

Commission d'enquête sur le déclin des populations de saumon rouge du fleuve Fraser

Public Hearings

Audience publique

Commissioner

L'Honorable juge /
The Honourable Justice
Bruce Cohen

Commissaire

Held at: Tenue à :

Room 801 Federal Courthouse 701 West Georgia Street Vancouver, B.C.

Tuesday, December 14, 2010

Salle 801 Cour fédérale 701, rue West Georgia Vancouver (C.-B.)

le mardi 14 décembre 2010



Commission d'enquête sur le déclin des populations de saumon rouge du fleuve Fraser

Errata for the Transcript of Hearings on December 14, 2010

Page	Line	Error	Correction
ii		incomplete title	Patrick McGowan Associate Commission Counsel
ii		incomplete title	Jennifer Chan Junior Commission Counsel
iii		counsel did not attend hearing	remove Keith Lowes
iv		James Walkus is not a participant	remove from record
iv		Musgagmagw Tsawataineuk Tribal Counsel	Musgamagw Tsawataineuk Tribal Council
		Consistent spelling of Nlha7apmx (i.e. Nlaka'pamux etc)	Nlha7apmx
5	17	income or are part of	indiscernible or are part of
25	33	James Tate	James Teit
30	6	may be	maybe
31	42	Is the (sic) required?	Remove the (sic)
35	38	Lakahamen	Nlha7apmx
46	44	titling rights	title and rights
49	18	comanagement	co-management

Suite 2800, PO Box 11530, 650 West Georgia Street, Vancouver, BC V6B 4N7 Tel: 604 658 3600 Toll-free Tel: 1 877 658 2808

Fax: 604 658 3644 Toll-free Fax: 1 877 658 2809 www.cohencommission.ca

APPEARANCES / COMPARUTIONS

Patrick McGowan Commission Counsel Jennifer Chan Commission Counsel

Mark East Government of Canada

Charles Fugère

Boris Tyzuk, Q.C. Province of British Columbia

No appearance Pacific Salmon Commission

No appearance B.C. Public Service Alliance of Canada

Union of Environment Workers B.C.

("BCPSAC")

No appearance Rio Tinto Alcan Inc. ("RTAI")

No appearance B.C. Salmon Farmers Association

("B.C.SFA")

No appearance Seafood Producers Association of B.C.

("SPAB.C.")

No appearance Aquaculture Coalition: Alexandra

Morton; Raincoast Research Society; Pacific Coast Wild Salmon Society

("AQUA")

Tim Leadem, Q.C. Conservation Coalition: Coastal Alliance

for Aquaculture Reform Fraser Riverkeeper Society; Georgia Strait Alliance; Raincoast Conservation Foundation; Watershed Watch Salmon Society; Mr. Otto Langer; David Suzuki

Foundation ("CONSERV")

No appearance Area D Salmon Gillnet Association; Area

B Harvest Committee (Seine) ("GILLFSC")

APPEARANCES / COMPARUTIONS, cont'd.

David Butcher, Q.C. Southern Area E Gillnetters Assn.

B.C. Fisheries Survival Coalition ("SGAHC")

No appearance West Coast Trollers Area G Association;

United Fishermen and Allied Workers'

Union ("TWCTUFA")

Keith Lowes B.C. Wildlife Federation; B.C. Federation

of Drift Fishers ("WFFDF")

James Reynolds Maa-nulth Treaty Society; Tsawwassen

Derek Christ First Nation; Musqueam First Nation

This it allows

("MTM")

Robert Janes Western Central Coast Salish First

Sarah Sharp Nations:

Cowichan Tribes and Chemainus First

Nation

Hwlitsum First Nation and Penelakut Tribe Te'mexw Treaty Association ("WCCSFN")

Brenda Gaertner

Leah Pence Fisheries Council; Aboriginal Caucus of

the Fraser River; Aboriginal Fisheries Secretariat; Fraser Valley Aboriginal

First Nations Coalition: First Nations

Fisheries Society; Northern Shuswap Tribal

Council; Chehalis Indian Band;

Secwepemc Fisheries Commission of the Shuswap Nation Tribal Council; Upper Fraser Fisheries Conservation Alliance; Other Douglas Treaty First Nations who applied together (the Snuneymuxw,

Tsartlip and Tsawout)

No appearance Adams Lake Indian Band

No appearance Carrier Sekani Tribal Council ("FNC")

No appearance Council of Haida Nation

APPEARANCES / COMPARUTIONS, cont'd.

Joe Gereluk Métis Nation British Columbia ("MNB.C.")

Nicole Schabus Sto:lo Tribal Council

Cheam Indian Band ("STCCIB")

No appearance Laich-kwil-tach Treaty Society

James Walkus and Chief Harold Sewid Aboriginal Aquaculture Association

("LJHAH")

No appearance Heiltsuk Tribal Council ("HTC")

Krista Robertson Musgagmagw Tsawataineuk Tribal

Counsel ("MTTC")

TABLE OF CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATIERES

PANEL NO. 10: (Affirmed)	PAGE
CHIEF FRED SAMPSON In chief by Mr. McGowan Cross-exam by Ms. Pence Cross-exam by Mr. East Cross-exam by Ms. Schabus	1 4 53/58/64/71 76/77
MR. THOMAS ALEXIS In chief by Mr. McGowan Cross-exam by Ms. Pence Cross-exam by Mr. East Cross-exam by Ms. Schabus Cross-exam by Mr. Geraluk Re-exam by Mr. McGowan	2 37 55/56/60/66/72 76/78 80 81/82
GRAND CHIEF SAUL TERRY In chief by Mr. McGowan Cross-exam by Ms. Pence Cross-exam by Mr. East Cross-exam by Ms. Schabus Re-exam by Mr. McGowan	3 15 57/59/67 77/79 82/83
DR. RON IGNACE In chief by Mr. McGowan Cross-exam by Ms. Pence Cross-exam by Mr. East Cross-exam by Ms. Schabus	3 24 55/62/66 75/79

EXHIBITS / PIECES

No.	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
291	Witness summary of Chief Sampson	2
292	Witness summary of Mr. Thomas Alexis	3
293	Witness summary of Grand Chief Terry	4
294	Witness summary of Dr. Thomas Ignace	4
295	FNFC Co-management discussion paper	
	October 25, 2010	48
296	DFO Aboriginal Aquatic Resource and Oceans	
	Management (AAROM) Program document	59

1 PANEL NO. 10 In chief by Mr. McGowan

46

47

1 Vancouver, B.C. /Vancouver (C.-B.) 2 December 14, 2010/le 14 décembre 3 2010 4 5 The hearing is now resumed. THE REGISTRAR: 6 MR. McGOWAN: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. 7 continuing today with the evidence focusing on 8 aboriginal traditional knowledge, Aboriginal World 9 View and cultural context. We have four 10 panellists for you today. They're all represented 11 by Ms. Gaertner and Ms. Pence. I'll just follow 12 the same pattern I did yesterday of taking a moment to introduce them to you, have their 13 14 witness summaries filed, and then hand them off 15 for a more detailed oral examination to Ms. Pence. 16 Starting on the right, we have Chief Fred 17 Sampson. 18 19 EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY MR. McGOWAN: 20 21 Chief Sampson, you're the chief of the Siska 22 Indian Band? 23 CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes. 24 And that's part of the Nlaka'pamux Nation? 25 CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes, it is a part of Nlaka'pamux 26 Nation. 27 Thank you. And you participated in an interview 28 with Commission counsel on September 21st of this 29 30 CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes, I did. 31 And we produced a summary and you've had a look at 32 that, since that time? 33 CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes. 34 MR. McGOWAN: Okay. If we could just have brought up, 35 please, Mr. Lund? 36 Are you content with the contents of that summary? 37 CHIEF SAMPSON: This is Dr. Ron Ignace's summary I'm 38 looking at. 39 MR. McGOWAN: It's Chief Sampson we're looking for. 40 THE REGISTRAR: Excuse me, counsel. Did you wish them 41 affirmed first, or are you --42 MR. McGOWAN: Perhaps before we mark this, we'll just 43 have the panel affirmed. 44 THE REGISTRAR: Good morning, gentlemen. Do you 45 solemnly affirm that the evidence to be given by

you to this hearing shall be the truth, the whole

truth and nothing but the truth?

```
1
                 (ALL PANEL MEMBERS AFFIRMED)
 3
       THE REGISTRAR: Thank you. Your name, sir?
       DR. IGNACE: Dr. Ronald E. Ignace. My Shuswap name is
 5
            Stsmél'ecgen.
 6
       THE REGISTRAR:
                       Thank you.
 7
       GRAND CHIEF TERRY:
                          Saul Terry.
8
      MR. ALEXIS:
                   Thomas Alexis.
 9
       CHIEF SAMPSON: Fred Sampson.
10
       THE REGISTRAR: Thank you, gentlemen.
                                              Counsel?
11
       MR. McGOWAN: Thank you. If we could have Chief
12
            Sampson's summary brought up.
13
            As you said, sir, you've had an opportunity to
14
            review this summary, and you adopt its contents?
15
       CHIEF SAMPSON:
                      I do.
16
            Thank you. Mr. Alexis --
17
      MR. McGOWAN: Moving to the left, Mr. Commissioner.
18
            You're a member and former chief of the Tl'azt'en
19
            Nation?
20
       MR. ALEXIS: Yes.
21
            And the Tl'azt'en Nation is a member -- is part of
22
            the Carrier Sekani Tribal Council, or --
23
      MR. ALEXIS: Yes, they are.
24
            Okay. And you're also a board member for the
25
            UFFCA presently?
26
      MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I am.
27
            And UFFCA, does that stand for Upper Fraser
28
            Fisheries Conservation Alliance?
29
       MR. ALEXIS: Yes, that's it.
30
            Okay. And you also had an interview with the
31
            Commission on September 22nd of this year?
32
      MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I did.
33
            Okay. And you've had a chance to review that
34
            summary?
35
       MR. ALEXIS: I did.
36
            Okay. And you adopt its contents?
37
      MR. ALEXIS:
                   Yes.
38
      MR. McGOWAN: Okay. And I wonder if before we mark
39
            this one if we could just mark the last one, Chief
40
            Sampson's, assign an exhibit number.
41
       THE REGISTRAR: For Chief Sampson, the exhibit number
42
            is number 291.
43
      MR. McGOWAN: Thank you.
                                 And Mr. Alexis' summary?
44
       THE REGISTRAR: 292.
45
                 EXHIBIT 291: Witness summary for Chief
46
47
                 Sampson
```

3 PANEL NO. 10 In chief by Mr. McGowan

46

47

MR. McGOWAN:

1 EXHIBIT 292: Witness summary for Mr. Thomas 2 Alexis 3 4 MR. McGOWAN: Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, now moving 5 to the left as we face the panel, we have Grand 6 Chief Saul Terry. 7 Chief, you're a member of the Stl'atl'imx Nation? GRAND CHIEF TERRY: 8 That's right. 9 Okay. And you're presently the Chief Executive 10 Officer of the Inter-Tribal Treaty Organization? 11 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: That's correct. 12 And that's sometimes referred to as the ITO? 13 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: That's right. 14 And I understand you're also a commissioner on the 15 Pacific Salmon Commission; is that right? GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Correct. 16 17 Okay. And your interview with the Commission was 18 on September 21st of this year, and we produced a 19 summary from that. Have you had a chance to 20 review that? GRAND CHIEF TERRY: 21 Yes. Okay. And you've made any corrections that you --22 23 that are required? 24 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Satisfied with the way it's 25 presented there now, yeah. 26 MR. McGOWAN: Thank you. And finally moving to the 27 left, Dr. Ron Ignace. 28 Sir, you have a Ph.D. in anthropology from Simon 29 Fraser University? 30 DR. IGNACE: Yes. 31 And you're a former chief of the -- is it 32 Skeetchestn? 33 DR. IGNACE: Skeetchestn, yes. 34 Skeetchestn Band. You were a chief there for over 35 20 years? 36 DR. IGNACE: Yes. 37 And you're also a former chair of the Shuswap 38 Tribal Council? DR. IGNACE: Yes. 39 40 Thank you. And have you had a chance to review 41 the witness summary we produced for your interview 42 on September 21st? 43 DR. IGNACE: (Speaking Secwepemc) 44 Okay. And you're content with the contents? 45 DR. IGNACE: (Speaking Secwepemc).

Thank you. If we could mark those -- I

think we've only marked two, so if we could mark

4
PANEL NO. 10
In chief by Mr. McGowan
Cross-exam by Ms. Pence (FNC)

the last two now.

 THE REGISTRAR: For Grand Chief Terry, it will be 293, and for Dr. Ignace, 294.

EXHIBIT 293: Witness summary for Grand Chief Terry

EXHIBIT 294: Witness summary for Dr. Thomas Ignace

MR. McGOWAN: Mr. Commissioner, Commission counsel relies on the summaries as its examination in chief, and I'll now pass it off to Ms. Pence, counsel for the panellists, to conduct her examination.

MS. PENCE: Thank you, Patrick, and Mr. Commissioner.

I'm going to start the examinations today and the questions to the panellists in kind of a geographic order. So I'll just start with questions to Chief Sampson, and then I'll move and ask certain questions of Grand Chief Terry, and then I will move to Dr. Ignace, and I'll finish with Thomas Alexis. My hope is that I can finish the questions to these witnesses this morning.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. PENCE:

So, Chief Sampson, can you take the Commissioner and the rest of us in the room here out of this room and explain to us where Siska is, where your community is, where it is within the greater Nlaka'pamux Nation, please.

CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes. My community is pretty well centralized within the Nlaka'pamux territory. We're located north of Boston Bar and nine kilometres south of Lytton on the Number 1 Highway and the main stem Fraser River. Our community is located in the canyon, so it's a very incredibly steep area, and the river is extremely narrow.

The community, of course, historically, has been there for a long, long, long time. Through archaeological studies and research that was conducted in the area years ago, there's very strong evidence that that community has been there for a long, long time. In my community, we have 150 community members that live on the reserve, and about that much off the reserve, because the

size of the reserve is very small. We have approximately 1200 acres of reserve lands, and that was primarily -- of course, the allotment of reserves in British Columbia were directly related to historic fishing stations, and Siska most certainly is one of those.

In the immediate area just below the reserve, you can throw a rock across the river. It's incredibly narrow. This gave excellent opportunities to fish because the salmon would get condensed into those areas and it was a very strong historic dipnet fishery in that area. Chief Sampson, if you could also share with the

- Q Chief Sampson, if you could also share with the Commissioner how many communities or bands form part of the Nlaka'pamux Nation?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Yeah, there's a total of 16 bands that income -- or are part of the Nlaka'pamux Nation. Approximately -- well, they say we're getting close to historic numbers now, so I would think that we're in and around between 20,000 and 30,000, within the entire Nation. So slowly getting back up there.
- Q Now, Chief Sampson, you started to talk about this, and I'd like you to speak in a little more detail about where it is that you fish, how you get to your fishing spot and what kind of fishing methods you use there.

CHIEF SAMPSON: Okay. As I was saying earlier, it's a very steep part of the canyon, so of course you access the river by fishing trails. So you walk down into -- down to the water, and all of the fishing sites are there. Where my family fishes, it is the key dipnet site in the Siska area, to the point that when you're down there at the fishing site, there is what we call the dipping rock. You can actually see where our ancestors have worn the rock.

There are three different levels to the dipping rock, and they -- as the river drops, then people will move and shift. Of course they have to, to stay close to the water. But there are three levels on that rock and I was told by my grandfather that that rock was put there by Coyote for the people, and he made the rock have those three levels that targeted and coincided with the three biggest runs that come up our river. You can actually see the rock is worn. When I stand

down there and I'm going to start dipping, I have this incredible sense of belonging, because I know that I'm standing in the footprints of my ancestors, and you can see that. You can see it when you look there. You can see the rock is worn from years and years and years of people dipping on that same site.

My grandmother and grandfather told me that people would come all the way across country from the Merritt area through Sunshine Valley through the Boston Bar trail to come to Siska to fish, because the ability to catch huge numbers in a very short period of time are there. I mean, to the point when I was nine years old, me and my buddy went down and we seen the fish just going by, and we're just young fellas, but we were still dipnet fishermen, and we grabbed those nets and we went to town, and before we knew it, within 45 minutes to an hour, me and my buddy had 250 salmon in the holding hole, which is a great big bowl that's worn right into the bedrock. That's where we would put the fish. It's right close to the dip site. That, too, was put there by Coyote for us to hold our salmon when we fished.

Then we realized that we'd better stop. We're having too much fun. The work begins. We had 250 salmon. You can only pack 15 to 20 up the hill at a time, and it is well over an hour to get up top. It is steep. It is a hard, hard climb. At that time, we were still using baskets with a head strap. So at nine years old, I was able to pack 20 salmon up that hill and do it five times a day. We took a huge amount of salmon out of that — out of that river in dipnet fisheries.

I mean, those kinds of things, they're almost non-existent now. The ability to go and use a dipnet and go fishing is so greatly restricted that we're lucky if we get two days for a dipnet fishery. How do you transfer knowledge and traditional knowledge to your children when your opportunities are so restricted now?

My son is 18 years old. He doesn't know how to make a dip net. I made my own first dip net when I was nine years old. I haven't had the time to teach him that because when we do get the opportunities to fish, it's, "Stand aside, son. We gotta go, we gotta give 'er," and we'll go

around the clock. He's in school so he loses out, and he has lost out on his traditional knowledge and his culture.

Q Chief Sampson, I wonder if you can tell the Commissioner and the rest of us in the room a little bit more about this dipnet fishing being a selective method, which is something I believe is included in your summary.

CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, the dip net is absolutely probably the most efficient selective fishing tool, at least if the numbers are there and you are on the right piece of river. A dip net is an incredible selective tool.

My grandmother used to always tell me that there are certain times that we'd go fishing, and the good example that I use is on -- on the chinook. She would wait until the mock orange blossoms came out on the trees, on the bushes, then she would say, "Now we're going to go fish spring salmon." I asked her, "How come? There fish in the river right now. I see them when I walk down there. I can see them swimming by." And she would tell me, "Because those fish belong to someone else." So already, at that time, and prior, there was management regimes in place based on respect. She would not go fishing until those orange blossoms came out, the mock orange blossoms came out on the bushes. She said it's because those fish belong to those people up there, respecting the northern tribes and those people that actually owned that fish. That was part of that universal -- a universal sharing formula that was communicated between nations, and respecting each other and the fish resource.

Q Chief Sampson, can you speak to some of the ceremonies that are held at Siska that involve or that honour salmon?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Oh, absolutely. For us at Siska, there is a First Fish Ceremony. In some cases, it's conducted by the whole community, but each family has their own way of paying respect to the salmon in a First Fish Ceremony. For myself, when I go down, I go down with my wife and we go down and we start dipping or we set the net, and the very first fish that we catch, we release it back into the river alive, and we say to that fish, "Thank you, my relative." They are not a fish to us;

they are our relatives. We believed that by returning fish to the river, they would continue to come back for us in respect.

This is -- like I say, it's done by different families (sic). I know some families who will do their First Fish Ceremony, they'll actually catch the first fish and they will actually kill it. But they would take a piece of its -- its flesh or a piece of its rib and honour the fish that way and put it back into the river. So it varies from family to family, community to community. But the key point is the respect that's paid to the fish because they are our relatives, they are our family who come back to nourish us.

In the past in Nlaka'pamux territory, a lot of our dead were placed into the river when they passed away. The burying and burial grounds and headstones and that was a -- came after contact. My grandmother told me that they used to put our people back into the river, 'cause they would come back as the salmon. So there was that high respect. Not only was this a fish, it was your relative.

- Thank you. Now, recognizing that you're not a fish biologist, but instead a fisher with an incredible amount of experience on the river, can you tell the Commissioner some of the observations that you've made about the health of the fish that are returning at Siska?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, I mean, I can just go back to that story of when I was nine years old, and even at that age, having the ability to catch 250 salmon in 45 minutes to an hour, but over time that has steadily, steadily declined to where the point, in 2009 and 2008, I could dip for a whole hour and would not catch one fish. So there's obviously been huge drastic declines since the time when I was nine years old up to the 2007,'08 and '09, where I could spend a whole hour down there and all I do is get exercise, to the point where when they did -- would close the dipnet fisheries.

I had contemplated going down to the river with my dipnet and taking the mesh off and going dipping, just to see what would happen. If Barry (phonetic) came along in a boat and saw me dipping in a closed -- on a closed day but with no net in

the dip net, to be able to say to him, "Well, at least I'm getting exercise." It would be -- it made no difference whether I had a net on that dip net or not, because a whole hour, I couldn't even catch a fish.

So most certainly, after time, there's been huge changes. Temperature water (sic), at that dipping site that I talk about, in the last five years I'm seeing bedrock that I've never ever seen in my life, so that tells me that there's been huge changes to the water levels over time. To actually see rocks in the river that you've never seen in your life -- and I bet if my grandmother was still alive, she would very easily say, "I have never ever seen these rocks in my life." So there is definitely changes that are happening to the river.

We see a lot more lesions now on the fish. We're positive that's directly related to sea lice, because we see more and more fish now that have spots all over them. Once the salmon's skin has been breached, it allows the bacteria that builds up in warmer water temperatures, and it impacts the fish.

Numbers, drastically reduced. Bears down at the river, drastically reduced. In the good years, right across from our site there's what they call a catchment area where all of the logs and all of the debris and that catches on one side of the river. We could see 20 bears down there. Now, you're lucky if you see one or two.

This year, with the heavy return, we saw seven. That is still way down from the past, and I think it's because of the inconsistency. The bears can't rely on it.

- Thank you. You spoke a little bit initially about some of the impacts you're noticing to your culture from not having the level of fish returning year to year. Could you speak in a little more detail about what happens to your culture when you don't have that opportunity to fish?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, with it, of course, all of it —
 I mean there's not only the loss of the practice
 itself, there's the loss of the language. That
 language is really key to whole big parts of our
 fisheries. I mean, in our language alone, there

are 47 different words that describe all the parts of a salmon, and all the different names for the different species of salmon. It is very complex in the sense that our relationship to the fish resource is directly linked to our languages.

So when there are huge impacts to our fishery, and the inability to fish and practice and utilize our traditional fishing methods, not only is there a cultural loss in that aspect, but there is a loss in language as well, and most certainly a huge loss in the transferring of that knowledge to our children.

Thank you. Can you describe your people's relationship with the fish in terms of food, social and ceremonial fishing and describe what that term that we often refer to as "FSC" means to you?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, FSC, I've tossed this one around in my head so many times over the years, after being in leadership and hearing, the first time, hearing that term, "food, social, ceremonial". In my mind, it was always the ceremonial that would be placed first, because there is such a deep, deep, deep respect to the fish resource and how we interact with the fish, how we recognize them as being a part of us, our relatives. By placing our dead into the river, they came back as salmon. By doing First Salmon Ceremonies, we paid respect to the fish, that the fish would come back and feed our children.

I think that in relationship to that, when you look at food, social, ceremonial, most certainly what I see it as is the social part of it is the people, and the people are in the middle. The ceremonial and the food is what rotates around on the outside of the people or the community that utilize the fish.

So I can't really -- you know, I can't really agree with the acronym, but in some sense, I can relate to it. I think it's, you know, our inability to determine what "social" means in that acronym. It is an imposed concept. It doesn't really capture the First Nations' way of thinking or their value system and how they look at fishing and the act of fishing.

So I think that -- well, I think that's pretty well my thought on "food, social,

ceremonial". It needs to be recognized and broadened, I guess. What does that mean to a First Nations, a Nation, and their approach? Thank you. You mentioned that it doesn't capture

your thinking and your view of the fish. Some of the things -- one of the things that the Commissioner has been hearing about is traditional knowledge, First Nations traditional knowledge and traditional ecological knowledge. You spoke about some of the indicators.

Can you share with the Commissioner how First Nations' thinking, as you said, can be better incorporated into management decisions and can better aid management decisions in relation to Fraser River sockeye?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, first and foremost, the biggest weakness that I've found is that the traditional ecological knowledge is not recognized and not respected by contemporary scientists and biologists and these people who are technicians who participate in the management of fisheries through the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. We believe that traditional ecological knowledge is going to play, and will play, a key role in the management of the fish resource if -- if it's recognized and has equal footing at that -- at the tables where these decisions are being made.

Far often -- far too often, when I'm at meetings with scientists and elders trying to talk about traditional ecological knowledge and how it relates to fish, the scientists will turn around and say to us, "You just don't understand the science." We turn around and we tell them the opposite, "No, it's you who does not understand. You will not recognize traditional ecological knowledge, and the vital role it can play in the management of all resources."

Do you have suggestions on how that can be moved forward, how traditional knowledge can be seen on equal footing at those discussions and those meetings?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, as I said, it has to be respected. It has to be able to have equal footing at that table, and we, as First Nations, have to be at those tables, and currently we're not. We're pushed back from the tables where the big decisions are being made. When the province

 issues fishing licences in this province, First Nations are not at that table to say, yeah, we agree with that or, no, we disagree with that. I mean, look at the huge effort that went into the early-time chinook and trying to curtail the recreational fisheries. It took the First Nations right from the spawning grounds all the way down to the ocean to have any kind of impact. And who were we fighting against? It was just an unreal discussion.

And to hear that the killer whales won a court case when First Nations had been fighting to protect this resource for the last 20 years, and to have killer whales come in and win a court case against DFO, and those — those killer whales, their main diet is early-time chinook. Through that study, that's what they found. Those killer whales rely on the early-time chinook and yet they were just having wide open recreational fisheries to the point where these runs were almost exterminated.

Louis Creek had six early chinook returns. That is frightening, not only to me as a First Nation, but to everybody as a British Columbian. When we have one of our resources in this province almost extinct -- and not just in the Louis Creek. There was the Deadman Creek, there was the Coldwater, there was the Nicola. Huge declines in the early-time chinook. That is unacceptable, and yet it happens.

Q Chief Sampson, I'm going to take you back a little bit to the traditional knowledge piece, and specifically as early traditional practices. You mention the dip net. Can you describe for the Commissioner some ways that those traditional fishing methods are being kind of reborn in more modern tools, fishing tools?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Oh, sure. I mean, absolutely the dip net has been redesigned. It is now a fish wheel, which is basically a giant dip net except it's got three nets on it. It does the same thing, it has exactly the same principle. The salmon are coming up the river, the dip net goes down the river and you catch fish. The fish wheel does that.

We have an inland -- we're exploring an inland communal commercial fishery. We had a huge effort last year and we utilized beach seines. We

wanted to use our fish wheels, but we were told, no, because science -- there you go again -- it was the scientists who we were working with on the wheel, collecting data, so we're handling all of these fish, we're handling them, we're collecting scales and DNA and sexing and sizing, and we wanted to do the commercial communal fishery. But the Science Branch would not let that happen on our fish wheel. They said, "If you start pulling fish off of this wheel for commercial use, we will shut this wheel down." And yet there was a beautiful opportunity to do both of those things together.

And the fish wheel itself is highly selective, highly selective. The fish are captured, they slide off ramps, they go into holding pens that are open on the bottom with screens so they're well irrigated, and it allows us to release steelhead, coho, chinook, sturgeon, eels, red-sided shiners, trout, whitefish. Any of the none-targeted species, we can release unscathed. Unscathed. Not the same as a catch-and-release fishery where the chinook salmon is caught, it's played for an hour and a half. They don't have any way to tag that fish to know if it actually survives to the spawning ground. What are those real numbers?

So the wheel is very similar in that sense to a dip net. It's highly selective.

- I'd like to move to ask you some questions about co-management or joint management. I'd like to start by asking what is your definition of co-management?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Yeah, well, co-management to me means the right to manage something, but not a right to the resource itself. So I would more lean towards the side of what is joint management.
- Q Mm-hmm.
- CHIEF SAMPSON: And I would put my -- I will put my title in front of rights, so I would say this is a titling right, because once you have title, the rights flow from that. I'm regressing (sic).
- Q What do you think would need to be done from the First Nations perspective, First Nations speaking with each other on a Nation-to-Nation level, to put the structures in place for what you have called joint management?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, most certainly we need the capacity to do so. There is -- we are out there, but we're not engaged. With the steady cutbacks to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans -- and it's strictly constantly moved us farther and farther away from those tables where we will be recognized.

We have awe some organizations out there. We have the ITO, we have the First Nations Fisheries Council. There are coalitions. My friends here all participate in those, but to what end, if we're constantly being told, "There is no money, there is no money"? This isn't about money. It's about saving these fish for our future generations, and not only ours, but yours too.

- MS. PENCE: If I could just have one moment, Mr. Commissioner.
- Q Chief Sampson, just as a final question, I wonder if you could speak to, and give the Commissioner your perspective on the role of First Nations on the international scene with regards to sockeye management?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Are you talking about the Pacific Fisheries Commission -- Panel?
- Q Pacific Salmon Commission, if you'd like to.
 CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, absolutely. I mean, First
 Nations need to be at those tables where the
 decisions are being made and to bring about those
 changes at those levels, at the high level. We
 need to be fully endorsed and recognized at those
 tables, and have equal say and equal voice.

In many cases, it's more of symbolism or tokenism that aboriginal people sit at those tables, and you will hear from my friends of the frustrations that they have, in wanting to do the right thing, and wanting to engage so that our knowledge and our fish are protected for our future generations. And yet their voice isn't heard or respected at those tables.

- MS. PENCE: Thank you, Chief Sampson.
 - I'd like to move and direct my questions now to Grand Chief Terry. I'm just going to pull up my materials.
- Q Grand Chief Terry, I understand that the Commissioner actually made his way up to Lillooet and up to Bridge River this summer. But I wonder if you could explain for us in the room now and

for the record where your community of Xwisten is, Bridge River is, where it's located and where your fishing spots are there.

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Yes. Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, good morning.

THE COMMISSIONER: Good morning.

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Certainly it was -- we were pleased to host the Commissioner and his people there at Bridge River this summer. Bridge River is located near what is known as the village or the municipality of Lillooet. It's a few miles above that, about three or four miles, our town, where the location of our fishery is.

Essentially, the Xwisten fishery is very lucrative and much as Fred has explained at his community, there experiences some tremendous opportunities for harvesting salmon. Same at Bridge River.

Bridge River is really a focal point because of the conditions there are such that we are capable of harvesting a lot of fish as well. I think that historically we were able to harvest so many fish that it was — it was not only a food staple for our people through the winter, but it was also a trade, goods for — with our neighbours and/or with the — at that time, the Hudson's Bay Company. We used to — our folks used to trade quite — have a lucrative enterprise trading back and forth until we were sort of outlawed from doing that, the latter part of the 19th century, I guess, and which seems to go on today.

Q Could you situate Bridge River and Xwisten within the larger St'at'imc territory for us, Grand Chief Terry?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: I'm sorry?

- Q Could you situate Bridge River, where it is within the larger St'at'imc territory?
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: The Bridge River is in the northern sector of the St'at'imc country, and above us would be the Pavilion people. That would be the northernmost reaches of the St'at'imc or up in and through the -- we're going up into the northern territory then of the Secwepemc. That's -- we're at the northern tip, then.

There are seven communities that are directly located in and around the area of our community, and I think that the Xaxli'p or the Fountain

people are across the river from us on the Fraser. Just south of us would be the people we call the Tit'q'et or the Lillooet, and also Sekw'el'wás or Cayoose. Over the — over the mountain is Lake — Seton Lake, and there is the Seton people that live in that area.

Many of these folks now need to gravitate to Bridge River to do a lot of their fishing because of the impacts, tremendous impacts that the Hydro developments in our area have impacted on the fishery. So therefore it really needs to -- they need to come to the Bridge River and our areas there to do their fishery -- fishing.

- Thank you. Can you describe for us, and just paint a bit of a word picture in terms of what the fishing at Bridge River looks like, what kind of methods are used, what kind of rocks you might see, all of that sort of detail.
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, primarily we do the -- what some people called wind-dried or sun-dried. The -- because of the heat in the summer, the -- it's very conducive for the wind to generate, you know, along the river banks, and our people have set up various racks we call them racks where we hang the fish once they're processed. Primarily they are the means by which we process is drying our fish. That's a prized product that we use.

 O Mm-hmm.
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: In terms of harvesting, we do use the setnet process as well as the dipnet process. The difference is that the set net is anchored to the bank and the dip net is utilized in a paddle. You know, it's like a paddling process. So you're -- it is not anchored and the folks are just using the current, the swiftness of the current to paddle the river and then the fish swim up into it.

In the set net, it is utilizing the up current in the river that helps the setnet people. Also we utilize now the gillnet process and those kind of things now.

- Q How important is a high level of abundance to the methods that you've described, the setnet, the dipnet methods.
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, it certainly lends itself to being very effective in retrieving or harvesting the fish when there's abundance. Certainly it's

pretty trying when there's low abundance or a lack of returns in the runs. Then it's very difficult for folks to meet their needs for the winter. We've been experiencing this for quite a number of generations. But I think too that because of that, we're investigating again the utilization of Some of our folks in the Seton area weirs. reintroduced the weir, for example, this past summer, and just by locating the various poles that were used previous to their being outlawed from use, and so they've relocated them, and then began using them again this summer because of the fact that there's a high -- higher rate of control on the kind of fish that you catch and what you can release and -- up the river. Those kind of things, I think, are very important for the greater returns in the future.

Q Thank you. I asked this question of Chief Sampson and I'd like to ask it of you as well, Grand Chief Terry. That is, can you describe your people's relationship with salmon for food, social and ceremonial purposes and what does this term -- this term, "FSC", mean to you?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, for those that know me, I've been involved with the politics of Indian rights in this province for 40 years. I'm always suspicious of various names being given to -- or acronyms applied to many of the rights that our people have.

Too often, I'm thinking that food, social and ceremonial, you know, may be too susceptible to interpretation of different kinds, or it's not very clear. Because I think our people also are interested in barter/trade and sale of the resource, and I think that much of that is, you know, left out in that particular picture, or can be. So I think that there's a greater definition that needs to be applied that is determined by our people, not by someone else.

- And in your witness summary, when you say that DFO doesn't consider the cultural element of fishing, what do you mean by that?
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, I think that as I believe my colleague here, Chief Sampson, has indicated, that it permeates the wholeness of our culture, of our people, our way of life. Our people have told me, you know, that this is our way of life that our

people are being deprived from. Too often, I feel that we're losing a lot of the culture of our people that's associated with the harvesting of a very important resource in the fish because, for example, I was up in my friend Thomas's area here this summer, and up in that area, many of the elders were saying, "My goodness, we've been without proper quantities of fish for so long," that they couldn't pass on the customs, traditions, the practices to the younger people. I think Chief Sampson also reflected on that.

I think that's the kind of thing that's associated here, and I think that's why it's so important to have our voice heard as how best to deal with the conservation, preservation, enhancement and greater opportunities for bringing back the healthy stock as fish as we seen before. Mm-hmm. Grand Chief Terry, yesterday there were some questions to the panel about ways that First Nations talk with each other to figure out what should happen in times of low abundance. I'm wondering if you could tell the Commissioner a bit about what has happened in terms of dealing with that between and among Nations in terms of the Early Stuart example.

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, the -- most recently, if I could start there, in that about four years ago the Department really realized that they needed to deal with our people because of the fact that the pressure was on them for our people to get fish, and how is it that they're going to allocate this -- in this low abundance period.

But of course I think that they couldn't make the decision themselves, so they had to come to us. I think that's rightly so, because I think that we have been dealing with much of these kind of things for eons, for generations upon generations.

I think our people tell of stories of starvation. In periods of starvation what do we do? You know, there are different strategies that need to be applied. I think the Early Stuarts, for example, we have, in the St'at'imc and Nlaka'pamux and others down river from the Carrier and Sekani peoples, been really making certain that many of the runs are -- or that particular run especially, returns to their spawning grounds

7 8

9

10

15

20

38 39 40

37

41 42 43

and into the homeland areas of the -- of the Carrier peoples, because of the importance that that reflects in their culture, in their history.

So we've done that, and I think just as I think that we too are concerned for many of the stocks that are returning into the Seton River, for example, into the Gates Creek area and the significant diminishment of the numbers is such that we need to safeguard that, and we need to find ways and means to cooperate with one another, and that is one of the reasons why, in 1989, we signed the treaty amongst the various Nations to save the salmon.

Grand Chief Terry, I wonder if you could just get a little bit more specific for us in the room today and tell us what kind of actions you did take in those times of very low abundance. What specific actions did you decide, with your neighbours and other First Nations, in those situations?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, the only thing that comes to mind is the example of -- 2009, I guess that's the year in question here -- is what happened in 2009. What did we do in that time? It was -- we were advised it was a very critical time for making certain that every last fish got up that river, and we, at the St'at'imc, I was primarily the lead person in the fishery up in the area there, and took the lead in deciding what needed to be done on behalf of our people, the St'at'imc people, and -- in relationship also as well to the northern Secwepemc up there as well, and the Carriers.

What we did was that we, as chiefs, got together and talked about this situation. conveyed -- and then we also met with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and tried in getting -- making certain that the numbers that were being talked about were as firm as they are. So we needed to get the information as best as we could, and then the chiefs met amongst ourselves, and then we made a decision. The decision had to be made as to whether or not our people were going to get fish that summer. We decided, yes, our people were going to get fish that summer. were going to go fishing. It was important.

We also knew that the importance of conservation to making certain that there were

salmon that went back to their various natal
streams upriver, and wherever they were going.
But of primary concern was the fact that our
people also needed food for the winter, so we
decided that they needed to go fishing.
Thank you. Grand Chief Terry, I understand fr
Commission counsel that the Intertribal Treaty

Thank you. Grand Chief Terry, I understand from Commission counsel that the Intertribal Treaty Organization, ITO, will likely be explored in more detail in the following year, but I do want to take advantage of your being here today to ask some questions of you about the ITO.

Could you briefly explain to the Commissioner what the Intertribal Treaty Organization, what the ITO is?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, it's -- the ITO, Intertribal Treaty Organization is, I guess one might say, a federation of various Nations of ours along -- on the Fraser River. In this case we had the Carrier Sekani peoples, the Secwepemc peoples, the St'at'imc and Nlaka'pamux. Within the last two months as well, we had the Okanagan Nation as well join the group.

Principally, these are the nations that signed the treaty in 1989. The thing was that we had not implemented the treaty. This was the mechanism that we devised — that is, those that were participating devised to implement the treaty that was signed in 1989. So it essentially is to — prime objective, to save the salmon, and the ways and means of doing that, we figure, had to be done by getting together in this federation, I'd say right now, in order to coordinate our various fishing plans that we have, and how best to implement that in the conservation of our food source.

Q And when was a decision made to kind of re-engage the treaty, to work on implementing this treaty that had been in place since 1989.

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: The treaty was signed in 1989 but really wasn't implemented. So in 2007, after a couple of years of discussions amongst — especially the Nlaka'pamux and the St'at'imc, because we were two nations that — we seen ourselves — and not to pat ourselves too much on the back, but we seen ourselves as the guardians of the treaty because we didn't really sign onto the watershed agreement that was being promoted by

44

45

46

47

the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. 1 therefore Nlaka'pamux and St'at'imc talked about 3 revising the treaty again because of the dire 4 situation that the fish were, you know, 5 encountering. 6 And why do you feel that it's important to develop 7 these relationships between Nations? 8 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Essentially because I believe that 9 politically we understand one another, and how 10 much more effective we can be in dealing with the 11 resource that is so, you know, endangered. 12 believe, too, that socially, I think we needed to 13 address some of these things because our people 14 were getting very concerned for not only in terms 15 of the quantity of the fish, but also in the 16 quality of the fish that were returning. 17 Also, they're concerned for the environment. 18 Where you saw the river beginning to show its 19 ribs, one might say, you know, and that there was 20 so little water coming through there that if there 21 was a good abundance of return, there was 22 tremendous mortality of fish returns going up 23 river. What needed to be done was a collective 24 voice being created that was new, but yet old, 25 because our various homeland areas were devised 26 well over a millennia before, and I think it's 27 time to bring it back because it's needed. 28 Thank you. Now, you mentioned that the ITO isn't Q 29 involved in working together on fishing plans of 30 each of the Nations, but can you describe in a 31 little more detail what your vision is for the 32 role of the ITO in the management of fisheries? 33 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, I think that it's -- if I can 34 sort of compare, if I could, and if it'll make 35 sense to some, that when you look at our 36 territories, they're quite clearly defined. 37 know where there -- our boundaries lay, and we 38 know our own territories best. 39 Also, for example, there was a policy that 40 has been devised by the Government of Canada 41 through its Wild Salmon Policy of various what 42 they call conservation units. Those kinds of 43 delineation of watershed drainage areas that could

be utilized as sort of CUs, they call them,

I think that the territories of our nations

fit that so neatly, I would say, that it would be

conservation units.

an effective means by which we can really manage in a very -- you know, together we can manage better, I feel, in the long run, not only amongst the Indian nations, but also with Canada.

- Q Thank you. My last point on the ITO is if you could explore for us some of the challenges that the ITO might have in moving forward, and like -- what you would like to see done to overcome those challenges.
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Oh, boy. You should come with me for a month or so. There are tremendous challenges, I tell you, because of the manner in which the administration of Indian Affairs happens these days is such that there's no resemblance to what I'm talking about when we're talking about a "Nation". While you can hear the term "First Nation" it really generally reflects onto what is in the *Indian Act* terms "Indian bands". So that was appropriated and then utilized as a means by which you use the term "Nation" then, as "First Nation". So, number one, confusion then begins to build in all of this kind of stuff.

But in terms of Nations having a voice, I say that -- I feel very confident that once we're able to be able to overcome the hesitancy to recognize our Nations, I think it would be much easier.

For example, I think that, at least in my talking with some folks in government is this, "How do we deal with you? We got no legal means by which to deal with you." Whereas in the *Indian Act*, you have *Indian Act* reflects the bands. So therefore, we don't have a means to -- that kind of a mechanism in place to deal with the Nations themselves.

- Q So I heard that challenge, overcoming the "band", "First Nation", moving to a "Nation" system that recognizes the Nations. What other challenges and possible ways to overcome them do you see?
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, there's a concept that has been talked about, about revenue-sharing. That certainly would be helpful for many of our Nations to be able to realize some income, as it were, from our homeland areas from which many are becoming quite affluent these days from many of the lands and resources that are within our territories. I feel that there needs to be a

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

means on how we can best devise ways and means of resourcing our Nations to properly manage not only the fishery, but our ways of life within the territory.

~

And specific to the ITO, what kind of resourcing do you think needs to be in place for the ITO to move forward with its goals?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, I'd be -- we have put forward, and maybe Thomas will be able to elaborate on some of this from his territory as well, or Ron here. But we do -- have put forward ideas on some means by which we could utilize resources to best effect. I push forward too, and I think I tried to share some of this with the Commission in the public forum in Lillooet, in that I think we are in a time when resources are very, you know, hard to get, as it were, economically. And so I think the means by which we are administering the ITO would be a much more effective means of managing because they're with -- instead of, for example, 11 communities coming from St'at'imc to a meeting, you can have one representative speaking for all of the folks in the St'at'imc.

And that's the principle that we're carrying forward with the -- for all the other Nations. So therefore, instead of having, for example, if there were four Nations, instead of having 55 or 47 communities coming together, you'd have five or four people show up at the table and they're talking with authority with the mandate from their Nation to be able to make decisions on the fishery.

So therefore I think, to me, that means you can utilize then much of the stream cleaning, much of the projects that need to be done in our home areas to utilize those dollars in that more effective way, I think, than spending it on enormous huge meetings that sometimes are quite questionable in their -- you know...

- MS. PENCE: Okay. I hear that. Mr. Commissioner, I have just a couple of more questions to Grand Chief Terry.
- Q Grand Chief Terry, you are a commissioner on the Pacific Salmon Commission. We heard that in the introduction. Do you have any views you'd like to share on how First Nations issues regarding the

management of Fraser River sockeye, and I'm including in-season decision-making in that, that can be enhanced at the Pacific Salmon Commission level and at the Fraser Panel level. GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, I think certainly the -- it is nothing new for many of our people to say they want to be able to have a seat at the table, for example, the Fraser Panel. In this Intertribal Fishery Treaty, for example, there are eight Nations encompassing both the Fraser and the Columbia River, mind you. But we thought that we should investigate ways and means, perhaps, that that kind of an arrangement could be realized in order to have a voice from each of the Nations to something that is critical and important for everyone.

I think too that it is important in Canada/United States relations when dealing with a common resource, as the fishery, as to how it is that we're going to be dealing with one another. Now, many of our Nations, the Okanagans, for example, Nlaka'pamux, and in the lower Fraser here too, much of their territories are on both sides of the border, and so we need to maybe take a look at that and see how, perhaps, we can accommodate the ways and means of sitting with the various Nations and how to coordinate that with the Canadian domestic system as well as the international system.

MS. PENCE: Thank you. Those are my questions to Grand Chief Terry. Mr. Commissioner, I note that it's ten after 11:00 and I wonder if we might take the morning break now.

THE REGISTRAR: The hearing will now recess for 15 minutes.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR MORNING RECESS) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

(PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: Order. The hearing is now resumed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. PENCE, continuing:

Q So Dr. Ignace, I'd like to now turn my questions to you. And I'd like to have you start by

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47

describing to the Commissioner where Skeetchestn is, locating it for us within Secwepemc territory and taking -- explaining to us where your people fish in that territory.

DR. IGNACE: (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN)

PR. IGNACE: (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN)

First of all, I'd like to recognize the

Creator and thank Him for giving me the

opportunity to be here. And as well as thank the

West Coast Coast Salish People for allowing us to

have such an important hearing as this in this,

their house. I have to, according to protocol,

recognize another Nation when I enter their house.

Thank you.

DR. IGNACE: (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN)

I would like to say that I wish that I had an opportunity to speak to you all in my language. I feel that I'm at a disadvantage in having to speak in English but I honour and recognize the hearing here. And Mr. Commissioner, thank you for giving me the opportunity to explain myself. What was your question again? Who am I?

- So my question again for you, Dr. Ignace, is if you can describe to the Commissioner where your community of Skeetchestn is and situate it within the larger Secwepemc territory for us.
- DR. IGNACE: (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN)

Excuse me, sorry. First, yes, I'm of Shuswap ancestry. My community is part of the Secwepemc Nation and it's located west of Kamloops, about 40 minutes between Kamloops and Cache Creek. It's -we are part of the Kamloops Division, which makes up -- we have seven regional governments within the Shuswap territory. James Tate called them divisions. But they're not divisions insofar as that we're separated from each other. And each one of our divisions is given the responsibility according to our laws to be the yoochameenmen (phonetic). Yoochameenmen means the caretakers of that part of the Shuswap Nation on behalf of the whole Nation and there are seven other divisions within the Shuswap Nation. And that's where I'm located.

- Q Thank you. Can you also describe for us the rivers within that Shuswap territory where the sockeye return to and flow through?
- DR. IGNACE: If I -- if I may take the liberties, Mr. Commissioner, and state that that was a hundred

years ago -- I should give you some background of my family. My mother's mother was Milani Paul (phonetic) and she's from Kamloops. And her husband is the son of Chief Edward Ignace. And Chief Edward Ignace's wife was Sulyen, who was also a medicine woman. She was a medicine woman -- the daughter of a medicine woman, Miliminetka (phonetic), meaning medicine water. As well as that, she had a brother and an uncle, Jimmy Antoine (phonetic), who was chief, and Joe Tomah, who was also a chief. And Joe Tomah was one of the chiefs among the -- our Nations here that met with Sir Wilfred Laurier in 1910.

And we made an offer to the Government of Canada, as our chiefs made an offer to Canada back them back then in 1910. They told it and we still abide by that Sir Wilfred Laurier memorial that these people want — entered into our homeland and became guests, although uninvited guests in our house, that they wished to be brothers with us. And as such, that we were prepared to offer up to Canada half of our homeland, land, water, timber, everything. What is ours will be yours and what's yours will be ours. But there was a provision in it of — a relational provision in it that we must help each other to be great and good.

And thus far, Mr. Commissioner, that what is -- what have we gotten for our patience, the Chiefs pointed out? Is the governments have taken everything into -- of advantage over us, taken our land, water, timber into their possession and imposed their laws on us. One -- one way for the Indians, one way for the -- another way for the rich whites and yet another for the poor white people. They took -- they took possession of all our lands without any consultation, signing any papers or any treaties made with us. And that still stands today. Yet, the power and the wealth of this country comes from that and thus we remain impoverished and without power to control our own affairs and rule our lands the way we used to.

So having said that, the -- the waters that we held control over and our laws applied to where the -- what is called the Secwepemcwetkwa (phonetic), the North Thompson River, on the -- I mean the Simpwetkwa (phonetic), the North Thompson River, sorry, and the Secwepemcwetkwa, the Shuswap

 -- South Thompson River and the Shuswap Lakes area and the Quinquetkwa (phonetic). That was is the South Thompson River from Savona down into the Fraser are great fishing runs for us. We also have the Horsefly and the Likely River, along with the Fraser River.

And each one of these carry a great abundance of various types of fish that all my colleagues over here spoke about. And I agree with all that they've said so far. Now, we have the keksu7, the sheni7, the squelelten7uwi, the -- you know, the spring salmons, the Chinooks, the Cohos, the sockeye, all those -- the different types of fish, the rainbow trouts, all of those that come into our -- our rivers. And we are -- we view ourselves as the protectors and the growers of the salmon, as such, at that part of -- as the Secwepemc people.

- Thank you, Dr. Ignace, and thank you for grounding us in that history. I'm going to focus my questions on the nature of this forum and the nature of the Commissioner's mandate, which is focused on looking at the reasons for the decline of Fraser sockeye and what we can do to sustain that. And in that light, recognizing the importance of Secwepemc oral tradition to the Secwepemc people, I wonder if you could share with the Commissioner one of the stories from your oral history that captures the nature of that relationship of your people to salmon?
- DR. IGNACE: Oh, yes, I can do that. Salmon is very significant to us in many ways. And by way of example, without telling all the stories that we have, which would take some time, is that (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN) long time ago, Coyote, by the way who was sent down by the Creator to fix the land up for us the way it is. And when he came down off the mountain after the great flood, there was very little vegetation or plant life on the land except for a few grasses and trees. he took a tree for a wife. And from that, the forests and the plant life underneath are our relatives. We're related to all living things. All things are living in our view. And he had a hankering for fish. And so he went to the river (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN) he turned himself into a rock to try to float down the river but instead

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

45

46

47

he just sunk. Then (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN) Sk'elep so he changed himself into a feather and he just got blown around by the wind. And then a leaf. And he got just whirled about in the back eddy in the hoolontkum (phonetic).

And so finally, he turns himself into a sakstay (phonetic), into a nice stick (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN) then he floats all the ways down the river and he gets stuck in this fish dam or weir that was put up by two powerful medicine women. And he stays with -- and they find this stick and they pull it out and they're going to use it for their fire -- firewood. (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN) and Coyote turns himself back. Once he was thrown in the fire, he turns himself back into a small baby and so they reach in and say, "Oh, wow, this cute little baby boy. We should raise him as our own." (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN) and he stays with -- they look after this baby and he was $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$ the Coyote was there for there four days and four nights. And at the -- on the morning of the fourth morning, he gets up really early and he runs and he -- by -- by being with these women for four days and four nights he breaks their power and was able to tear down the dam. And he invites the fish upriver. So the Coyote was the one that brought us the fish.

And according to our oral history, the greatest gift that Coyote gave us is the fish. And because those — being with those women, they — they were — became our kinfolk and, as such, you cannot deny your kinfolk food or access to a resource because the foundation of our laws is based on kinship, kinship ties. Without it, you cannot enter into a — we're unrelated to these Nations. We have similar cultures and — and stories. But I could not go into their territory and fish unless I had kinship ties over there like — and vice-versa with us. And that is our law. It's a very strict law. I could be severely punished if I went into their territory without their consent and proper protocol.

- Q I'd like to take you --
- 44 DR. IGNACE: And --
 - Q Sorry. Continue.
 - DR. IGNACE: -- I'm not quite finished with my story yet. And Coyote brings the fish up the river and

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47

he's proud -- so proud of what his accomplishment that he invites the chiefs from the throughout the Shuswap Nation of -- we had 32 communities. Now, we're reduced down to 17 because over the -- the years, our population was decimated through smallpox and all kinds of other things that I think you're all familiar with. I don't have to go into detail. But he invites all the chiefs and he fills up his drying rack with salmon. he's drying the salmon, he's dancing and singing, filled his head, it's swelling bigger and bigger with pride. And some of the salmon get hooked in his hair and it gets pulled off the rack. And -and he gets mad at the fish and he kicks it. not long after that, all the salmon jump back -come back to life, jump off the rack and go back in the river. And just then, all the chiefs show up to see what great gifts the Coyote has brought them. And all they have to lick is the slime on the stick. And so they -- they mock Coyote.

And so that's what's happened is that, you know, if you disrespect the salmon, they will leave you. And we have done that in so many ways in this modern age, through pulp mill pollution. I mean we fought the CN twin track -- CN was going to twin track the Secwepemc and Thlecwepemc (phonetic). And other Nations fought -- fought the CN from twin-tracking it to the river because that would have led to the destruction of the wetlands, the salmon-rearing habitat and all of that. And we got a permanent injunction even though CN said that we are one -- two doors down from God, you cannot stop us. But we did it. stood on the tracks and stopped the train because that's how much we believe in the salmon. And we're prepared to do that again should we have to.

You know, we have -- as one of our elders up in Canim Lake said, "Salmon is our firstborn child." You know, so it's -- that's how we -- we're related to the salmon. We're related to all living beings. And the problem is that we ought not to focus just on a particular species but what we ought to be focusing on is the interconnectedness between the species, between us and the species, between the environment and the species that we're concerned with. That is traditional ecological knowledge. It's a life-

45

46 47

lived experience through observation as well. Q Thank you. I want to get into a discussion about what the impact to your culture is when you don't have an opportunity to do the fishing and when the fish aren't returning in the same abundance as they may be used to. Could you speak to that? DR. IGNACE: Most definitely. It's -- it's -- you know, the way -- way we've been managed vis-à-vis the government under the residential schools, it's been -- what is -- the objective there was to take the Indian out of the child, okay? If we take that and look at the example of fisheries, what -the way the fisheries have been operating is to take the fish out of the Indian. That's the analogy that I would put forward there. And that -- we have lost so much of our -- of our knowledge of the fishery of our -- our -- you know, in many

ways, a lot of our young people today. We used to

do fishing when I was like -- our -- my chief over

go and fish all kinds of fish. Well, we fished in

the creek. We had to build special places for the

salmon to come under and hide in so we could --

and we'd have to sneak out there and spear them

there said that when he was young that he used to

from there. Well, in the Deadman Creek, that -- the Coho out of there disappeared and we imposed on ourselves - as a matter of fact, before we did that, we used to go up against fisheries. used to come in helicopters with their guns and we had gunfights to protect our right to fish. And they would come and tear out our nets, you know. So we passed a fishing bylaw within our reserve because under the *Indian Act*, there's laws of general application apply only if you don't occupy the field. And so we occupied the field and we pushed that out. And as soon as we did that, we imposed closure on ourselves on the Deadman River so that we -- and we put in fish hatcheries. tried every trick in the book to bring back that But the sad fact of it is, is that no -- the younger generations in the last 20 years have lost the knowledge of how to fish in the creek with a They've lost the technology, how to make spear. the technology to -- to spear salmon in the creek. They have lost the language of -- of that. And it was a collective communal -- all our fishing was

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

collective and communal. We'd all -- you know, families would go down there and help each other. Likewise down the river.

We don't -- manets -- manets are two-pronged harpoons that when you spear a spring salmon they come off and you could pull them in. There's no more spring salmon to go -- or very few. this was the first year that there was enough that we could have gone down there and did it but we've lost that. That practice is lost to us. As well as the hooking of the salmon, the dip-netting of the salmon. The only way that we can catch -- use right now is to have -- to be able to catch enough salmon is through gillnets, set nets in the river. You know, but traditionally, we had up at the -you know, when all our traditional ways, as my colleagues have pointed out here, have been outlawed. I mean in between Kamloops and Chase, if you go there, you can still see evidence where we built rock walls across the Thompson -- the Thompson River -- the South Thompson River. the fish would come up and they would pool in there. And this was -- it would take the number of different communities coming together, packing mountains -- rocks off the mountain to make these fish dams where the fish could pool up. And so that we could go in there and we could selectively catch and pick.

All our traditional techniques are geared to fish one type of fish or another, as opposed to the commercial fishery in the ocean where it's much like clear-cut logging; you clear cut the ocean floor, you know, which has been very harmful to the fisheries. And that has to end. That has to stop. You know, we -- we pick and choose, as my friend here, if we want the sockeye, the males -- or so many males or so many females, whatever, to ensure a continuation of the -- you know, the species, the genetic diversity.

I mean we went so far as a community to try to save the steelhead that we -- we used -- we tested out and cryogenetically (sic) saved the sperm from the -- the rainbow trout -- steelhead, I mean, so that we could have -- if they were all gone one day, we could go back and bring it back and revive it. You know, we're desperate in terms of trying to save that fish.

 We've -- we've lived off of salmon for thousands of years. It's significant and important to our diet, to our way of life and we have to fight to look after its -- its home. And its home is not just the water. If you look at the Earth, when the Creator came down to finish off Coyote's work, he gave us what was called teskalia (phonetic); that's a sweat house. People call it the sweat house. That name doesn't -- in English doesn't do justice for teskalia as a sweat house. But being that as it may, he went (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN).

The Creator gave us a sweat house, a direct gift from the sweat house as our church, if you will. That's where we go and pray to be healed and to ask for things that we may be wanting in or the strength to be able to do what we need to accomplish in a good way -- always in a good way. We don't go there to ask for something bad to happen to someone or to something. But he went to the -- he went to the furballs (phonetic) and he told the furballs that when the people go to the sweat house you help the sweat house in healing and giving the people what they want.

Then he went to the water and said to the water the same thing, "You'll be the sweat house. You will work with the furballs in helping the sweat house heal the people and giving them what they want." So those are sacred things to us. Water is sacred and we're not treating as sacred. We don't -- we're disrespecting the water. We dump our pollution in the water. And that's where -- just think we're polluting the air and how much it makes us sick. Just think what it must do to the salmon.

- Q Mm-hmm. Dr. Ignace, I'd like to get a little more specific with you and -- and ask you how the traditional knowledge that we've just heard you speak of, Coyote stories that teach respect for salmon, needing to respect the waters and traditional practices, spear fishing and those sorts of methods, how can those pieces and that wisdom of traditional knowledge be better used or be used today for fisheries management?
- DR. IGNACE: Well, I -- I appreciate you asking an elder-in-training that -- that question. But I will do my best to try to give the best answer I

can to it. When -- when you look at our -- our technologies and you look at the fish, right now we're -- the way we're harvesting the fish is upside down as far as we're concerned, is that the best place to do the -- to do a harvesting of the fish is to allow them to come inland where they will self-select, you know, out. The sockeye will go one way. The other salmon, Cohos, Chinooks, they will separate themselves out so that you're not catching, you know, different types of fish at once.

And not only that, you can -- you can selectively catch the amount you need, the amount you want, what kind you want, when you want it and that's the type of technologies that we need to -to adopt. And in terms of -- we've got to ensure that -- that we look after -- I mean we -- we worked hard, for example, in trying to maintain the Deadman -- the Deadman River where the farmers went in and cut down all the trees right up to the edge of the river. And what that led to was the warming of the water, which harmed the fish. we -- we had to negotiate with the farmers, say, "Look, we want to try to -- 20 feet back we'll fence off the riverbank on each side and we'll revegetate it so that the vegetation could grow over and cool down, keep the water streams cool."

And also, you know, bears go in and eat the salmon and take it out and help fertilize the riverbanks and help maintain the vegetation over the stream banks, particularly the spawning grounds. But that's not the -- a lot of places now have cabins and houses and the bears can't go over there and help re-vegetate and maintain a healthy habitat, ecosystems. It has -- the clearcut logging in the mountains has led to siltations -- siltations of the spawning beds, you know, which has caused serious harm. And we've been talking about all of that. And you know, we've got to get back to respecting the environment, respecting the -- the water, respecting the fish. Otherwise, they're going to disappear on us. Thank you. The Commissioner has been hearing some information on the theory of over-escapement. I'd like to put that question to you and seek your views on this theory. This theory that it's possible to have too many salmon returning to the

45

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

46 47

46

47

spawning grounds. What does your traditional 1 wisdom and knowledge say to that theory? 3 DR. IGNACE: I think we have too much abuse and disrespect of the fisheries and the environment. 5 We can never have too much fish. When you have a 6 lot of fish much like -- and we're happy to see 7 what happened come back this year and, you know, 8 the -- this year the -- the -- I guess the stars 9 were aligned for the fish because the water 10 temperature was right, there was rain when -- in 11 cooling down the environment unlike last year when 12 the salmon hit the Kamloops Lake, it was so warm 13 that they all -- majority of them got knocked out 14 and floated back downstream. A lot of them didn't 15 revive and died. A few of them made it through 16 but this year they -- they did, you know, and --17 sorry, what is your question? 18 We've heard about over-escapement. 19 DR. IGNACE: Okay, right, yeah. And what happens when 20 a lot of the salmon go there and were like happy 21 to do that because what -- when the salmon 22 spawn and die in the spawning grounds, what 23 they're doing is fertilizing the river, 24 fertilizing the food that the fry and the salmon 25 will eat as they grow and get ready to go back out 26 in the ocean. And it feeds -- they feed -- it's -- it's a great fertilizer. We all know salmon is 27 28 a great fertilizer. And without that, you cannot 29 feed the future generations of fish. And we have 30 to ensure that there's nothing wrong with over-31 escapement. That's just an excuse to catch more 32 fish for commercial sales and to enhance 33 somebody's bankbook. I'd like to move to questions about what Grand 34 35 Chief Terry was talking about and work within 36 Nations, building up Nations. Can you tell the 37 Commissioner a bit about how Nationwide fisheries 38 decisions are made for the Secwepemc people and 39 the Secwepemc Fisheries Commission's role in that? 40 DR. IGNACE: Well, you know, the policy has 41 individuated as a Nation of people, as Secwepemc. 42 And so we now have individual communities and 43 individuals going down and fishing. And there's 44 no collective -- our collective laws can't be

applied in those individuated circumstances. So

and I believe between 2002 and 2004, we had a

we need to get back to the Nation level and we --

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

262728

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 meeting and we invited our neighbouring Nations and we met in Kamloops.

And we looked at -- amongst ourselves, we said that we need to get the people in the Horsefly/Likely/Williams Lake area. They're the caretakers of that area. We need to stand them back up and monitor and assess all -- you know, the fish that are returning, assess the quality of the water, assess the environment surrounding the river to ensure a healthy, good habitat, along with the people up in the North Thompson/Barriere area, likewise, along with the people up the Adams Lake and -- you know, South Thompson area, that they do that and that they -- we have people that are fish monitors and looking all of those, the quality of the environment to ensure that wherever there's enhancement required, that they will come -- we will come back -- these people will come back and make recommendations to the chiefs and the chiefs will make the decisions as to how we should -- which -- how we should manage various runs in various rivers and when to do that. if need be, then our chiefs would then go down and meet with Chief Saul Terry and -- you know, and Stl'atl'imx country and his fellow chiefs and we would say, "Hey, this is what we need," along with our Chief Fred Samson down there. We -- this is what's happening up here. How can we work together to ensure that these salmon are going to come back?

I mean we have an aboriginal right to fish but I can't eat a right. I definitely sure can eat a fish. So in order to have that right to have any value to me, we need to protect at all costs those fish from coming back — to come back. Thank you. You spoke about the dialogue that can happen with Grand Chief Terry on behalf of Stl'atl'imx and the Lakahahmen Nation leaders. What's your view of the role of the ITO in that type of dialogue and Nation-building?

DR. IGNACE: Well, I think it's important that we, as Nations, not as communities, come together at the -- each Nation level and -- and lay out a common objective to ensure that all of us get healthy runs of salmon. That's -- and a healthy environment. If we can ensure healthy runs of salmon and a healthy environment, then the rest --

36
PANEL NO. 10
Cross-exam by Ms. Pence (FNC)

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

we have different histories and approaches and technologies and techniques and conditions for fishing. That will take care of itself within our Nations, you know. I don't -- we don't have the same conditions as Saul. For example, the Fraser River, the salmon can't see that well because it's dark and silty. But in the Thompson River it's clear so you can't go and dip during the day. They'll see you and they'll duck away from you. You can't spear. They'll duck away. There's certain different times and ways. Each technology has a different approach and method to it. And those will take care of itself within our Nations. There's certain areas that we can come together on and there's certain areas that we differ on. That's fine.

- Dr. Ignace, I'm just cognizant of the time and I feel I can only put one last question to you at this point. But that question is to ask you to comment on what you view as -- what's your definition of co-management or joint management? Which term do you prefer and what's your vision for what that entails?
- DR. IGNACE: Well, when I started off this morning, I started off with saying, you know, we offered up with Canada that what is ours will be yours and what's yours will be ours and we'll help each other to be great and good. We have to be equal partners with Canada. You know, and equal decision, equal access, revenue sharing, you know, we said for us, as Secwepemc, half-and-half in everything. And that, you know, we have to -- and we're still fighting for that and we're still working towards that. Presently, right now, the way the -- the DFO regulations are divisive in our communities and it leads to hardships between communities. And that makes it more difficult for us to be able to come together as a Nation and to speak when there's -- when there's hurt between communities. We have to overcome that. the intergenerational transmission of that harm has to be dealt -- pushed aside and we move together collectively for the good of all. not just for ourselves but it's for the good of all.
- Q Thank you.
- DR. IGNACE: (SECWEPEMC LANGUAGE SPOKEN)

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to say what I've had to say and I hope it's been helpful. Thank you.

- Q Thank you, Dr. Ignace. I am going to turn now to you, Thomas Alexis. Mr. Alexis, as I have with the other panellists, I'd like you to start by explaining for us where Tl'azt'en community is, where it's situated within the larger Nation, and to describe some of your traditional fishing practices, too.
- MR. ALEXIS: Okay. Thank you. My name is Chief Thomas Alexis, former chief or the Tl'azt'en Nation. I've been a politician for about ten years and been in the fisheries field for most of my life. Right from birth to today, I still regard fishing as a practice that's been taught to me through generations. My home community is at the Tl'azt'en Nation, Tache Reserve. It's on the upper reaches of the Fraser Watershed. It's in the headwaters of the Fraser Watershed in the Stuart Takla area.

I don't know if there's a map that delineates that but our people consist of the Carrier people. The Carrier peoples have different dialects within the Nation that speaks their language in different manner but still deemed as Carrier language. Our Carrier territory encompasses the Babine, the Takla Lakes systems down to Prince George and down into the Nechako Watersheds, as well as the Stellaquo and all those watersheds that's west of us. Tl'azt'en Nation territory is situated at the northeast corner of the Carrier territories.

We are situated at the divide where we sit at the top of three different watersheds, one being the Skeena Watershed, the other one being the mainstream Fraser Watershed and the other one being the -- the Arctic Watershed. So as a Carrier Nation, we have to be careful of what we do above there to ensure that we respect the people downriver from us. So then those are important points to understand because you look at this picture here. The driftwood system looks like this. It's pristine in a way that, you know, the salmon still could go back there but it has been decimated in a way that with -- through logging practices has diminished that run on its own. Our people historically used to say that

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 there was three different Stuart runs, one being the driftwood run, the other one being the Stuart Takla run and the other one being the Middle River run. That's the late Stuart run. There's a run of Chinook that comes to our territory and different resident species that we target throughout the territory of the Carrier people.

Our history goes back millennia. Couple of years ago, in one of our fishing sites on Stuart Lake, a historical fishing site that our people used to gather and to do the salmon fisheries, there was an archaeological dig there a couple of years ago. And they dated the artefacts there to be back to 12,000 years. So that's one of the areas that our people used to converge onto to do their traditional winter fisheries for salmon.

The pictographs on Stuart Lake on the rock bluffs of Stuart Lake dates back about 30,000 years. And the pictographs themselves depict the animals and the fish that we utilize throughout the systems in the Carrier -- Carrier Nation territories.

- Thank you. If you could also give the Commissioner a sense of what those traditional fishing practices looked like in the -- in the systems that you fished traditionally?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes. Prior to contact, our people used to have different methods of fishing. The weir fisheries they call it. There's about six or seven different types of weir fish -- weirs that were constructed for specific stocks. There's one type of weir. They call it a deep water weir. It's made up of different trap boxes tied together and sunk into a deep, deep part of the river to capture the salmon, as it's migrating upstream. second type of weir is one as a cone trap, they call it. It looks like a big funnel. And those traps were used -- utilized for smaller streams. Those traps are set at a confluence of the stream so that they could capture the fish that's going into the smaller streams.

There's different types of small box traps that our people use to -- to set anywhere to -- to target even resident fish, white fish, rainbow, char. You name it, there's those resident fish that's there that -- that we capitalize on. And these rivers are made up of willows and tied

together by spruce -- spruce roots and whatnot to ensure that we are efficient in our system.

- Thank you. Can you tell the Commissioner if you see a role for these traditional fishing practices today and what attempts have been made to reinvigorate those types of processes?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes, since we used those weirs and traps in our fisheries, it was very selective. Like my colleagues are saying here, the majority of the methods that our people use are selective and are utilized for sustainability. In today's standards, I think DFO have already started to use those processes, one being in the incline plane trap, they call in counting out the fry that's coming out of the systems in the spring. That resembles our big box trap weir that -- that our people use in the deep water. The other one was the shallow water weirs that they strung across the fences that they strung across the streams to DFO are using that concept today as capture fish. enumeration fences. So there's that -- that concept has been adopted in many ways in the management of DFO science management, I quess, or management of the fisheries and -- but we are still outlawed from practising our traditions in using those weirs.
 - Could you provide the Commissioner with some information -- some more information -- you've already touched on this -- about how the fishery was managed historically? What kind of communication was there up and down the river so that, as you said earlier, you can respect your neighbours down river? What was happening that way?
- MR. ALEXIS: Our people had the special person with a special gift that knew the dialects of the people along the river and communicated. They call this person the messenger or the natanayani (phonetic) in our language. And these people communicate to see the conditions of the runs and to see if there's abundance or not. And once -- once a decision is made to fish based on the abundance and that, the hereditary system kicks in. Our hereditary chiefs from the different clans. In our -- in our territory we have four different clans: the Lasaylu (phonetic), the Slameshyu (phonetic), the Granton (phonetic) and the

Lakchaboo (phonetic). They call our -- all our head chiefs and these are the people that do decide whether there's going to be a fisheries or not.

Do you see any resemblance between that system an

- Q Do you see any resemblance between that system and modern systems like, for example, the ITO?
- MR. ALEXIS: That would be something similar to what the ITO is proving to do in this current terms because, you know, the chiefs, the hereditary chiefs and the chiefs that communicated back and forth had the mandate to do so. And I think ITO is resembling that very practice.
- Thank you. Could you share with the Commissioner, Mr. Alexis, some of the stories and legends that you were told that embody the respect that your people show to the salmon?
- MR. ALEXIS: I would maybe reflect on three stories, I guess. One would be -- one that's similar to Dr. Ignace cited in the respect for the salmon. I don't know the name of this. I can't translate it in English. So I just call it the "salmon spirit story". And it's similar to what Dr. Ignace said, is that there was one time back in the early days when fishing was at its peak. A widower was fishing and doing all this work himself because he was all alone. He had nobody to help him. Back then, in our practice, this was a community gathering that at the weirs where they dished out or shared the catch amongst community members. This story is a story that gives us respect to the salmon. It goes like this.

There was one time, this widower that went fishing or caught enough fish to go -- to prepare for the winter and that he had no help. Other families are too busy doing their own work. men were out hunting doing their hunting and he was left behind to do all -- all the work on the fish and whatnot and was jealous of the other people because he was hard -- working so hard that he had no time to do other things. When he processed his fish in his drying rack, we call it nineye (phonetic) in our language. And the smokehouses, we call it ageebyoh (phonetic) in our language. He processed the fish. He processed everything. He didn't waste anything. He saved the heads. He saved the backbones. He saved everything and processed and dried it but still

had this urge to go out and hunt with the men. But he couldn't do it until he finished his -- his fish.

At one time, he went into his smokehouse to stock the fire and got -- got his hair or head caught in the ribs or the backbone of the fish. He got angered by that. He was already angered because he couldn't go hunting and I guess that -- the backbone that nicked his head angered him to a point where he took that backbone of the salmon and threw it in the corner and stomped on it in anger and muttered some words that's disrespectful to the salmon.

And what the salmon spirit did is that he made that person pay for it. He -- the salmon spirit in July -- our fisheries is in July and the salmon spirit caused it to snow. And so the first thing that happened is that once the person that is angered did that to the backbone, the fish came back in life and jumped back into the system and it started to snow. And it snowed until it covered the whole smokehouse. And there was no way that this person could get out. And this person perished right in that smokehouse. Fishless, mind you, but he perished. And this is the story that came about in -- in our smokehouses, as I was growing up, and these stories came down in our tradition to give us the meaning of respect for the salmon. Thank you. I'm going to change gears just a

- Q Thank you. I'm going to change gears just a little bit and just note that the Commissioner has already heard evidence about how DFO's Science Department is now making efforts to consider the ecosystem more broadly and do ecosystem-based management. Could you tell the Commissioner what your traditional knowledge has to say about the place of salmon within the ecosystem and the importance of salmon to the ecosystem?
- A Yes. There's another story that -- that I could tell you based on your question, is the life cycle story of an orphan. The orphan went down to the river at one time and, you know, tried to find out where the salmon are going or where the salmon are coming from. And he was very interested in that. And he had nobody. He had nobody with him. And when he thought about this over and over again throughout the summer and winter and spring, by

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 the time, you know, the salmon was going to leave the system as smolt, the orphan changed himself into a smolt to, to go back with the other fish to see where they go and to see where they come -- or they -- you know, where they spend their time in their life cycle.

Four years after this, this young boy came back as an adult salmon and turned back into a man or -- or a young man and told his story about his travels. And he indicated to the people that this salmon travels far and wide and it feeds a lot of people. It feeds the bears, the eagles, it feeds Like Dr. Ignace indicated that every the trees. living thing is our ancestor or -- in one form or another was man before. The bears are one example of that. They are our ancestors and we know that the bears need the -- the food that's coming through the systems and that these animals would need this nourishment, the ocean-borne nutrients that come along with the salmon. So is the ecosystem. The trees and the -- the resident fish, whatnot, because when there's a high abundance of salmon, there's always high abundance of resident fish, too. And there is good productivity at that time.

- Thank you. Can you tell the Commissioner some of the observations that you have made about the abundance of fish coming back now, as opposed to when you were younger, or what you've heard from your elders and your community?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes. Back in the early days during our weir fisheries, we were managing so sustainably that the fish came back in very high abundance. Our people used to talk about walking across the backs of the salmon to cross the river. think you'll hear those stories all along the river -- the river systems even today. Hearing those stories made me think about the times we're having now. A lot of people say that, you know, there's overabundance in those systems and that's not truly so. There's over a hundred streams in our -- the Carrier Nation territories that -- that produce sockeye salmon or produce Chinook and fish like that. And those streams today are not being fully utilized. So there's -- the misperception of overabundance is not really there. You know, the animals are smart enough to go to a different

spawning stream if there's -- there's capacity, there's -- the other stream couldn't carry him as a capacity. And these things are observed throughout the millennia that if there's an empty stream there it would be full some day again.

- Thank you. We've heard and we know about the phenomenal returns of sockeye this year, in 2010. How was that experienced by your people up river?
- MR. ALEXIS: Well, our people in the Carrier Nation consist of about 30,000 people throughout the whole traditional Carrier territory. And this year, despite the high numbers, the historic numbers that came back into the systems, according to DFO I think it was the highest they've ever gotten back in a hundred years. This perception makes people think that, yes, everybody up and down river have their catch of fish but it's not truly so. The highest abundance that got back into -- close to the Carrier territory is the Quesnel -- Horse Quesnel run. And that's where the abundance stopped. Above Quesnel and the 600 kilometres of river that's above Quesnel had no abundance at all. Our people did not have any food fisheries to speak of. The Carrier Sekani Tribal Council and its people only caught 8,700 fish. My own people of 2000 of Tl'azt'en Nation caught 2,200 fish. And that's for food for the winter.

Historically, each family used to put away a thousand fish for the winter. Imagine to today's standards, there's over 250 families in my community with three different villages. Imagine the amount of fish that we require to sustain ourselves over the winter would be 250,000 fish. But we didn't get to that point. We got at least 1 percent of it.

- You've spoken to the impacts of not having food fish. What are some of the cultural impacts of not having sockeye return to your territory?
- MR. ALEXIS: Like my colleagues say, that the practices or traditional practices, the gathering and the preparation of the equipment that we're going to use to do our fishing are no longer there. The stories that come along with sitting beside in the campfire and dissimilating the stories orally. I mentioned two stories to you that I've learned from my grandparents while sitting at the campfire

doing fish and these stories are related to me are now related to my kids. So -- and there's -- the disconnect is there because there is so low abundance and there's hardly any fishing going on, as opposed to back in our days of the weirs, the fisheries was a communal fisheries. You know, as a community getting together to help each other, to gather the food for the winter. In comparison to today, since our -- our weirs are no longer allowed to be utilized, we resorted to gillnet fisheries. And -- and these fisheries have impacted us culturally because now it became an individual effort. It became an individual effort and it became a fishery for the people that had equipment and gear to do the fisheries. So it left a big hole in our community in relation to the fishing and the stories that comes behind it.

Q Thank you. Mr. Commissioner, I note that it is now 12:30. I do have a short series of questions about some of the bodies that Mr. Alexis sits on, the FNFC and the ITO and UFFCA. I'm happy to take about ten minutes after lunch, with your leave and with Commission counsel's permission.

THE COMMISSIONER: The hearing will be resumed at two o'clock. Thank you very much.

THE REGISTRAR: Hearing is now adjourned until 2:00 p.m.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR NOON RECESS) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is now resumed.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. PENCE, continuing:

So Mr. Alexis, before I turn to some questions about the different organizations of which you are a member, I wanted to ask you if you could tell the commissioner about some of the sharing arrangements that you see between nations and communities at your part of the river.

MR. ALEXIS: Yes, there are examples of sharing arrangements between bands, I guess. It's not between nations. An example I could give is that in times of low abundance, Chief Robert Hope used to send fish up to our community. They fished it here in the Lower Fraser and packed it, ice-packed

it and delivered it to our community. And that would come out of their allowable catch. So there's the sharing arrangements that chiefs and bands could do along the river to help with sustaining the fisheries.

There's other examples in the river that happens when there's low abundance in the Upper Fraser, there's sharing arrangements between the Babine bands and Nak'azdli and Tl'azt'en to ensure that our people got enough fish for the winter. Historically what happens in the Babine area is that the Babine tribes usually set aside a certain amount of fish for our people to fish for in the Babine Lake system. And similarly, along the river systems we had a chief by the name of Bob from Fountain Band delivered fish to our people or to our elders because he heard in a meeting that we were not getting our share of food fish in the Upper Fraser, so what he did is he got his community together to fish for us and bring it to our people so that our elders and the youth and the ones in need that can capitalize on some fish for winter.

Even although there's no formal processes in the DFO management system to do that, there's still a process in the First Nations regime to sign protocols with each other to do some fair trade. In giving thanks to these two communities that gave us fish, our elders sent them some moose meat, so there's these kinds of arrangements that are made between First Nations and bands along the river to ensure that everybody had a good share of fish. So it's there, but there's no formal process to do that currently.

Thank you. I'd like to ask now some questions about the different organizations of which you are a member and that includes the Upper Fraser Fisheries Conservation Alliance, the UFFCA, also the First Nations Fisheries Council, the FNFC, and then your work with the Inter-tribal Treaty Organization.

So I'd like to start with the UFFCA and just briefly, because I am wary of time, could you briefly describe for the commissioner what the role of the UFFCA is?

MR. ALEXIS: The UFFCA is an organization that was formed by the Upper Fraser tribes, the tribal

councils or individuals bands, to put together a strategic plan to help with giving some technical services to about 23 bands up in the Upper Fraser. The reason these bands got together is because we all had something in common, and that one thing in common was we had spawning habitats, and we needed to engage with each other to see if we could ensure that there's abundance in run sizes and that in the Upper Fraser.

- Thank you. And if you could also touch on what you see adding or -- adding to what Grand Chief Terry has said about the ITO, but what do you see as the role of the ITO?
- MR. ALEXIS: Well, the ITO is an organization that's been formed out of an agreement that was signed in 1989 and that relationship I see with the ITO and the clan systems is they fit together well. The clan systems are based on nation management and nation building and whatnot and the ITO is simply doing that and moving an initiative forward where people have mandate to speak on behalf of the nations.
- Thank you. And can you speak to what the role of the Fraser River Aboriginal Fisheries Secretariat, FRAFS, is?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes. The Fraser -- FRAFS is an organization that was formed back when the AFS agreements were signed. It's an organization that's been running for about 20 years. They provide technical services to all tribes in the Fraser watershed. It's all-encompassing. It's based on technical services to -- and communication services for the tribes in the Fraser River.
- Q So am I right in understanding that both FRAFS and the UFFCA are technical bodies?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes.
- Q And the ITO, as you've said, is a mandated political body?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes.
 - Q Thanks. And then finally, what do you see as the role for the First Nations Fisheries Council?
- MR. ALEXIS: I see that organization as a mentoring organization that advocate for titling rights issues and region-wide issues. I see the organization as a group to help anyone in British Columbia or any First Nations in British Columbia

to move along an issue that's near and dear to them. It's in its formative stage and once it's been finalized, I think it's going to be an organization that the leadership and the technicians in British Columbia would look to to help them move some initiatives forward.

- Thank you. Can you speak in a little bit more detail about how these technical and communications type bodies, like FRAFS and UFFCA, can support the work that's being done by the larger organizations, whether it's political bodies like the ITO or province-wide policy-oriented ones like the FNFC?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes. As you know, there are 203 First Nations in British Columbia and are all diverse and each nation or each region or each sub-region has very good knowledge of their areas and that's what First Nations Fisheries Council could feed from and make sure that the knowledge is out there for everybody to use.
- Q Thank you. And what are the main challenges of the work that these organizations are doing?
- MR. ALEXIS: Well, there are some challenges within ourselves. There are some organizations that do not look into -- or look at these organizations as a body to feed from but there's, like I said, they're a diverse First Nations in British Columbia and I think the challenge is to be allinclusive.
- MS. PENCE: Mr. Lunn, I wonder if you could pull up for me, please, the co-management discussion paper that was on our list, and just for the record, this is a more up-to-date version. It's dated October 25th, 2010, so it's a more up-to-date version of the document that was at Tab 1 of Canada's documents.
- Q Mr. Alexis, are you familiar with this comanagement discussion paper?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I am familiar with it. The Fisheries Council has moved forward with an agreement between DFO and the Fisheries Council to -- an agreement that would allow us to work together in four priority areas and one of them is comanagement.
- MS. PENCE: Mr. Registrar, could I please have this marked as the next exhibit?
- 47 THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit number 295.

 EXHIBIT 295: FNFC Co-management discussion paper October 25, 2010

- MS. PENCE: Mr. Lunn, if I could get you to please take us to page 3 of that exhibit.
- Q Mr. Alexis, what I'd like to do here is put to you some of the definitions of co-management that are explored in this paper and just to get your feedback on the nature of those definitions.
- MS. PENCE: And I'd like to start -- oh, sorry, page 3 in the document, not on the pdf. Okay. And if you could please enlarge the part that starts just under the heading "Definition", yeah. Thank you.

Q So Mr. Alexis, the discussion paper says:

There is no legal definition of co-management but it has come to be generally understood that co-management is the sharing of management responsibility and accountability between more than one party.

Would you agree with that? Would you have anything to add to that?

MR. ALEXIS: Yeah, I basically agree with that.

MS. PENCE: And then if you could just scroll up a little bit more, Mr. Lunn.

 And I'm just going to draw your attention, Mr.
Alexis, to the last sentence in that top paragraph and it says:

In Canada, particularly in British Columbia, another driving force for co-management with First Nations is an asserted right to engagement in management and decision-making for fisheries and aquatic resources wherever that decision-making may infringe on an aboriginal right.

And again, I'd ask for your comment and whether or not you agree with that characterization?

MR. ALEXIS: I partially agree with it, because a lot of the statements that are made are based from case law and -- and prior to case law, the comanagement regime was that the government made a decision, then engaged us after to implement the decision. So there is a basic title in right issue here that are near and dear to every First

Nations and I think Dr. Ignace did reflect on it that if we're going to be true managers of the 3 resources, then we have to have ownership of it. And I think co-management doesn't do that for us. 5 MS. PENCE: If I could go now to page 4 of that same 6 document and there's a bulleted list there and 7 it's that that I'd like to have enlarged. 8 Mr. Alexis, I'm going to read to you some of the principles that this discussion paper suggests 9 10 should be part of any co-management arrangement 11 for fisheries resources, and I'll read them all 12 and then I'll give you an opportunity to comment 13 on your view of the importance of those 14 principles. 15 So the sentence starts: 16 17 The FNFC has heard from B.C. First Nations 18 that any co--- management arrangement for 19 fisheries resources would need to respect 20 (but not be limited to) the following 21 principles: 22 23 And the first one there is: 24 25 First Nations Ownership: 26 27 It says: 28 29 First Nations title and rights arise 30 from prior use and occupation of the 31 land and ocean spaces, and include 32 rights to utilize and manage aquatic 33 resources. 34 35 Would you agree that that's an important 36 principle? 37 MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I strongly agree with that. And the next one is: 38 39 40 Shared Responsibility: 41 42 It says: 43 44 A central First Nations role in 45 management is necessary, based on 46 Aboriginal and Treaty title and rights.

47

- MR. ALEXIS: Yes. I agree with it, but there is a difference between the treaty right and a true title right.
 - Q Okay.
 - MR. ALEXIS: Treaty, the title stems from the treaty and gives them permission to hold a title, but the true title and rights that we have as First Nations under the Constitution is very different than what the treaty encompasses.

Q The third principle is:

Scale:

It says:

Recognition that the proper title and rights holders are at the community level - in the Chiefs and community members of each nation.

Do you agree with that, including that principle in co-management?

MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I do agree with it because majority of the First Nations work from the ground up. If I can make a statement to the inverted triangle that people talk about in meetings, you see the disparity in that when we're dealing with the government bodies, the minister makes a decision and flows that decision downward towards the ground, but when a chief makes a decision, the decision flows upwards from the ground to the chief, so there's that difference that -- and there's going to be a need for a connection somewhere along the line.

Q Thank you. The following principle is:

Conservation: The protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of aquatic resources, their habitats, and interconnected life support systems, take precedence in managing aquatic resources.

 Do you agree with including that principle?
MR. ALEXIS: Yes, that's the very principle that our elders taught us in the campfires and the need to protect the resources that feeds us dearly.

51 PANEL NO. 10 Cross-exam by Ms. Pence (FNC)

1 3 Q And then we go to:

Stewardship:

5

It says:

6 7

8

9

10

11

The use of aquatic species and their habitat should carry with it the responsibility to treat them with respect and ensure their continued and unimpaired use and enjoyment by future generations.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

Would you agree with including that principle? MR. ALEXIS: Yes. I think my colleagues here today have spoke to that in various terms to ensure that if we're going to succeed in maintaining the runs and -- of the sockeye salmon and our people have to take stewardship back prior to contact. That's what happened and these runs were successful. Thank you. The next principle is:

20 21 22

Q

Trust:

23 24 25

It says:

26 27 28

Successful relationships are built on a foundation of mutual trust.

29 30 31

Is that principle important within a co-management or a joint management regime?

36

37

38

39

40

MR. ALEXIS: It is very important, particularly in every relationship you need to have trust and in this relationship I think there need to be trust because in the years that's under the government management we didn't have trust for these people. They were thought of as people that took away our people because they fish. We're talking about the fisheries officers and the people that maintain the Fisheries Act. So that trust is not there for I don't know how many hundreds of years now, and in order to build back a good relationship, you've got to have that trust and people have to have confidence in it.

I just have three more principles and then I'll close the panel. The last one -- or sorry, the

45 46 47

third-to-last one is:

52 PANEL NO. 10 Cross-exam by Ms. Pence (FNC)

47

1 Transparency: 3 It says: 4 5 Decision making should be open and 6 transparent. 7 8 Would you agree with that? 9 MR. ALEXIS: Yes. That's how our people operate. the potlatch houses in any gathering venues people 10 11 talk open and transparently. They do not hide in 12 the corner to talk about something else. 13 been the nature of our people through generations. 14 Thank you. The next is: Q 15 16 Accountability: 17 18 It says: 19 20 Aquatic resource managers and users 21 should be accountable for the results of 22 their decisions and actions. 2.3 24 Do you agree with that principle? 25 MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I do. There's a few occasions where 26 -- where the government had made some decisions to 27 open commercial fisheries in the mixed stock 28 fisheries, and what happened is that when our runs 29 co-migrate with a bigger run, then our runs are 30 getting decimated because there's a commercial 31 opening on the stronger run, so we have to find a 32 way to find accountability to that. We've been 33 saying as First Nations that there should be some 34 terminal fisheries on these -- on these runs in 35 some occasions so that the Lower stocks that's co-36 migrating with them can make it back to the 37 spawning ground successfully. 38 The last principle that's on this list is: 39 40 Communication: 41 42 And it says: 43 44 Information must be shared with First 45 Nation communities. 46

Do you agree with including that principle?

- MR. ALEXIS: It is very important. Like I said, the highways you see here today throughout the province are all probably trails of our people that travel up and down the river to communicate with each other and that's very important and in my opening statement I indicated that we have the messenger type person who was capable of speaking different languages to go up and down the river to communicate.
- Thank you, Mr. Alexis. I just put it out to the other panel members, and this is my last question, if you have anything to add to that discussion about the principles of joint or co-management? Grand Chief Terry?
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Yes. My comment is, you know, I think these are all very well and good to have recognized those kind of observations within an organization; however, I observe them as the status quo which exists within the Province of British Columbia and that is that it is a reflection of the relationship that has been developed between the Government of Canada and the First Nations, quote "bands" and essentially to me that's what's reflected in here. It -- whereas I think in terms, the Inter-tribal Treaty from where I'm speaking, is that the Inter-tribal Treaty organization had developed its treaty which continues to live and exist and then developing the Inter-Tribal Treaty organization which would essentially be set -- put in place to implement the objects and principles and values within the treaty, then I see that as being quite a different animal, if you will, or structure.
- MS. PENCE: Thank you for those additions. Those are my questions to the panel.
- MR. EAST: Mr. Commissioner, Mark East for the Department of Justice.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. EAST:

Q Good afternoon, Gentlemen. I have a few questions for you today and I thank Ms. Pence, I think, for very well setting up the issues and topics that I want to start to ask you some questions about and that's with respect to co-management.

First, though, I had to chuckle a bit, Chief Terry, when you said earlier that you're

 suspicious of acronyms and you were talking about a different context, but I had to laugh because it made me think that if there is such a thing as a DFO world view it would surely involve a love of acronyms. And Ms. Pence in her last few questions, and your answers, Mr. Alexis, kind of went through some of the more -- some acronyms that we all toss around and unfortunately I'm probably going to start my questions with some more acronyms and perhaps for Canada's list of documents, Tab 3, I'd like to call that up first. And you'll see a whole bunch of -- I'll just introduce the document.

I don't suppose you've seen this document before because it's a DFO document. It's called DFO Aboriginal Aquatic Resource and Ocean Management (AAROM) - the first acronym we'll throw out today - Program Fraser River and South Coast Groups (with member bands and INAC band members, as of August 2010). This is a DFO document, as I said, but I thought it might be useful to just identify some of the organizations in this document that we're talking about and who their component members are or participants.

Going down to the bottom of the first page, Mr. Alexis, you mentioned and just now the Fraser River Aboriginal Fisheries Secretariat or FRAFS, our second acronym. And I see there it's administered by the Nicola Tribal Association. I believe that's an organization to which the Siska belong; is that right, Chief Sampson?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Nicola Tribal Association?
O Nicola Tribal Association.

CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes.

Q And actually, over on the next page, page 2, I think there's a reference to the Siska and there's also reference to the Tl'azt'en as members of the -- of FRAFS. And I just wanted to read, this is on page 2 a little further down, what -- this is, I guess, DFO's perspective of the objectives. The objectives:

To continue to provide communications and biological/technical support services for First Nations in the Fraser Watershed to:

⁻ enhance First Nation knowledge of

42

43

44

45

46

47

Q

issues around management of fisheries on Fraser River salmon, and their ability to engage with DFO at the local level on a wide range of fisheries issues:

And the second bullet:

- enhance First Nation ability to engage with DFO in the formation of watershed collaborative fisheries management and consultative processes.

Does that ascribe to your understanding of what FRAFS does? Chief -- Mr. Alexis, sir?

- MR. ALEXIS: I agree with most of the objectives, except that in the consultative process there's a different process that happens. Okay.
- MR. ALEXIS: And that process is normally done bilaterally throughout the watershed, and if there is going to be an issue raised at the watershed level, then a Tier 1 process engages.
- Okay. And that's -- and I will in the next Q document get to, just as a foreshadowing, I'll probably go back to the document that Ms. Pence had up and talk a little bit about some of those different processes, bilateral and multilateral. I just want to finish with this document. If you go to the next page, and I apologize if I don't say this properly, the Secwepemc Fisheries Commission or SFC is an organization that involves the Skeetchestn First Nation; is that right, Dr. Ignace?

DR. IGNACE: Yes.

Are you familiar with that? And I note at the bottom, just in the brackets, that:

> (This is a well established AAROM group (since 2003) with excellent administrative and technical capacity.)

So this is an organization that is funded at least in part by AAROM funding that involves these First Nations of the Secwepemc people; is that correct, Doctor? Are you familiar with that organization? DR. IGNACE: Yes. As far as I'm familiar. Okay.

- DR. IGNACE: I haven't had dealings with the Shuswap 1 Fisheries Commission for a number of years. 3
 - Okay.
 - DR. IGNACE: 'Cause I'm no longer chief.
 - Okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45 46

47

- And I think the person that would better DR. IGNACE: answer those type of technical questions would be Pat Matthews.
- Okay. Thank you.
- DR. IGNACE: From the Shuswap Nation Fisheries Commission.
- Thank you. And then later on that -- the bottom of the page, Mr. Alexis talked about the Upper Fraser Fisheries Conservation Alliance or UFFCA, and that's an AAROM-funded body and I see the Tl'azt'en First Nation among others is listed under that heading; is that right?
- MR. ALEXIS: Right.
- Mr. Alexis. And then over into the next page, and I won't linger on the document, but some of the other bodies funded by AAROM according to this document are the First Nation Fisheries Council and you'll see at the first -- just the first paragraph there it says here that:

This is a province-wide group largely aimed at facilitating Tier 1 and 2 (limited) processes. Management and technical capacity are being developed. Currently in capacity building phase but with additional funding support from other DFO programs such as PICFI.

Is that -- Mr. Alexis, does that seem correct to you?

- MR. ALEXIS: Yes. It seems correct, but I think our technical people would better --
- Okay.
- MR. ALEXIS: -- give you a better view on that.
- Okay. And right at the very bottom, just as a heading - it goes over to the next page - it says:

Pacific Salmon Commission - First Nation Caucus support

And maybe this is a question for Chief Terry. What is the First Nation Caucus as it relates to 57
PANEL NO. 10
Cross-exam by Mr. East (CAN)

45

46

47

1 the Pacific Salmon Commission? GRAND CHIEF TERRY: These are folks that are part of 3 working groups or the panels from the various 4 Pacific Salmon Treaty, for example, Fraser River Panel, Southern Panel, Northern Panel, Trans-5 6 Boundary Panel and so on. These -- the aboriginal 7 representatives that's on these various panels. 8 And do the aboriginal representatives of these 9 panels, do they collaborate amongst themselves to 10 work with you as -- in your role as a Pacific 11 Salmon commissioner? 12 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Yes. Well, we're -- essentially what has been addressed by the First Nations folks 13 14 are much of the issues that were raised here this 15 morning with us or today and so these are issues 16 of concern for folks in the north central part of 17 British Columbia and the south, as well, so all 18 the rivers and streams and so on that are of 19 concern to them for the preservation and 20 conservation of the salmon and the management 21 really of the specially the Fraser River. 22 And how are these representatives of the different 23 areas of the aboriginal peoples of the province 24 for this purpose, how were they nominated or 25 appointed by the aboriginal community for this 26 purpose? 27 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Currently they're essentially being 28 nominated from a particular region, if it's -- for 29 example, a trans-boundary area, then folks that 30 live in that particular region would nominate 31 someone and then -- and then they push forward the 32 nominations to the Department of Fisheries and 33 Oceans. 34 Okay. And perhaps of your own position as Pacific 35 Salmon Commissioner, Chief Terry, can you explain 36 the process by which you became to be nominated 37 and appointed as Pacific Salmon Commissioner? GRAND CHIEF TERRY: My understanding is that a couple 38 39 of folks on -- for the Fraser Panel nominated 40 myself and then was then put forward as a nominee 41 to the minister. 42 And in your role as Pacific Salmon Q Okay. 43 Commissioner, is there a mechanism through which 44 you, I suppose, forgive the term if it's

incorrect, but report back or return to your

deliberated on with the Pacific Salmon Commission?

community in order to discuss what you've

58
PANEL NO. 10
Cross-exam by Mr. East (CAN)

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Essentially if and when asked about any particular issues that are arising affecting the Fraser River especially, I do respond, yes.

Q Well, perhaps return just the last couple -- last page on this document, scrolling down a bit, where it says Lillooet Tribal Council, and it appears that this is a body that involves the Xwisten, Xwisten Nation and --

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Xwisten.

Xwisten. Thank you. And that's -- and that's another AAROM-funded body, the Lillooet Tribal Council; is that a body that receives, in your knowledge, funding from DFO through this program?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: It used to.

Q Used to? Not any longer?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: No. I don't -- I believe that they're making arrangements to have a different kind of an --

Q Okay.

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: -- an agreement.

- I see. Okay. And the last one, and this is a group that I'm not familiar with, and I apologize to Chief Sampson because I know I'm not going to say this correctly Barry Huber (phonetic) has been trying valiantly to try to teach me how to say this properly, but the Nlha7apmx Nation Tribal Council, is that a different organization representing certain First Nations, Nlha7apmx First Nations?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes, there are two tribal associations within the Nlha7apmx nation. There is the NNTC as seen here and there's also the Nicola Tribal Association. And there is at one time there was the Fraser Canyon Tribal Administration, as well, but now I believe they are reduced to one band so or two bands, so I don't know if they're recognized as a tribal any more, so they are independent.
- Q I see.
- CHIEF SAMPSON: And also, I believe the Lower Nicola Indian Band and the Upper Nicola India Band are also independent bands within the Nlha7apmx Nation, meaning they have no tribal affiliation at this point in time.
- Q Okay. Thank you for that clarification. That's helpful. I noticed the one organization that's not on this list that we've talked about today is

the Inter-tribal Treaty Organization and I was just wondering, is that simply because they don't have an AAROM funding arrangement? Chief Terry? GRAND CHIEF TERRY: No, they don't. And I think it should be clarified too that just because that we're not involved in the funding currently, we're trying to make arrangements; however, I think that it should be clearly understood that the Intertribal Treaty Organization is an organization that's been established whereby we can have a voice within the management system in British Columbia. We think we -- we have the constitutional right as of now, and we haven't been given the opportunity to lay out the kind of arrangements that we would have within that in the decision-making process, and so I think that we are attempting to sort of wedge our way in, if I could say that, Mr. Commissioner.

- Q Thank you. The next document perhaps I will take you to now is the one that Ms. Pence introduced and that's Exhibit 295, the paper.
- MR. EAST: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. I'd like to mark this, this document here, as an exhibit, Mr. Commissioner.

THE REGISTRAR: Exhibit number 296.

EXHIBIT 296: DFO Aboriginal Aquatic Resource and Oceans Management (AAROM) Program document

MR. EAST:

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30 31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45

46

47

So if we could go to Exhibit 295, please? Now, Mr. Alexis, I apologize if I'm focusing my questions on you again. Ms. Gaertner indicated that perhaps you were -- and you had indicated --I'll wait. And you'd indicated that in your answers to Ms. Pence that you were aware of this diagram, and it's actually on page 8 of the document. I'm not sure what the Ringtail page number would be. That's it. And I'll read the quote, but I just wanted to -- I like this diagram. I'll return to it because I think it's actually helpful on a number of levels, but perhaps to introduce it, I'll just read the paragraph and ask the panel to comment upon it. This is right under:

1 2 3

AUTHORITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

5 6

7

9 10 11

12

21

22232425

272829

30

26

41 42 43

45 46 47

44

And again, this is a paper prepared by the First Nation Fisheries Council, the one that Ms. Pence just introduced. So I'll just read the first paragraph:

For First Nation communities, the strength of authority is concentrated at the local level, as inherent title and rights flow from attachment to land and marine space within a specific territory. As modern governance has pushed decision-making further way from the community level (i.e. in many cases to a B.C. wide scale), the recognized authority for a First Nation community and/or organization in decision-making has become diluted. In contrast, the strength of authority in DFO lies at the national level, with the Minister having supreme jurisdiction. In the current federal model the field staff who are the primary point of contact for most First Nations, are at the opposite end of the spectrum from the Minister, and therefore have little strength of authority to make decisions at the community scale with the proper First Nations' rights holders.

And before I throw this out, the comment, I note that I think today and I think clearly were heard by some of the panel members yesterday, that there was a concern that most of the engagement seems to be with -- at the community level and DFO is at perhaps the lower level of the DFO hierarchy where there is a need for engagement at a higher political level with DFO. And I just wanted to get a sense from the panel whether you see this challenge of authority at the community level but that DFO officials that speak to you don't come with that kind of political level of authority that you would like them to see. I wonder if you could just comment on that before we go any further.

MR. ALEXIS: Yeah. I reflected on it earlier by saying that the two spectrums are very different in management regimes. You know, if you see -- if you see a chief at the local level wanting to

61
PANEL NO. 10
Cross-exam by Mr. East (CAN)

speak and make a decision instantaneously, then that chief has to go to the ADM or the minister to do that. If we do try to make decisions with the field officer or somebody in a lower ranking, then that time it takes for that person to get that permission is a time wasted. So in our terms, in our -- in -- in our mandates, we do get our mandates from the people, they give us that authority to speak on their behalf regardless of which level we're at at this government regime here.

Then looking at the diagram, maybe you can blow that up a little bit for the panel, it's an interesting -- it's interesting because, I mean, looking at the left side of the panel it says "First Nations Geographic Scale, Strength of Authority". And clearly on this diagram, and I should introduce the diagram. This is a diagram, as I understand it, from this document, it was created by Brigid Payne of DFO, so this is a -- I quess it's been used in DFO presentation materials. And it suggests that the strength of authority is high at the local -- and it says nation level, and I just wanted to ask a question of -- about what we mean by nation in this context? And perhaps to put that into perspective, go back to page 4 of that document, to the list of principles that Ms. Pence asked you And the third one, it says scale: about.

Recognition that the proper title and rights holders are at the community level in the chiefs and community members at each nation.

Now, when we're talking about nation here, I've heard nation used today in a couple different contexts. It could be the community, for example, the Tl'azt'en, or it could be the Secwepemc Nation, at a level of, I guess, a common language and community group, and perhaps nation even more broadly than that. But in this definition, are you talking about the community, the local — sometimes called the band, sometimes called the First Nation, but the — the community that would be considered, for example, a band under the *Indian Act*, the Tl'azt'en, the Xwisten? Is that what's — is that what's referred to in this

definition of nation? 1 2 You're asking me that? MR. ALEXIS: 3 Yes, or anybody who wants to answer it. 4 MR. ALEXIS: Yeah, they're one and the same. When we 5 get our authority from the community level, I 6 guess the definitions of nations are skewed by 7 definitions under the *Indian Act* and other 8 documentations in Canada but there is a -- we call 9 ourselves Tl'azt'en Nation is because there was 10 five bands under our administrative organization 11 and these five bands are amalgamated in 1958, to 12 make it easier for the government to deal with us. So there's that terms in -- at the community level 13 14 as a nation, but in a broader perspective, when 15 you look at decision-making by either the tribal chair or by the tribal chief in some terms, you 16 17 get the whole community or all the bands together 18 to make that decision and give that mandate. 19 Great. That's exactly where I wanted to go next. 20 If you look at the chart, go back to page 8, the 21 way I read this, the arrow getting narrower and 22 going down is that as you get to aboriginal 23 organizations at the regional and aggregate level, 24 some of the organizations that we just referred to 25 now, like the UFFCA, use that as an example, or at 26 the B.C.-wide level, the BCAFN is maybe another 27 example, the authority of those organizations gets 28 somewhat -- I think the term they used here was 29 diluted, unless they can demonstrate that they 30 have been given a mandate from the communities 31 that compose the greater whole. Is that right? 32 Would you agree with that? 33 MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I'll agree with that. The authority, 34 when you get into a regional or aggregate level or 35 B.C.-wide level stems from the resolutions that's 36 passed, by all the chiefs in British Columbia or 37 either all the chiefs in the sub-region. 38 Mr. -- Dr. Ignace? 39 DR. IGNACE: You know this whole thing about how this 40 whole thing about First Nations started off was in 41 mid-1980s we were at Assembly of First Nations 42 Chiefs and we wanted to make it clear that we, for 43 example, the Secwepemc Nation collectively, all 44 the Secwepemc communities together collectively, 45 that's what makes up the Secwepemc Nation, nothing 46 other than that. But what the government -- we

said we're here as a nation and we're here first

and hence, First Nation was referring to us collectively all the Secwepemc together.

Q Mm-hmm.

- DR. IGNACE: Okay? But then the government appropriated that term and began applying it to the reservations and hence the reservations became and confounding the politics of it all, of what a nation is, much like what Grand Chief Saul Terry talked about, the confounding of our political field, which the government likes to do. So my definition of a nation is that we, all of us Secwepemc collectively as one united, and that's how our laws speak and that's how our rights are defined, that we I as a Secwepemc person have the right to all the resources within the whole Shuswap territory, not a part of it, not here, not there, but to all of it.
- And I guess what I'm hearing you say, Dr. Ignace, and this is for the whole panel, but I guess one of the greatest challenges right now for First Nations nations in British Columbia, tribal organizations up to the regional level, is finding those mechanisms, those processes by -- whereby organizations like the ITO or the FNFC, any of those larger-scale aggregated political organizations have the mandate to represent all the communities and getting that mandate. Would you agree that that is -- that's not been easy. That's been a challenge. And I would just like to hear your thoughts about your vision for how to ensure that these organizations -- that those organizations are able to have the mandate to represent the community, where perhaps the political and legal power lies.
- DR. IGNACE: Well, if the government would quit trying to use divide and rule tactics continuously and allow us to internally decide and define how we're going to represent ourselves, it would be very simple. And I think it would be simple for the government to be dealing with 30 different nations within B.C., rather than 300, 299 bands, First Nations. You know, that's where the confounding comes in. Confounding is with the government, it's not with us. And we know that, for example, we extend certain authorities to the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs to represent us, but they don't have the authority to make the final decision with us

64
PANEL NO. 10
Cross-exam by Mr. East (CAN)

as Secwepemc Nation. We have that final say. Anybody else?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Yeah, it kind of brings me back in time, sitting down at the river with my grandfather before he passed away and he talked about Nlha7apmx people and he talked about what he remembers and what he was told by his grandparents of the past. For example, even right in my area, there's the Siska Indian Band, there's the Skuppah Indian Band, and there's the Kanaka Indian Band, but prior to that, it was just the Skuppah. because they -- at least this is the way he understood it. But because they were a powerful group and they controlled such a productive piece of the river, that it was then easier for the department to split that community into three and create three communities with three sub-chiefs that would then play a part in the divide and conquer, where they would segregate the communities into numbers, this band being bigger than this other band, and they getting more resources through the Department of Indian Affairs, further to fragment the nation.

Hence, within Nlha7apmx tribal or within the Nlha7apmx Nation you now have two tribals. And these — these divisions were intentionally done and that was to weaken the nation; I mean, to the point right now that I'm also the political portfolio holder for fisheries within the NTA, but every time that we need to make a decision, it has to go back to the communities, back to the grassroots people who are impacted by these decisions. Then it goes back up to the larger table and that allows us to say this is the voice of our people. It's not our own opinion on how these things — I do not make the decisions for my people, my people assist me to make those decisions.

So I think that, you know, we need to be able to move forward in the future as Ron has said, Dr. Ron Ignace, is the provincial bodies and the federal bodies have got to stop trying to fragment the communities and the nations and allow them the time to rebuild. I mean, it's like the residential school situation right now where they're starting to close down all of the aboriginal healing foundations and yet the wounds

that were created by the residential schools are very much alive in our communities and will be alive for many, many years to come. And yet there's no recourse for us as aboriginal people other than to go into the courts.

I look at this commission and I do not mean

I look at this commission and I do not mean any offence, but the astronomical amount of money that's being spent to do this could have been directed to on-the-ground positive, positive work and not always end up in these commission states. If people would just sit down and work with First Nations and create and have the true open dialogue, we could save a heck of a lot of money and save the resource at the same time.

Thank you.

Q Thank you. I want to return to this -- the answer that DFO or Canada, the Crown, has been responsible for a divide and conquer situation among aboriginal groups, and I want to look at today and perhaps if we can go to the very last page of this document, page 14, and it's Appendix 1, "Co-management process currently in place in B.C." And one of the reasons I showed you the earlier document that had the list of First Nations and the organizations is because those are all organizations that are funded by DFO and the purposes of that funding is to assist these different First Nations to work together and to a large aggregation in order they could talk to DFO and talk to each other; is that right?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, that's kind of the way it comes out on paper, but if I had my technician sitting here in the room, Neil Todd and Tracy Sampson, they would certainly relay the frustrations to you in what it is like to be in an AFS agreement, and the level of frustration they feel in managing a very limited resource, constantly held accountable to meet the bar in regards to reporting, there would be a different picture. I think if all of our technicians were right here right now and talked about AFS agreements, it wouldn't be nearly as rosy as it's sounding through this report coming from DFO.

And going back to that initial article that was placed up just before, in regards to AAROM agreements and the Nicola Tribal Association doesn't have an AAROM agreement. We actually had

to move our communal commercial fisheries project through the Secwepemc Fisheries Commission, 3 because they had an AAROM agreement. wouldn't even allow four First Nations who have 5 actively been engaged in communal commercial 6 fisheries to look after a project on our own. 7 it was restrictive in nature. We had to go 8 through a body that had an AAROM agreement, 9 notwithstanding that we already had AFS agreement, 10 we still couldn't access PICFI funds. 11 Okay. CHIEF SAMPSON: So very... 12 13 Dr. Ignace? 14 DR. IGNACE: Yeah, in another area where, you know, 15 DFO's funding has -- is -- causes difficulties 16 within our communities is when it funds a 17 community for fish monitors and calls upon it to 18 apply -- in order -- the condition for that to get 19 that funding is to apply DFO rules and 20 regulations, which then in turn violates our 21 Secwepemc law for -- we had communities in our law 22 that we have a right to go and fish or utilize the 23 resources anywhere within Shuswap Territory, but 24 because -- and we -- some of our people from down 25 Chase area went up to the High Bar area to go 26 fishing and they had their vehicles, nets and 27 everything confiscated and caused a squabble 28 between the two communities. That doesn't lead to 29 very -- and makes it difficult at the political 30 table to sit down and talk about comprehensive 31 strategies when those type of scenarios exist 32 between people. And DFO needs to recognize that 33 and move away from that type of approach. And 34 then we can lead to some positive dialogue. 35 Thank you. 36 Maybe this is a question for Mr. Alexis, give him 37 a chance to answer this one, as well. In going back to this document, 'cause I think setting this 38 39 up, I want to look at the second column which says 40 Tier 2, and the Tier 2, as I understand it, are

MR. ALEXIS: No, I don't. But what I'll tell you is

in that organization?

processes and forms for First Nations and

aboriginal people to speak to DFO. And I want to

Planning on Fraser Salmon; have you participated

ask Mr. Alexis if you can tell us a little bit

about the Forum for Conservation and Harvest

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

this, these are the current regimes that's happening here today and -- but they're not inclusive for everybody. The conservation and harvest planning forum or the harvest planning group are basically an invitation organization that's dealing with sharing arrangements. That's what I understand. The roadmap process is another process that's developed by DFO but it's not inclusive. It doesn't give the whole picture in how First Nations would like to see the Fraser or fish being managed.

- Q Would you describe those processes as collaborative ground up type of processes?
- MR. ALEXIS: No.

- Q No? It's --
- MR. ALEXIS: It's just -- some of these processes that's happening are ad hoc. They have no clear mandates on where they should be going. There's some -- I think there's some -- maybe terms of reference that need to be developed to move some of these initiatives forward but it's -- I think DFO are trying their best to, I guess, to get inclusivity in these processes, but it's not happening. They're using organizations like FNFC or FRAFS to help them guide them along in those processes and it's a slow process. But I don't know too much about all these other processes, but maybe some of our technical folks would know about it
 - Q Okay. Well, I'll leave -- oh, sorry, Dr. -- Chief Terry?
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Thank you. I don't belong to this particular organization that put this paper together, but I think that what we're seeing here is a small example of the kind of confusion that permeates the structure of the department and also affects many of our peoples. And I believe that that is one of the main reasons why that those that are proponents for the inter-tribal fishery being implemented are seeking something that is much more simple and straightforward.

In my experience, the idea of having one person mandated from a particular nation coming and sitting down with the department is almost to the point of repugnant, being repugnant, I would think, because of the fact that as you asked earlier, do we have an AAROM agreement, it's been

 very difficult for the St'at'imc, for example, for which -- for whom I'm speaking right now, in that who would like to have a different kind of an arrangement that is quite different than what has been proposed by the department. And we feel that there is a better way to do things and we're certainly making efforts to go in that direction and it's certainly not a helter-skelter kind of groups and organizations in the region being developed. It should be a much more strengthened nation recognition than moving to set up an artificial structure that doesn't really represent or has no -- bears no resemblance to who we really are as nations within this region.

Anybody else want to wade in on that subject? And if not, I'll move to some more targeted questions. Perhaps maybe go to -- I'll start with Chief Terry, your witness summary, and that's Exhibit 293. And this is perhaps just maybe a concrete example of -- I'm interested in the process of dialogue between First Nations as decisions are being made on the ground. And you indicated, Chief Terry, in your testimony today and I believe it's on page 2 of your witness summary a difficult decision you had to make in 2009 with respect to your community, to go out and fish, and I just want to talk a little bit about the process that happened. First of all, this is in 2009, what time of the year was this, the incident we're talking about, where you, after talking to as you said a number of chiefs and communities, decided to go out fishing?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Yes. It was right at the onset of the fishing season for our people and that would probably have been into July, because of the fact that the runs are so poor now that we only, when we used to at one point be able to fish June, July and August, now we're only fishing in August and sometimes it's only three weeks in August. The -- so the time that was being talked -- I was talking about was the -- when the openings would have been expected for the early summers and summer runs.

Q And this is early summer sockeye that we're talking about?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Yes.

Q Where --

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: That would have been at the latter

1

part of those particular runs, I believe. 2 So would some of them be, for example, early 3 Stuart in this run or would they have been --4 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: No. 5 -- earlier probably? 6 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: No, they should have passed by our 7 area by then. 8 Should have passed by then. How many fish --9 well, first of all, when you said that after 10 discussions with the chiefs, we went out fishing 11 or we ordered our people to go fishing, were you 12 talking on behalf of the Bridge River, the 13 Xwisten, or on behalf of the groups, the Lillooet 14 groups generally? 15 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: The whole tribe or the nation. 16 majority of the communities met, that is the 17 chiefs, came together and we discussed this matter 18 amongst ourselves with the department as well and 19 then gleaned as much information as we could and 20 then determined -- made the decision and then we 21 also requested the department to acknowledge the 22 kind of decision that we had made. And because we 23 had negotiated or tried to negotiate, one might 24 say, I guess, with the department in saying we 25 would like to have all of the nations along the 26 river receive -- be able to access 80,000 fish and 27 out of that each nation would take their take. 28 That -- this was on a conference telephone call, 29 right? And we're trying to bring on the 30 department to get into this kind of a discussion 31 of whether or not that was appropriate. 32 Where did this 80,000 come from? It came 33 from the notion that out of a total amount of fish 34 that were returning, they determined that -- or 35 the resource sector determined that I believe it 36 was in the area of about .32 percent was for total 37 allowable mortality and that is number of fish 38 that they expected would die along the way. And 39 so we put forward the notion that maybe about 50 40 percent of that would be our target for 41 harvesting, so that our people will get some fish 42 for the winter. 43 And DFO, I assume, disagreed and said no? 44 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: They -- yes, they disagreed. 45 they said that every fish that went up the river 46 should be allowed to get to their spawning 47 grounds, and so we reduced the request. We said

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 44

45

46

47

all right, if you feel that that's a little too much for your folks and our people are in need, perhaps we can talk about 40,000 fish. Well, they still wouldn't agree, just to shorten the story, they wouldn't agree; however there was really no consensus either from any of the other representatives on the telephone call, that is from the other nations, other than St'at'imc - all of our chiefs were listening on a line - and so we said then that look, we have made a decision. Are you going to be part of our decision or not, we asked DFO and they didn't respond, and so we took it upon ourselves then collectively as chiefs and speaking to our people we indicated that we were going to go fishing and that our target was going to be about 5,000 fish. And with that, then we adjourned from the conference call and conveyed the message out to our people and then they went fishing.

Q How many sockeye did you -- did your communities catch in that fishery?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: The -- we, actually over a period of about four days, I believe, we were able to harvest about close to what we were targeting as 5,000 fish. I believe it was less than that that we got through that period. And because of the fact that I was in communication with the Pacific Salmon Commission as well, and we had put forward the notion that perhaps there's going to be a late arrivals or late numbers of fish to come forward at -- in this run, and I found out that that was not going to be the case. And I didn't know how many fish our people had caught by that point and so I called up Chief Mike Leech who is the chairman of the St'at'imc Nation and so I conveyed to him, I think we better stop our people from fishing and have an assessment of how many fish that we have caught. And so that's what transpired.

Okay. I guess the key question I'm interested in, and sorry if I missed your answer on this, what discussions did you have with your neighbours to -- downstream of you and upstream about this decision, that your communities made to go fishing at this point?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: I made an effort, I actually went and visited with Fred and his people over there in

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Merritt and conveyed to him the process that we had inaugurated to make that decision and also shared that with the other representatives on the commission. I shared it with Thomas, Chief Merlin Camille (phonetic) and the other Nlha7apmx people from the Main Stem Fraser.

Q And was there a consensus that this was acceptable among the people you talked to?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Well, the -- I think we were well ahead of the game in terms of understanding what needed to be done in order to carry out this fishery, and maybe Fred could fill it in, but at that point the Nlha7apmx weren't really as a whole weren't ready to proceed on that basis. As a matter of fact, I believe he did try and get his people to go fishing but -- but the other faction was opposed to that and therefore, I believe the department was sort of in there, as well. So, for us, I thought we were the most organized of -- to do the fishing that time.

Q Thank you. Chief Sampson?

CHIEF SAMPSON: Yeah. Most certainly, I'd like to speak to that fishing season of 2009. Most certainly Terry was moving the information around. As we got it, received it at the Nicola Tribal Association, we had a meeting of chiefs, seven chiefs got together and we looked at what the St'at'imc were doing and we said we too need to engage in a rights-based fishery. But the big difference is as Terry and their communities went fishing, DFO stayed right out of their face. the seven communities of the NTA went down and fishing and they threatened our people, they were threatened with charges. They, in fact, charged myself. And it was such a fly in the face of all of the processes that DFO carries forward. mean, to be approached by a conservation officer down on the river telling me that the river is closed but, Chief, you can keep your fish, you can keep your fish. I said, "Is this river open or closed? Make up your mind." I told him, "You have to charge me." "No, Chief, take your net out of the water, take your fish and go home." And I said, "The minute you go away in your boat, my net's going back out into the water." So they did formally charge me, but I've never had my day in court in regards to that 2009 fishing season.

On one hand, the St'at'imc went fishing because the dire needs of their community. We were in the same boat. It was a terrible fishing season. My community was striving and just looking for fish. So we went fishing, but it was a totally different scenario. What happened at Siska, helicopters flying around, boats, people harassing our fishermen on the river, and yet none of that happened up there in the St'at'imc.

I don't understand that. How do you categorize it? What is that, systemic racism amongst racism? I don't understand. But it certainly showed that, you know, communications not only amongst First Nations, it is happening. The real challenge is the communications and DFO on how they approach the different communities or the different nations. There is a huge difference on that scenario that happened that summer.

We supported their fishery. He in turn supported ours, but they were treated totally different. It was the first time in my life that I actually felt like I was a criminal in my own territory on my own river trying to feed my people with our own fish. And yet they wouldn't even give me the courtesy to have my day in court. How can DFO have the ability to, when things aren't working for them in court, they can throw it out? It was a very frustrating summer.

Did anybody else want to comment on their experiences that summer?

I'd like to -- and I'm conscious of the time, so perhaps just one more question, and this is just a -- for Mr. Alexis, and this is, Mr. Alexis, Exhibit 292, this is your witness summary. Now, one thing that we haven't discussed today in any detail is some of the history behind what is referred to in your witness summary, Mr. Alexis, is the Barricade Treaty. And I don't propose to get into it, but as you've indicated here, your grandfather was a signatory to this agreement that your community or your forefathers anyway had with the Department of Fisheries with respect to the use of weirs and other kind of selective fishing methods called barricades, I suppose.

MR. ALEXIS: Yes.

Q Now, and I'm just really just doing this for the record. You, on behalf of your First Nation and I believe the Nak'azdli First Nation have commenced a lawsuit against the Government of Canada with respect to this agreement that was signed back in 1911; is that right?

MR. ALEXIS: Right.

- Q And it's just fair to say that on some issues anyway, with respect to this, what we would call -- what DFO would call, I suppose, the Barricade Agreement, and is referred to here as the Barricade Treaty, that there is a difference of opinion about what this agreement is and what it means; would you agree with that?
- MR. ALEXIS: Well, DFO has a different opinion on it.

 Q Okay. Thank you. I was interested in your testimony, Mr. Alexis, about -- about the current situation with respect to weirs. Clearly, the purpose and I don't think this is -- it comes out in your witness summary that the Barricade Agreement or Treaty of 1911 had the -- certainly the intent of having the Tl'azt'en people and other people switch from using barricade weirs and other kind of traditional methods to using nets and I think I heard you say today that that's still the method of fishing that your community uses today; is that right?
- MR. ALEXIS: No. I said that after we signed the agreement and the barricades were outlawed, we resorted to gillnet fisheries, but DFO still uses the concept of barricade to manage their enumeration projects.
- So DFO uses barricades for their selective fishing studies? Just seems kind of ironic then that they're using traditional aboriginal methods to do their studies.
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes, that's what I said earlier, is that yet there are some concepts that DFO uses that's similar to our weirs and traps and they are still used today and the enumeration fences, for example, is one form of a barricade that our people utilized. I made reference to the incline plane trap. That's a similar trap that were used in -- by our people for deep water fisheries.
- Q Thank you. I was interested in your comment I just maybe want to explore this a bit, about how you indicated that today the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is -- I don't have the exact words but essentially preventing your community

 from fishing with weirs and other kind of methods such as the barricade today. And I was wondering if you can explain how that is, why -- in what way is DFO preventing that from taking place?

- MR. ALEXIS: Well, under the terms of the Barricade Treaty, our forefathers signed an agreement saying that they would stop using the weirs and traps that they normally utilized and in place of the gillnet fisheries. The reason for that was that they -- when the fishing industry and the commercial industry got really good back in the 1800s the canneries and the commercial industry resorted to DFO or their fishing officers and asked them to dismantle these weirs back in our own territories, because they deemed that these weirs were unsustainable and that they were catching all the fish and that there will be nothing going back to the spawning grounds, which wasn't true. If -- if the Government of Canada did the research and took a look at all the traditional knowledge our people had, this Barricade Treaty wouldn't have been in place today.
- Q And this is my final question on that then. Speaking today, my understanding is that if the Tl'azt'en Nation and other communities that uses those kind of traditional methods in the past were to approach DFO today, there would certainly at least be a willingness to discuss the approaches of using those fishing methods today; would you -- would you agree with that?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes. We tried under a few occasions, as Tl'azt'en Nation, to re-invigorate the weir system for our communities because, like I said earlier, when we fished with the weirs and the traditional traps, it was a communal event. Our young people built the traps, they built the weirs and they learned how to do all this stuff. They help with gathering the salmon and did all the processing and all that and it's not there now with the individualized effort under the gillnet system. And I made that reference to the same thing as the commercial fisheries. You have one rich person owns about 20 different boats. It's an individual effort. It's not a communal effort any more.
- MR. EAST: Well, I'll leave it there. And thank you very much all of you for your thoughtful answers

to my questions and that's my questions, Mr.
Commissioner.
THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. East. We're go

THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. East. We're going to take a ten-minute break and then I would suggest whichever counsel are remaining to ask questions would divide up the balance of the 25 minutes or so when we come back, so that there's some evenness between them in terms of time-sharing. Thank you very much.

THE REGISTRAR: Hearing will now recess for ten minutes.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED FOR AFTERNOON RECESS) (PROCEEDINGS RECONVENED)

THE REGISTRAR: Order. The hearing is now resumed.
MS. SCHABUS: Mr. Commissioner, Nicole Schabus, cocounsel Sto:lo Tribal Council and Cheam Indian
Band. Kukwpi7s, Chiefs, I just have a few brief
questions.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. SCHABUS:

- Q My first question is specifically to Kukwpi7 Ignace, but I also have a more general part of the question for all of you, and that's regarding the traditional knowledge and indigenous knowledge you have regarding habitat protection and examples of that. And Kukwpi7 Ignace, specifically, your nation has initiatives to protect spawning grounds and in the case of the Lake Suquokmok (phonetic) Division to protect some of the last remaining river deltas, such as the Salmon River, and I would ask you just to briefly speak to that if you feel in a position to do that.
- DR. IGNACE: No, I mean, you know, like I pointed out earlier, in the Deadman River we worked hard to try to rehabilitate spawning grounds, rearing channels, we created rearing channels, fish hatcheries, all of those, and fencing off riverbanks from insurgence by cattle, so they're very destructive to the spawning grounds and fish habitat. Those are important.

And I also pointed out earlier that we fought CN, who intended to build a twin track from Jasper down into Vancouver, that would have been in the river, in the North Thompson and South Thompson

and in the Fraser River, and we fought that because, again, of the -- it would have narrowed the channels, sped up the river, destroyed a lot of the salmon and rearing habitat, and especially those areas in the Shuswap Lakes areas. It's important, they're key areas for the rearing of the fish and the salmon have fry, the salmon habitat, to live there until they're strong enough and able enough to go into deeper waters.

And I commend those communities for standing up and protecting those wetlands. It's very, very important.

- Any of the other panellists, if you wanted to comment on the habitat protection, your traditional knowledge, or even habitat restoration?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Well, I think a part of the, you know, the habitat most certainly is the people. We are the land and the land is us, as First Nations people, and the efforts that we make collectively, just to maintain the stocks that we have currently, and I'll use the example of the Spius Fish Hatchery in the Nicola Valley, which introduces 250,000 Chinook smolt into the system every year and get absolutely no benefit of that back to their communities. And, indeed, the 250,000 fish that get returned into the system seem to be to the sole benefit of the rec fishery, as there's been a steady decline in those systems, irregardless of that effort.

So most certainly the effort's being done on the other end, but it's being totally diminished when it comes through the ocean. I mean, and that's just one example. For sure you could have many, many communities sitting here that could all tell basically the same kind of story of how they have tried to engage in enhancement and protection of the fish resource, only to have it taken by another user, and to the point where it's not conservation or First Nations, it's the commercial sport rec fishery. Thank you.

MR. ALEXIS: Thank you. Yes, we do a lot of projects within our area to maintain habitat and to maintain the pristineness of the habitat. We do have policies in place, as a nation, to allow a certain part of development, but there's some quidelines that they have to go by. That's our

guidelines, it's not the province guidelines, it's not the federal jurisdiction guidelines, it's our own that we developed in negotiations with both levels of government to ensure that there is proper protection in any watershed.

One example would be for the logging industry there's some very big buffer zones and no machine free zones that we impose on them to ensure that the water quality and the habitat quality is still there. We even located a logging road to protect one of our spawning streams. We shut down a jade mine to protect the spawning habitat within our territory.

So that's how important it is to us. We were taught as youth and as we were growing up, that the connection to the land is more important than the connection to the current, modern stuff we have now, because like our elders always said, "If you take care of the land, the land will take care of you."

- Q Thank you. My next question would be -- unless -- I can't see if Grand Chief Terry wanted to speak as well?
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to comment that, yes, habitat, I think, is critical and it is important and, you know, I've heard it said that, you know, that there's a tremendous over-abundance of escapement some were saying; however, I think that nature will look after itself as long as we take care to make certain that the habitat to which the fish return is well looked after, and I think that that's critical and important for, you know, the enhancement of the stocks as they are, and I think that we need to take care of that. That's a very important agenda matter.
- Q My next question goes to the importance that salmon plays in your indigenous economies. If you could speak to the central role that salmon play sin your economies, both in terms of diet but also economically to sustain your communities and the concerns you have in that regard and how you see that continuing in the future?
- CHIEF SAMPSON: Yes, thank you. Chief Fred Sampson.
 Yeah, most certainly, if I look back at the
 historic activity, especially in the Siska area as
 a wind-dried salmon industry, so to speak. On

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

record, in Fort Kamloops, I believe that anywhere between 25,000 and 50,000 wind-dried salmon were taken to Fort Kamloops in the form of trade commodity, and at that point in time, the Siska community, there was over 500 people living in the Siska area and community.

And when that economic -- social economic opportunity was removed and we were no longer allowed to sell our wind-dried salmon, the community was just decimated. We went from 500 people living on that reserve down to maybe 40 people, because the economy had taken away.

When the reserves were allotted, and I worked on a book with Cole Harris out at UBC, The Allotments of Indian Reserves in British Columbia, they were directly related to historic fishing sites and the economy attached to those sites. And then so Siska only got 1,200 acres of land. It's not farmland; it's riverbank; it's mountainside, it was because of the fishing sites. And then that economy was taken away from us, so the people left the community. They moved into the farming industry in the Lower Mainland and Chilliwack and they moved into the ranching areas in the Merritt area, and the community was just reduced to almost nothing, because it was directly attached to our economy that was attached to the wind-dried salmon industry. Thank you.

MR. ALEXIS: Yes, we did have an economy with the salmon that came back to our territory as well. Our people used to bring about 60,000 sockeye to the Hudson's Bay Company in Fort St. James for sale and barter to ensure that their people had an economic regime happening. It's the same thing with our people. Once the economics went down and was disallowed, then our people moved away and went for jobs that's in the general population, so It did make sure -it did decimate our people. it disconnected us from our culture and whatnot, and our people always thought that to preserve this regime and to ensure that the people know about this stuff, they keep telling these stories over and over again. They told us how they made the people survive in Fort St James. You know, it was a desolate place. In 1806, there was starvation and our people helped those guys to survive and live off the land.

So those stories are there, and there's economic value, even on the resident fish that's there. 80,000 kokanee was sold to Hudson's Bay company by our people and that value was there.

DR. IGNACE: You know, up until 1860, after the Oregon Treaty was signed, our people's laws were still enforced in which there was only Shuswap people that could catch fish or go hunting. The Hudson's Bay people were not allowed to, by our law, to go hunting or fishing.

And trade was the fundamental engine of our economy, even before the Hudson's Bay Company or the Europeans came along. And when the furtrading company, Hudson's Bay came along, they -all they had to do was just like taking an extension cord and plugging it into a socket. trading system and everything, the whole system of trade, transportation and routes was all there. All they had to do was plug in, that's all they did. And with salmon was a value of currency for For example, you could have three dried us. salmon for a tan deer hide, or four to five salmon, dried salmon, for a large elk hide. That was the measure of the value of these other materials that we traded for.

So it was fundamental to us, and when that --when the law came down and the hand rose -- lay down on us, that our whole economy collapsed, and we were reduced to beggary and white slavery, if I may use our chief's words of 1910.

- Q And thank you. Commission counsel has pointed out I'm coming to the end of my time, but I have a very quick clarifying question for Grand Chief Terry. Just in regard to you are a member of the Fraser River Panel, but you are appointed by Canada, correct? Sorry, I --
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: I'm a member of the Fisheries Commission.
- Q Of the Pacific Salmon Commission, sorry, a commissioner. But just to clarify that indigenous people from Canada do not have separate or independent representation at the Pacific Salmon Commission, like the U.S. tribes, and they do not have separate decision-making power, like the U.S. tribes?

GRAND CHIEF TERRY: That's true, but I think, though, that the folks that are represented either on a

panel and on my commission, we're working as hard as we can to work together with the other sectors to make certain that we all have fish to eat tomorrow.

MS. SCHABUT: Thank you. Those are all my questions.

MS. SCHABUT: Thank you. Those are all my questions.
MR. GERELUK: Mr. Commissioner and the respected panel,
my name is Gereluk, initial J. Gereluk is spelled
G-e-r-e-l-u-k. I represent the Métis Nation,
British Columbia, and I want to thank the west
coast peoples for permitting me to represent my
people on this occasion. We will have a witness
on the panel tomorrow.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. GERELUK:

- I have just a couple of questions of the panel, in particular, Mr. Alexis, if I may. We've heard from the management through collection process, but we haven't heard much about what the traditional method of enumeration of sockeye salmon in the Fraser has been, so perhaps, Mr. Alexis, you can describe what the traditional method or process of enumerating sockeye salmon, or fish in general in your particular areas?
- or fish in general, in your particular areas? MR. ALEXIS: Yes, our methods are the visual methods, the life counts and that of the sorts. Most of the streams in our area are pretty shallow. could be walked with a gumboot on. But there's some deep pockets in there that fish accumulate. And that's how we do it. There's other first -there's other parts of our people that, you know, just observe our -- observe the conditions, observe the abundance. I quess you could say by the way we catch our fish, we know that there's high abundance, and that's our enumeration, tool. We're always on the land. There's not one stream that's never been not looked at, because every family within our territory had a little chunk of land to take care of, and that's the way it was. They call it the Keyoh system, and that Keyoh system is a system where one family is allowed to take a chunk of land and maintain stewardship over
- Q All right. And Mr. Alexis, in your witness summary, on page 2, you discuss a year back in 1869, when there was a starvation time. Do you recall putting that in your witness summary?

81
PANEL NO. 10
Cross-exam by Mr. Gereluk (MNBC)
Re-exam by Mr. McGowan

MR. ALEXIS: Mm-hmm.

- Q And at that year, your people weren't permitted to catch any fish, I take it?
- MR. ALEXIS: We were permitted. We did it on our title and rights. We did fish our fish. But at that year it dropped or it crashed in the run sizes. I don't know by what. I hear these stories, it might be ocean or it might be the end route mortality, or it might just be some sort of a virus. But at that year there was hardly any salmon that went back into the territory, and our people were in the starvation mode at that time.
- And one other thing, Mr. Alexis, you referred to was a messenger that could communicate in a number of different languages and could communicate with the nations and tribes that neighboured your nation and also up and down the Fraser Watershed. Is there such a person in existence, today, that could communicate in all the languages of the various nations?
- MR. ALEXIS: No. I made reference to it a little earlier with a joke, I guess. I said I'm the one that drives up and down the river, now, and communicates with the chiefs and all the other tribes in the river, but I'm doing it in English.
- Q All right. Thank you. And one final question has to do with the traditional use of hatcheries. Is there, Mr. Alexis, was there a traditional use of fish hatcheries in your nation, with your nation, in your area?
- MR. ALEXIS: No, we have never had any hatcheries in our territory. The only hatchery that was built back in the seventies, I guess, under the Salmon Enhancement Program, was a Chinook hatchery that was built in Fort St. James and run by the Nak'azdli First Nation.
- MR. GERELUK: Thank you very much. That's all my questions.
- THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.
- MR. McGOWAN: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner, I just have a couple of questions in re-examination.

RE-EXAMINATION BY MR. McGOWAN:

Q Chief Alexis, you were asked a question by your counsel, Ms. Pence, about the ITO, and she asked you, "Is the ITO a mandated political body?" and

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46 47 your answer was, "Yes, it was." And I just wanted to understand what you meant by that answer. Is your answer intended to communicate that the ITO has a mandate to engage with DFO on behalf of First Nations, generally, or that it's intended in the future to attain that goal?

- MR. ALEXIS: Yes, under the terms of the agreement that the commissions or the executive that sits on the ITO would be mandated from their nations, and that the process might be putting forth names to pick from, but at this time, in formative stage, my organization, the Carrier Sekani Tribal Council, appointed me to that to help the ITO in developing the structure.
- Q Okay. And maybe, Grand Chief Terry, you can assist with this. At present, does the ITO have a mandate to engage with DFO on behalf of all First Nations along the Fraser River, or is it limited to only some?
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: Do we have the mandate to interface with DFO --
- Q On fisheries-related matters.
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: -- on behalf of all the nations? Q Yes.
- GRAND CHIEF TERRY: We have the mandate to do that by the Carriers coming to the table in Siwakmookh (phonetic), we have representatives there, and Sikukmookh (phonetic), as well, and St'atl'imx, and the latest addition has been the Okanagans, who have also chosen their representatives. We have yet to receive a direct representation or identification of representation from the Chilcotin National Government, but they are indirectly involved through the UFFCA. terms of direct, we are working on how that is going to work and we have had policy discussions as well as ways in which we could interface with the department. It's work in progress, one might say.
- MR. McGOWAN: Okay. Mr. Lunn, I wonder if you could please bring up Exhibit 295.
- MR. LUNN: Certainly.
- MR. McGOWAN:
- Q Thank you for that assistance, Grand Chief Terry. Chief Alexis, you're involved with the First Nations Fisheries Council; is that correct?
- MR. ALEXIS: Yes.

43

44

45

46

47

very much.

1 Okay. And you spoke to this document that's on the screen, earlier; do you recall that? 3 MR. ALEXIS: Yes, I did. 4 Now, I'm just looking at the cover. It says it was prepared by the FNFC Co-Management Staff. 5 6 that your understanding? 7 MR. ALEXIS: Yes. 8 Okay. So this document was prepared by the First 9 Nations Fisheries Council? 10 MR. ALEXIS: It was prepared by the First Nations 11 Fisheries Council with a working group that's 12 developed under the Co-Management Action Plan. 13 There are six DFO members on there, and there are 14 five or six First Nations members on there. 15 Okay. And this document is intended, I take it, 16 in part to communicate a message to DFO and other 17 First Nations about factors that ought to be 18 considered when exploring co-management; is that 19 correct? 20 MR. ALEXIS: Yes, that's correct. 21 Okay. And who is the message being delivered on 22 behalf of? 23 MR. ALEXIS: I guess both parties, because this is a joint initiative between DFO and the First Nations 24 25 in British Columbia. 26 Is it your understanding that the First Nations 27 Fisheries Council, in delivering this, is speaking 28 for all First Nations in British Columbia? 29 MR. ALEXIS: Not all. I won't say all. But we did get 30 a mandate in our assemblies to move these 31 initiatives forward and were adopted at those 32 assemblies to make sure that we are doing the 33 right thing for the people of British Columbia. 34 Thank you, Chief Alexis. Grand Chief Terry, does 35 the First Nations Fisheries Council speak on 36 behalf of the St'atl'imx Nation? 37 GRAND CHIEF TERRY: No. 38 MR. McGOWAN: Thank you. Those are my questions in re-39 examination. 40 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much to counsel, and 41 I want to thank each of the members of the panel

We'll now, then, adjourn until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Thank you.

who came here, today, to speak your voice in

answer to the questions, as well as to provide

your views through your statements. I thank you

 THE REGISTRAR: The hearing is now adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2010, AT 10:00 A.M.)

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the evidence recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability, and in accordance with applicable standards.

Diane Rochfort

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the evidence recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability, and in accordance with applicable standards.

Karen Acaster

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the evidence recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability, and in accordance with applicable standards.

Susan Osborne

I HEREBY CERTIFY the foregoing to be a true and accurate transcript of the evidence recorded on a sound recording apparatus, transcribed to the best of my skill and ability, and in accordance with applicable standards.

Karen Hefferland