Six Miles Deep
LAND RIGHTS OF THE SIX NATIONS OF THE GRAND RIVER

"them and their posterity are to enjoy forever"

Joseph Brant

General Frederick Haldimand
A Journey Begins

The history of the Iroquois may be better known in the United States than in Canada. American historians and researchers have long recognized the profound influence of Iroquoian societies and their forms of government upon the thinking of those who would later become the Founding Fathers of the American Constitution.

Yet, the Iroquois have also had a profound influence upon the history and fortunes of British North America, and Canada. Even today, their influence may be felt in the formation of Canadian federal and provincial Indian policies and through the expression of self-determination by national and provincial Native organizations.

However, past neglect of the Iroquois by historians in Canada means that even many of our own people may not know their own rich history today. Many textbooks only mention the Iroquois briefly, and then as bit players in the larger battle over the domination of North America between the French and British.

As a result, many Iroquois learn about themselves in one-minute spots in history shown on television or in the few (but increasing) number of Native Studies programs that exist in college or university.

So it is no wonder that people who live up and down the Grand River may have only a vague notion that Six Nations is practically next door to them in southern Ontario even though their ancestors may have benefited from the protection and generosity of the Six Nations in the past.

This booklet is an extension of a hand in friendship to our neighbours, as our ancestors have done in the past. It is a first step to inform people along the length of the Grand River watershed about the Six Nations, a chance to learn about our history, our community, our peoples and cultures. For we all share many common interests and concerns, from Port Maitland, at the mouth of the Grand River, to the headwaters of this magnificent waterway.

Every journey begins with a first step.

Chief G. Ava Hill.
Historically, the homeland of the Iroquois was in modern-day New York State, between the Hudson River Valley to the east and the Great Lakes to the west. Through military conquest, trade and diplomacy, the Iroquois extended control or influence over vast portions of northeastern North America; from the Atlantic seaboard in the east to the Mississippi Valley in the west, from the southern tip of James Bay, south along the St. Lawrence River Valley through eastern and southern Ontario into Michigan and south to the Carolinas. While the majority of the Iroquoian population remained in their traditional homelands, they established vast networks of military and trade alliances with other nations across these territories.

Although feared militarily, the Iroquois were also admired for their political stability and sophisticated form of governance, called the League of Peace, or Iroquois Confederacy (Haudenosaunee). The Iroquois were five independent nation states (Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga and Seneca) bound by a central constitution and common set of laws. It was a democracy with a system of checks and balances to protect state autonomy and individual rights; a participatory democracy with universal suffrage, long before such hallmarks of modern democracy became fashionable among European-based societies. In 1722, the Tuscarora joined the Iroquois Confederacy to form the Six Nations.

The instructions he gave to Gen. Sullivan ... were very particular, and much more severe than was usual. Sullivan, with a considerable force, penetrated into the country of the Indians in three directions, laid waste their crops, and burnt their towns ... The late residence of the savages was rendered so far uninhabitable, that they were reduced to the necessity of seeking an asylum in the more remote western country.

[From the Life of George Washington, written by David Ramsay, a contemporary of Washington. Both this and the following quote from Washington himself are from the Archiving Early America site.]

Founding Fathers of the United States of America, such as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, openly admired the Great Law of Peace (the constitution) of the Iroquois and may have modeled the U.S. Constitution upon it.

Disaster struck the Six Nations when, during the American War of Independence that split the Iroquois, Americans invaded the Iroquois homelands in 1779. Many Iroquois allied to the British moved north into Upper Canada.

Iroquois communities in Ontario exist at Wahta Mohawk Territory (near Bracebridge), Akwesasne Mohawk Territory (near Cornwall), Oneida Nation of the Thames (London) and at Tyendinaga Mohawk Territory (on the Bay of Quinte near Kingston). The largest group of Iroquois is situated at Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, near Brantford, Ontario.
Following the American (Revolutionary) War of Independence, Great Britain and the newly formed United States established boundaries and negotiated a series of treaties that included the transfer of Six Nations lands from American control. The Six Nations, excluded from these negotiations, sought to have entitlement to their traditional homeland territories recognized. However, partly in compensation for lands they had lost, and partly for the role they had played as British allies in the war, a treaty designated approximately 950,000 acres in present-day southern Ontario to the:

The Haldimand Treaty is named for Frederick Haldimand, “Captain General and Governor in Chief of the Province of Quebec and Territories,” the person who issued the decree on behalf of the British Crown. The treaty was signed on October 25, 1784, at Fort St. Louis in Quebec.

To this day, the phrase “six miles on either side of the Grand River” reverberates within every person who lives at, or is a member of, Six Nations of the Grand River Territory.
Under the terms of the Royal Proclamation and existing treaties of the time, the land was to be held “in trust” by the Crown for the sole use and benefit of the Six Nations. This land could not be bought, sold or transferred without the knowledge and consent of Six Nations and the Crown.

In many cases, the Crown failed to uphold its trust responsibilities and participated in many actions that resulted in the dispossession of most of the Six Nations territory. Ten years after the 1784 Haldimand Treaty, Lieutenant-Governor, John Graves Simcoe, reaffirmed the original grant six miles deep from each side of the river to the Six Nations but removed approximately 275,000 acres - more than one-quarter of the original treaty.

As settlers moved into Six Nations territory, the land became unsuitable for hunting. Six Nations were forced to find alternate means of support and, at the urging of the Crown, surrendered lands to the Crown to raise funds for the perpetual care and maintenance of Six Nations. Soon, the Crown had “expropriated” approximately 600,000 acres in questionable transfers. The Crown appointed its officials known as “Indian Agents” which gave Six Nations’ land to friends and families, or sold land in order to pay their own salaries. Forty years after the Haldimand Treaty was confirmed, Six Nations were dispossessed of nearly 90 per cent of their original grant, often without their knowledge, consent, or to their benefit.

Funds raised by leases and/or sales of Six Nations’ lands were to be deposited into a “Six Nations Trust Fund.” Some of this fund was invested or “loaned” to towns and municipalities to build roads, bridges or buildings, sometimes with no record of repayment.

The remainder of the “Six Nations Trust Fund” was rolled into the Federal Government’s Consolidated Revenue Fund after Confederation (1867).

Since 1784, the Crown transferred more than approximately 900,000 acres of lands from Six Nations and a proper return on the investment should have resulted in a substantially larger sum of money in the trust account administered by the Crown. The Six Nations Trust Fund, however, has been substantially depleted, leading researchers to conclude that mismanagement occurred. Throughout Six Nations’ history, the Crown had a responsibility to manage and protect Six Nations’ interests. The Crown should honour its own proclamations, royal instructions and legislations. In many instances, the Crown failed to uphold its own legal requirements for the alienation of Indian lands; such as, descriptive plans to be signed, obtaining consent and collecting proper payments on lands. Orders-in-Council sanctioned by the Crown formally accepting surrenders were executed. Six Nations were to publicly agree to a purported surrender. But, very often this did not take place.
As a matrilineal society, the Haudenosaunee are guided by the leadership of Clan Mothers, elders who serve to represent their extended families known as clans. This honour was bestowed among women by the Peacemaker, whose message of Peace was first accepted by Jikonsaseh (Tsiknosaseh in Mohawk), a Seneca woman. Her title, as the mother of nations, gave women, in particular Clan Mothers, the authority to appoint or remove a Chief within a clan and to protect the names of titles and children.

The Haudenosaunee, or people of the long house (also known as the Iroquois) are a Confederacy of Six Nations joined together to form a peaceful alliance known as the “Kaianerakowa” or Great Law of Peace. The members of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy include the Seneca, Cayuga, Tuscarora, Onondaga, Oneida and Mohawk nations.

The Haudenosaunee being; the Chiefs, Clan Mothers and Faith Keepers are entrusted to provide for the well-being of the people and to sit with other Haudenosaunee on issues of national and international importance. It was the only leadership at Six Nations until 1924.

At that time, the Canadian Government ordered the removal of the Haudenosaunee and installed the elected council system according to the Indian Act. This change was done at the request of some members of Six Nations. This action resulted in a schism in the community that exists to some extent to this day.

It is only recently, during the past 20 years or so, that the Elected Council and the Haudenosaunee have sought to set aside differences of the past and seek to establish a more cooperative relationship. This is viewed by all as a positive step as the community moves forward.

At its maximum in 1680, their empire extended west from the north shore of Chesapeake Bay through Kentucky to the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers; then north following the Illinois River to the south end of Lake Michigan; east across all of lower Michigan, southern Ontario and adjacent parts of southwestern Quebec; and finally south through northern New England west of the Connecticut River through the Hudson and upper Delaware Valleys across Pennsylvania back to the Chesapeake.


It would be a strange thing if six nations of ignorant savages should be capable of forming such a scheme for such an union, and be able to execute it in such a manner as that it has subsisted ages appears indissoluble; and yet that a like union should be impracticable for ten or a dozen English colonies, to whom it is more necessary and must be more advantageous, and who cannot be supposed to want an equal understanding of their interests.

[Benjamin Franklin, Quoted in Van Doren, page 209]
The Six Nations Elected Council

The Six Nations Elected Council has a chief councillor, elected by the voting membership, and 12 councillors, two elected by each of the six electoral districts. They serve three-year terms of office between general elections, conducted under an election code. The duty of council is to consider and enact policy within the territory through council resolutions.

A Senior Administrative Officer (SAO) oversees and manages the day-to-day workings of the Six Nations Administration. This structure allows the separation between the political council (policy) and the administrative departments (programs).

The Six Nations of the Grand River Territory is large in population with 90 per cent of its residents living along rural concession roads. Ohsweken is the main village, located near the centre of Six Nations of the Grand River Territory.

Six Nations has the largest First Nation bureaucracy in Canada with approximately 13 departments, managed by directors and senior managers, and nearly 700 employees.

Six Nations is large in population with 90 per cent of its residents living along rural concession roads. Ohsweken is the main village, located near the centre of Six Nations of the Grand River Territory.

For further information, please visit our website at www.sixnations.ca.
Most grievances by Six Nations date prior to March 29, 1867 confederation. Six Nations often took its grievances to the Crown before and after confederation but these were usually ignored. Under the terms of the Indian Act, between 1927 and 1951, First Nations were not able to hire lawyers to bring land claims against the Crown without the Government's permission. Those provisions of the Indian Act were repealed and the Government removed these legal restrictions and First Nations were then able to pursue legal grievances against the Government.

The Federal Government did not consider First Nations claims until a Supreme Court of Canada decision, in Calder, recognized First Nations’ legal arguments to pursue comprehensive claims (lands unceded or unsurrendered by treaty).

In July 1974, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) created an Office of Native Claims to review claims. It took another eight years before the Federal Government adopted a Specific Claims Policy in 1982 (compensation for lands unlawfully removed from First Nations) in order to address the illegal acts and injustices attributable to the Crown in right of Canada and its agents, based upon certain conditions:

1. The non-fulfillment of a treaty or agreement between Indians and the Crown;
2. A breach of an obligation arising out of the Indian Act or other statutes pertaining to Indians and the regulations thereunder;
3. A breach of an obligation arising out of government administration of Indian funds or other assets;
4. An illegal disposition of Indian land;
5. Failure to provide compensation for reserve lands taken or damaged by the federal government or any of its agencies under authority;
6. Fraud in connection with the acquisition or disposition of Indian reserve land by employees or agents of the federal government, in cases where fraud can be clearly demonstrated.

The Specific Claims Policy was amended in 1991 to include:
1. Pre-Confederation claims;
2. Increase the Minister’s authority to settle specific claims and “fast track” claims less than $500,000;
3. Increase Ministerial authority to approve settlements up to $7 million without Treasury Board approval.

In 2007, the Minister announced Justice at last: Specific Claims Action Plan as a way to accelerate the resolutions of Specific claims. The Specific Claims Tribunal Act came into effect in October 2008 as a result of the Action Plan. Although many First Nations do not meet this criteria.

The following is a list of the 29 land claims filed against the Crown seeking resolution. One claim has been resolved (CNR Settlement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in claim</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innisfil Township, 900 acres (outside of tract)</td>
<td>Jan 21, 1982</td>
<td>Claim Validated for Negotiations, May 31, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hawkesbury Township, 4,000 acres (outside of tract)</td>
<td>Oct 18, 1984</td>
<td>Claim Validated for Negotiations, May 31, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block #5, Moulton Township, 30,800 acres</td>
<td>Oct 18, 1984</td>
<td>Claim Validated for Negotiations, Nov 19, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton-Port Dover Plank Road, Seneca &amp; Oneida Townships</td>
<td>June 18, 1987</td>
<td>Received by Specific Claims Branch (SCB), June 23,1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland Canal Flooding (Feeder Dam) 2,415.60 acres</td>
<td>Jan 21, 1988</td>
<td>Claim Validated for Negotiations, January 21, 1994 Accepted for Negotiations, May 13, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block #6, Canborough Township, 19,000 acres Fed. Gov’t. responsibility (Feb.1989)</td>
<td>Sept 20, 1988</td>
<td>Received by SCB, September 28, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Settlement, Brantford Township, 7,000 acres Fed. Gov’t responsibility (Feb. 1989)</td>
<td>Jan 19, 1989</td>
<td>Received by SCB, January 19, 1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outstanding Interests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in claim (continued)</th>
<th>Filed</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9   Burtch Tract, Brantford Township, 5,223 acres</td>
<td>April 20, 1989</td>
<td>Received by SCB, May 3, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10  Ordnance Reserve, Lots 25 &amp; 26, Con. 4, Port Maitland, Dunn Township</td>
<td>July 21, 1989</td>
<td>Received by SCB, July 21, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11  1841 Purported General Surrender</td>
<td>Sept 28, 1989</td>
<td>Received by SCB, October 4, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  Eagle’s Nest Tract, Brantford Township, 1,800 acres</td>
<td>Sept 28, 1989</td>
<td>Received by SCB, October 4, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  Onondaga Township, Lots 10-14, Con. II, Lots 6-15, Con. III, 2,000 acres</td>
<td>Mar 15, 1990</td>
<td>Received by SCB, May 10, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14  Martin Tract, Onondaga Township, 1,500 acres</td>
<td>Apr 19, 1990</td>
<td>Received by SCB, April 25, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15  Oxbow Bend, Brantford Township, 1,200 acres</td>
<td>July 19, 1990</td>
<td>Received by SCB, July 25, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16  Oneida Township</td>
<td>Sept 20, 1990</td>
<td>Received by SCB, September 27, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17  Canadian National Railway, Right-of-Way, River Range, Onondaga Township</td>
<td>April 18, 1991</td>
<td>Received by SCB, May 10, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18  Cayuga Township, South Side of the Grand River</td>
<td>June 20, 1991</td>
<td>Received by SCB, July 10, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19  Grand River Navigation Company (Land Grants) 368 7/10 acres</td>
<td>April 16, 1992</td>
<td>Received by SCB, May 7, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20  Bed of the Grand River and Islands thereon</td>
<td>July 16, 1992</td>
<td>Received by SCB, July 27, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21  Tow Path Lands</td>
<td>Oct 19, 1992</td>
<td>Received by SCB, October 22, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22  Exploration of Oil &amp; Natural Gas underlying the Six Nations Reserve</td>
<td>Jan 21, 1993</td>
<td>Received by SCB, January 28, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23  Source of the Grand River</td>
<td>April 2, 1993</td>
<td>Received by SCB, April 19, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24  Six Nations Investments in Custody of Coutts and Company</td>
<td>Aug 19, 1993</td>
<td>Received by SCB, August 23, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25  Misappropriation of Six Nations Funds by Samuel P. Jarvis</td>
<td>April 21, 1994</td>
<td>Received by SCB, May 3, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26  The Right to Hunt and Fish</td>
<td>Oct 24, 1994</td>
<td>Received by SCB, October 28, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27  Compensation for Lands Included in Letters Patent No.708 dated Nov. 5, 1851, Brantford Town Plot</td>
<td>Dec 19, 1994</td>
<td>Received by SCB, December 21, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28  Compensation for Lands Patented to Nathan Gage dated Feb 25, 1840, Brantford Town Plot</td>
<td>Feb 27, 1995</td>
<td>Six Nations formally submitted two additional claims in 1995. Canada refused to accept these two additional claims for review under their Specific Claims Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29  Compensation for Lands Included in Letters Patent No.910 dated July 12, 1852, Brantford Town Plot</td>
<td>May 18, 1995</td>
<td>Six Nations formally submitted two additional claims in 1995. Canada refused to accept these two additional claims for review under their Specific Claims Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Six Nations of the Grand River gave formal notice of action of pending Litigation to Canada and Ontario in December, 1994 and as a result, in January 31, 1995 Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) closed all of the claims filed by Six Nations, including those already validated for negotiation. This does not mean these claims are invalid or have been rejected. Nor does it mean that the list of claims is complete. There are many more potential claims that require additional research.
Exploration/Negotiations/Litigation

In March, 1995, the Six Nations of the Grand River filed a Statement of Claim against Canada and Ontario seeking from the Crown a comprehensive general accounting for all money, real property or other assets belonging to Six Nations which was or ought to have been received or held by the Crown for the benefit of the Six Nations and of the manner in which the Crown managed or disposed of such assets.

In 2004, the Six Nations Elected Council suspended the court action to undertake “exploratory” talks with Canada and Ontario as an avenue to reopen negotiations on Six Nations’ outstanding claims. This presented the promise of negotiated settlements instead of costly legal actions and had revealed two of the 28 unresolved claims as a possible negotiated settlement option.

In 2006, due to the events at the Douglas Creek Estates in Caledonia, Ontario, lands being part of the Six Nations’ Hamilton Port Dover Plank Road Claim, the Six Nations Elected Council did not pursue the exploratory talks.

From 2006 to 2009, the Six Nations Elected Council, Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council, Canada and Ontario participated at a negotiations table with the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council as the lead with respect to the Douglas Creek Estates. These negotiations eventually discontinued as agreements between all parties could not be reached.

In 2009, the Six Nations Elected Council took the original 1995 Litigation between Six Nations of the Grand River v. Canada and Ontario out of abeyance and is in active litigation once more.

Six Nations Land Use Unit

In order to assist with the reviewing of approximately 1,400 permits/licenses per year, the Land Use Unit was created under the Lands and Resources Department to monitor the development of land and the use of resources within specific land claims arising from the Six Nations Tract, granted by the Haldimand Treaty. Additionally, Six Nations treaty rights and interests in our 1701 Nanfan Treaty territory are asserted and protected.

With the assistance of 7 other departments, a consultation and accommodation policy was developed as a tool in preparing and negotiating impact benefit agreements and land use agreements that address meaningful consultation, accommodation and compensation requirements.

Slow, Costly, Ineffective

The Federal Government’s Specific Claims Policy is based upon a cash settlement payout for an extinguishment of lands from First Nations. However, the validity of some treaties are ignored while other treaties are called into question and, as we have seen in the case of land transfers with Six Nations, the legality of transactions that resulted in the loss of land can be challenged. Legal uncertainty for all affected parties is the result of a flawed Federal Policy that imposes a costly, slow, cumbersome process.

In the meantime, municipalities strive to accommodate growing populations and commercial expansion while seeking to balance the strain these place upon existing infrastructure as well as natural resources and the environment. These situations, and these concerns, are shared by Six Nations which create the potential for discord and confrontation, as the Ontario Government has recognized and sought to address from past events at Oka, Ipperwash Provincial Park and Caledonia a few years ago.

Haida, Taku River and Mikisew Nations

Three Supreme Court of Canada decisions:

i) Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests);

ii) Taku River Tlingit First Nation v. British Columbia (Project Assessment Director) and;

iii) Mikisew Cree Nation v. Canada (Minister of Canadian Heritage);

have far-reaching implications for all First Nations including Six Nations and its neighbours within the Haldimand Tract.

In these cases, the court confirmed the Crown’s duty to “consult meaningfully” and to “accommodate” the interests of First Nations, even where a claim had not been proven. The court limited this obligation to the Crown. It did not extend this legal obligation to third parties. The Crown may abide by the law, as per the Supreme Court, and fulfill its lawful obligations to First Nations. The Crown cannot simply tell First Nations to “go elsewhere to practice their rights”.

For further information, please visit our website at www.sixnations.ca.
The Ontario government initiated the Grand River Notification Agreement (GRNA) to avoid potential disputes between various levels of government and First Nations. The parties to the agreement have agreed to share information with each other, and to notify each other, of plans or development that might affect their common interests i.e. economic development, land use and environmental matters that may affect the water quality in the southern Grand River Watershed.

**To date, there are 14 signatories to the GRNA:**
1. Six Nations of the Grand River;
2. Mississaugas of New Credit;
3. The Corporation of the City of Brantford;
4. The Corporation of the Township of the Brantford;
5. The Corporation of the County of Brant;
6. The Corporation of the Town of Dunnville;
7. The Corporation of the Town of Haldimand;
8. The Regional Municipality of Haldimand-Norfolk;
9. The Corporation of the Township of Onondaga;
10. The Corporation of the Town of Paris;
11. The Corporation of the Township of South Dumfries;
12. Grand River Conservation Authority;
13. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada (Minister of Indian Affairs); (In the lastest draft in 2009, Canada refused to sign and was removed as a party)
14. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Ontario (Minister Responsible for Native Affairs).

Since enactment of the agreement in October 1996, it has grown beyond strictly environmental concerns into much more, perhaps even a potential vehicle to aid in the resolution of outstanding land claims.

The Federal Specific Claims process is inherently adversarial and unfair. It pits First Nations against the Federal Government, which appoints itself "judge and jury" of claims filed by First Nations, including violations of its trust and fiduciary responsibilities.

The federal process also promotes an “us versus them” perception among other levels of governments, municipal and provincial, by designating them “third party interests.”

These levels of government are excluded from the process yet affected by it.

The present Federal Specific Claims process seems designed to result in acrimony and costly legal action. The courts have recognized this and have routinely suggested that a better place to settle outstanding land claims is at the negotiation table rather than in long, expensive, debilitating court cases.

The Ontario Government may have grasped this when it envisioned the process that led to the Grand River Notification Agreement — a more cooperative approach based upon mutual respect and recognition of diverse interests but with a common goal. That goal, simply put, is to establish a working relationship among neighbours in order to avoid disagreement and legal entanglement.

The GRNA is not without its critics or its shortcomings. However, Six Nations faces similar problems as other signatories to the agreement:
1. A lack of funding to provide sufficient capacity to monitor and report on developments;
2. A limited ability to research and notify other signatories to the GRNA in a timely fashion;
3. A lack of awareness or understanding of the issues that might concern the interests of the other parties to the agreement.
The Six Nations Wildlife Management Office is one example of what works. The wildlife manager participates in committees concerned with long-term management of the Grand River Watershed. The officer has been able to contribute to or express concerns regarding projects, proposals, environmental issues, hunting and fishing rights both on and off Six Nations Territory. Most importantly, the officer does so early enough in the planning stages to avoid disputes, before development has already taken place.

The wildlife manager encourages better communications between various organizations within the agreement area. However, the wildlife officer also promotes the Grand River Notification Agreement as a model to other communities along the Grand River Watershed as a means of resolving differences of opinion, and encourages the remainder of the Grand River Watershed to participate in the agreement.

The following is a list of some of the committees the Six Nations Wildlife manager participates in:
1. Archaeological Working Group
2. Carolinian Canada Coalition – board of directors
3. Caledonia Fish Way Committee
4. Carolinian Woodland Recover Strategy
5. Dunnville Fish Ladder Operations Management Committee
6. Dunnville Fishway Committee
7. Grand River Fisheries Plan Implementation Committee
8. Grand River Foundation – board of directors
9. Grand River Heritage Working Group
10. Grand River Water Management Plan Steering Committee
11. Grand River Watershed Consortim
12. Grand Strategy Co-coordinating Committee
13. Habitat Stewardship Program – Partners in Recovery
14. Haldimald and Norfolk Stewardship Council
15. Lake Erie Shore Water Protection Committee
16. Low Water Response Team
17. Lower Grand Eco-system Restoration Working Group
18. Natural Heritage Working Group
19. Ontario Power Generation/Nanticoke – Public Liaison Committee
20. Ontario Raccoon Rabies Communications Team
21. Southern Ontario Water Consortium
22. Spills Notification Committee
23. Toronto Dominion Friends of the Environment – board of directors
24. Guest lecturer as requested