that trap. Last winter, during the Atleo and Harper meeting, did you see who spoke? No treaty people spoke. Vice Chief from BC, Watley said, get rid of the Indian Act. Right after that Mercredi said, I've always said women should be leaders; making it sound like he supported that woman. This gave the appearance that Indians want this; to give the appearance that there is consent to do this.

Right now there are eight pieces of legislation in parliament that will affect everything. In BC, last year, the National Health and Welfare Minister transferred 380 million dollars to a provincially incorporated FN health board to divvy up this money. This is the same thing they did with education five years ago. There is a **Health Act** passed in BC. There is **privatization of land**, to privatize reserve land to be made available for sale. **Water legislation** so there will be quality and standards compared to municipalities adjacent to the reserves. If reserves cannot meet this standard, they need to fix it otherwise the municipality can sue you. Where do they get the money? They can sell the land to raise funds. There's the **Education Act**. There's the **Taxation Act**. Then there's the **Health Act**. Rob Clark, MP, introduced **legislation 428 to amend the Indian Act**, removes the Indian Act of education sections and guts wills and estates so provincial laws will apply on reserve. The estate office will come in the absence of a will to apply the provincial laws to you and your family. This legislation rides along with privatization legislation. There's the **Oil and Gas** changes. There's another one. These legislations are coming down the tubes now. Harper has a majority.

They are using BC as a template because they don't have treaties. They passed 380 million dollars to a super Health Board. When I was in Ottawa last fall, I went to a Health Conference to see what they were talking about. Every morning and afternoon they had a workshop just dealing with this BC model saying this was something good. When you think about it, there are 192 bands in BC. When you divide 380 million dollars into 192 bands, it isn't a lot of money. How will this money be divvied up to meet all their health requirements? 380 million dollars seems like a lot but in reality it is not much to cover all the health needs of these people as medical treatments are very expensive. Most of the bankruptcies in the US are caused from

people who can't pay their health care costs. If you're under the province, they are strategizing. I've had a few people call me and say they are sick in the hospital in Edmonton. I say which hospital are you at. Do you know that they are all at Royal Alexander hospital? They are creating a two tiered health system where all the Indians can only go to the Royal Alex. In Saskatchewan, Indians are being sent to St. Paul's. Our people are not tuning into that. They are creating a system.

This is called **Manufacturing Consent** to give the appearances that we agree. That is where our people have to stand up and we have to say, NO!

You cannot talk about these things in universities because it is a political thing. Because we are indigenous to this territory and they want our territories. If you're born a descendent of treaty people, you are born to be a 'treaty fighter'. We have to understand our rights and stand up for ourselves.

At the UN, last February, Canada appeared before the Committee on Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) because of what they were doing here. One section was written about the land. We lobbied members of the committee to ask Canada the question, "What document is Canada relying on to say they have title to the lands and resources to Canada? Canada has to provide the proof. We (Indigenous people) are by our own life, have proof, we've always been here. But, Canada couldn't and didn't answer. Another member of the committee, Patrick Thornberry, Great Britain, asked Canada so you cannot provide us proof that you own the lands of the Indigenous nations, 'So how much of the resource wealth do Indigenous people get from the lands? 100 per cent, 75 percent, 50 percent, he carried on until he got to 0 per cent.'

Canada would not answer. Canada had three months from that meeting in February to provide a written response to those questions. They did not.

In June, Dr. Amir, mandated by the UN Co-Chair of CERD, came to a Treaty 6 Summit at Fort Pitt where he listened to the people speaking about lands and resources at this gathering. He went back to Geneva with a 100 page report to the committee about what he learned while he was here. Then after the Fort Pitt meeting, he went to Ottawa and they wouldn't meet with him. Chief Fox went with him. I'm on the phone with him and Dr. Amir said the government people ignore me; more at their own peril. Canada is only one country in the UN General Assembly. Canada will have a push back from the countries.

At the end of June, Rio Summit, all of Canada's documents on negotiations were leaked to the press. In Libya, Canada's negotiations documents were leaked to the press. There is ways that UN can punish a state like Canada because the international community understands the treaty relationship.

We can use our Treaties to promote and protect us but we need to understand our treaty and inherent rights. How government of Canada knows that and they understand it because they are manufacturing consent to eliminate the right. Why would they go through the trouble of doing that? Why? Because they know we have that right. They are going to play dumb bugger. I refuse to educate them anymore because as soon as one gets educated, he is replaced by the government at the negotiating table as soon as they get a grip of understanding that relationship. I say, you know how to read and write English, then educator yourself and talk back to us.

My job is to promote the right of treaty; your job is to educate yourself. Playing stupid is a negotiating tactic. Don't let them get away with that. We have to be very, very strategic on our approach this. Our job is to educate our own people about our Treaties. When our people understand the treaties completely then we can take the time to educate the other side. Story about teaching at the U of S Law School: I was educating these people about how they can use these against us. So I quit. I gave up a tenured position in a law school.

Definition of a Quisling – During the Nazi occupation of Norway in WWII, the Nazis wanted the people to elect a Prime Minister to meet with them. The Norwegians refused. The Nazis then appointed Quisling who became the Prime Minister of Norway to give them his assent.

Anybody that negotiates with your people on behalf of the occupying force against you is a Quisling. I have a Q-list. These are people who work against our people. I have sat across the table from people who are trained and look like our people. They say they are our people but they have no relationship to the laws and lands of our people. I tell them, you say that you are Indigenous but you are not. You do not follow the laws and live the inherent obligations; you have gone to the other side.

The Haudenosaunee have the Two Row Wampum. It is about two rivers parallel to each other. You cannot live with one foot in our canoe and one foot in the other side. The law says, if a strong wind comes what happens with the person with one foot in the canoe and one foot in the other boat? They're going to get lost. I'm always fighting against the stream. At least you know where you're going.

I am not going to give up because the future generations depend on us not to give up. We cannot give up on the future because our ancestors did not give up on us. They could have taken money or scrip at the time of the treaty making and they could have signed off. They didn't. My grandfather used to say, "Remember I never gave up on you." Now I understand what my grandfather was saying.

We are in tough shit right now. We have to be organized and have to be strategic thinkers. As Cree people we always were. We were militaristic because we had to hunt buffalo together. One person could not take down a buffalo we had to do it together so that we could survive. Dene people were individualistic because of the way they hunted. We Cree hunted together. That is what is going to save our people.

The government would like us to be just like the Nisga'a who gave up their land, introduced tax exemption and privatization. Their elders tried to go to court to stop this because in the future the children will say, this used to be our land. When I was in NZ, I was travelling with a woman and child who said, this used to be our land. I said, it's still your land and you still have responsibilities to the land. The Maori have less than 1 per cent of their lands. I don't want our people to end up like that. The land and water care that I still do the ceremonies at the river in Edmonton.

If you were in a school or university, what I told you tonight they would say it is not germane to what you ought to know. They've got you like the frog in the cold water bath and they will turn the heat on low until you are cooked. It's not good to have a warm bath it's better to have good cold shower. Thanks a lot.

Student thanks Sharon: Sharon, on behalf of all the students; thank you. You have set a fire to all of us. We have to take this message and take it all over. We have to be treaty fighters. We cannot give up on our children.