

SPECIFIC CLAIMS TRIBUNAL

BETWEEN:

LAC DES MILLE LACS FIRST NATION

Claimant(s)

and

HIS MAJESTY THE KING IN RIGHT OF CANADA
As represented by the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations

Respondent

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

This Declaration of Claim is filed under the provisions of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act*, SC 2008, c 22, and the *Specific Claims Tribunal Rules of Practice and Procedure*, SOR/2011-119.

December 31, 2025

Date

Dragisa Adzic

Registry Officer

TO: Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Litigation, Justice Canada
Bank of Canada Building, 234 Wellington Street East Tower
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H8
Fax Number: (613) 954-1920

I. Claimant(s) (Subrule 41(a) of the Rules)

1. The Claimant, Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation (“LDMLFN” or “First Nation” or “Band”), confirms that it is a First Nation within the meaning of section 2 (a) of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act*, SC 2008, c 22, by virtue of being a “band” within the meaning of the Indian Act, RSC 1985, c.I-5
2. LDMLFN’s two reserve land bases are located on Reserve 22A1, on Lac des Mille Lacs, and on Reserve 22A2, which is located between the Seine and Firesteel rivers, in the Province of Ontario.

II. Conditions Precedent (Subrule 41(c) of the Rules)

3. The following conditions precedent as set out in subsection 16(1) of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act*, SC 2008, c 22, have been fulfilled:

16 (1) A First Nation may file a claim with the Tribunal only if the claim has been previously filed with the Minister and

(a) the Minister has notified the First Nation in writing of his or her decision not to negotiate the claim, in whole or in part.

III. Claim Limit (Paragraph 20(1)(b) of the Act)

4. On March 1, 2022, Lac des Mille Lacs First Nation submitted a claim to the Minister alleging that His Majesty the King in Right of Canada (“Canada” or “Crown”) breached its legal obligations owed to LDMLFN when it failed to set aside sufficient lands that were suitable for “farming lands” as promised and agreed to in the discussion leading up to and included in the terms and conditions of Treaty 3. Canada informed the First Nation that the claim met minimum standards and was deemed to have been filed with the Minister on August 30, 2022. On August 26, 2025, Canada advised that it was only prepared to compensate the First Nation for the garden islands that it traditionally cultivated (which were not set aside as reserve lands) but not for the broader allegation of insufficient farming lands being provided to the First Nation.

5. For the purposes of this Claim, LDMLFN does not seek compensation in excess of \$150 million.

IV. Grounds (Subsection 14(1) of the Act)

6. The following are the grounds for the Claim, as provided for in section 14 of the *Specific Claims Tribunal Act*, SC 2008, c 22:

14 (1) Subject to sections 15 and 16, a First Nation may file with the Tribunal a claim based on any of the following grounds, for compensation for its losses arising from those grounds:

(a) a failure to fulfil a legal obligation of the Crown to provide lands or other assets under a treaty or another agreement between the First Nation and the Crown;

(b) a breach of a legal obligation of the Crown under the Indian Act or any other legislation — pertaining to Indians or lands reserved for Indians — of Canada or of a colony of Great Britain of which at least some portion now forms part of Canada;

(c) a breach of a legal obligation arising from the Crown’s provision or non-provision of reserve lands, including unilateral undertakings that give rise to a fiduciary obligation at law, or its administration of reserve lands, Indian moneys or other assets of the First Nation;

....

7. The First Nation submits that the failure to fulfill the treaty promise and provide sufficient lands suitable for farming falls under s. 14(1)(a),(b), and (c).

V. Allegations of Fact (Subrule 41(e) of the Rules)

Historical Context and Crown Motives

8. The First Nation is an “Indian Band” under the *Indian Act*, R.S.C., 1985, c.I-5, as amended and has since time immemorial used, occupied and possessed lands and waters in the vicinity and around the Lac des Mille Lacs, including the lands and waters which comprise Indian Reserve 22A1 and Reserve 22A2. LDMLFN is an Anishinaabe First Nation whose members engaged in, and relied upon, agriculture and gardening prior to and after the signing of Treaty 3.

9. The Crown was urgent to secure a treaty with the Treaty 3 First Nations in 1873 since the Crown had a strategic need to open a secure route to the West and consolidate authority during a period of heightened political tension. After the acquisition of Rupert's Land in 1870, Canada's only transportation corridor to Manitoba, the Dawson Route, ran directly through Anishinaabe territory, and federal officials repeatedly warned that without the consent of the First Nation, the movement of troops, settlers, and supplies could have been disrupted or stopped altogether. This concern was amplified by the Red River resistance under Louis Riel at the time, which had revealed Canada's lack of effective control in the region and raised fears that unrest could spread or that Anishinaabe leaders might align with western resistance movements. In this context, the Crown understood that the agreements negotiated with the First Nation were not merely procedural steps toward westward expansion but were essential commitments needed to stabilize the region, secure military and transportation access, and ensure the peaceful extension of Canadian authority. Given the volatile circumstances and the high stakes involved, the Crown would have recognized that the promises made to the Anishinaabe needed to be clear, reliable, and honoured in full.

10. In this fraught political environment, the Crown's commitments within Treaty 3, especially those relating to the provision of farming lands, took on heightened importance. Canada sought not merely to acquire a right-of-way but to establish a stable and cooperative relationship with the Anishinaabe during a period when colonial authority in the West was fragile. The promise of farming lands was central to that objective as it represented Canada's assurance that the transition accompanying settlement and transportation development would not leave the First Nation without a viable economic base. At a time when tensions were high, the region was strategically critical, and the Crown needed the First Nation's consent to ensure safe passage and political stability. The promises made in the negotiation and execution of the treaty were foundational to maintaining peace, supporting the First Nation's long-term livelihood, and ensuring that the treaty relationship would endure beyond the immediate crisis. In these circumstances, the Crown would have understood that fulfilling the farming lands commitments was essential to honouring the treaty,

upholding the relationship that enabled Canadian expansion, and ensuring that the First Nation received the tangible benefits it was promised in exchange for its consent.

11. On or about 3 October 1873, representatives of certain Indian Bands entered into an agreement with Commissioners representing Her Majesty the Queen, which agreement is commonly known as, and will hereinafter be referred to as, "Treaty #3".
12. On or about 13 October 1873, the First Nation entered into Treaty 3 by an adhesion of that date, executed under the mark of Me-tas-so-que-ne- skank, Chief of the First Nation.
13. Under the terms of the written text of Treaty 3 the First Nations agreed to share their lands and resources with Her Majesty the Queen. In consideration for the agreement to share the lands and resources, Her Majesty the Queen undertook, *inter alia*, to lay aside reserves for the Indians.
14. The reserves to be laid aside included "*reserves for farming lands, due respect being had to lands at present cultivated by the said Indians,*" and "*other reserves of land ... which said reserves shall be selected and set aside where it shall be deemed most convenient and advantageous for each band or band of Indians, by the officers of the said Government appointed for that purpose, and such selection shall be so made after conference with the Indians.* Disposition of reserves or any interest in them by the Government of Canada required "*the consent of the Indians entitled thereto first had and obtained.*"
15. The reserve lands were surveyed in 1875. Reserve 22A1, which is on the shores of Lac des Mille Lacs was set aside as the First Nation's "farming lands". The second reserve, Reserve 22A2, is situated down stream from Lac des Mille Lacs between the Seine and Firesteel rivers and was set aside as the First Nation's "wild lands" reserve.

16. Reserve 22A1 was subsequently abandoned because of the lack of arable lands. If the terms of Treaty #3 were fulfilled, and the First Nation was provided with adequate farming land in accordance with the intentions of the parties of Treaty #3, the First Nation would never have had to abandon its reserve. The abandonment of Reserve 22A1 is itself compelling evidence of the Crown's failure to fulfill the farming lands promise.
17. Prior to, at the time of signing of the Treaty #3, and thereafter until the First Nation was forced to abandon its Reserve 22A1, the evidence shows that the First Nation did engage in farming (to the extent that it could) and had various gardens and harvest sites on what was to become Reserve 22A1, and on its traditional lands, including various islands on Lac des Mille Lacs. The agents of the Crown noted that the people of Lac des Mille Lac First Nation were one of the more industrious and more successful First Nations at farming.
18. The First Nation is in the process of reestablishing its community on Reserve 22A1. The First Nation started its rebuilding by building its traditional roundhouse, and then its elder's complex. Various members are now constructing homes on the reserve again. Despite this effort to rebuild its community the Reserve lands still have little arable soil which can be used for agricultural and farming purposes, contrary to the promises afforded at the time of entering into the Treaty #3 and thereafter.
19. According to the text of Treaty 3 the Crown promised *"to lay aside reserves for farming lands, and also to lay aside and reserve for the benefit of the said Indians other reserves of land in the said territory hereby cede . . ."* and *"that the following articles shall be supplied to any band of the said Indians, [assorted agricultural implements] enough of wheat, barley, potatoes and oats to plant the land actually broken up for cultivation by such band."*
20. The text of Treaty 3, and oral promises made by Canada leading up to the signing of the Treaty, clearly establish that the Crown promised to set aside land for the Anishinaabe First Nations for two types of reserves, "farming" reserves and "other"

reserves. Such reserve would be set aside in accordance with the formula for allocating such reserve lands as contained elsewhere in the treaty. During the negotiation period leading up to the signing of the Treaty 3, farming was a material term that was discussed and negotiated.

21. In addition, the text of Treaty 3 also clearly established that the Crown promised to provide farming implements as well as crop seed to enhance the Anishinaabe First Nations' agricultural pursuits.
22. Upon the facial meaning of these terms, it is entirely reasonable to conclude that in preserving the Crown's integrity and honour, which would presume the Crown intended to honour its promises, any lands set aside as reserves for "farming" by the Crown in fulfillment of its promises would necessarily require such land to be conducive to agricultural pursuits. The Crown's failure to set aside such agriculturally conducive land would not only be contrary to the Crown's integrity and honour, but would also be contrary to "*the most important part of the treaty*" (re. the setting aside of the reserves) from Canada and the Anishinaabe First Nations' perspective.
23. In summary of the facial meaning of the terms within the text of Treaty 3 relating to agriculture, the Crown promised to set aside land for two types of reserve, "farming" reserves and "other" reserves, and to provide such farming implements and crop seed to enhance Anishinaabe agriculture. Accordingly, a reasonable interpretation is that if the Crown intended to keep its promise, and thereby preserving its integrity and honour, it was required to ensure that the land set aside for "farming" would be able to support the types of crops that the Anishinaabe First Nations were currently cultivating at the time of the signing of Treaty 3, as well as those crops that were promised within the treaty itself.
24. Such an interpretation of Treaty 3 is supported by the intentions of the parties, and the oral terms made by the treaty commissioners. Although the text of Treaty 3 does not set out the intentions of the parties to the treaty, nor the oral promises made by the

treaty commissioners, there is an abundance of extrinsic evidence pre and post signing of the Treaty to demonstrate such intentions and oral promises made during the treaty negotiations to highlight the importance of coming to terms on the farming commitments that both parties desired.

The Pre-Treaty Extrinsic Evidence of the Promises of Treaty #3 Pertaining to Farming

25. Both the pre-treaty and the post-treaty extrinsic evidence pertaining to the negotiations leading to the signing of Treaty #3 provides ample support for the First Nation's understanding and intentions concerning Treaty #3, and the common intentions of the First Nation and the Crown.

Treaty 3 Negotiations and Promises

26. During the initial negotiations for a treaty with the Anishinaabe in 1871, the three commissioners' instructions advised, among other things, that they were to select reserves in order to promote settlement of the Indians " . . .with a view to the gradual introduction of those agencies which in Canada have operated so beneficially in promoting settlement and civilization among the Indians." One important component of the "agencies" that promoted "*settlement and civilization among the Indians*" was the introduction of agriculture as a means of participating in the Euro-Canadian economy, and thereby to promote self-sufficiency.
27. After the initial commissioners failed to reach an agreement with the Anishinaabe First Nations, a new commission was created that included Lieutenant Governor Morris. During the 1873 negotiations, Lieutenant Governor Morris met privately with Chiefs to discuss their views on the terms of a treaty and noted that aid for agricultural pursuits would provide an inducement for a treaty agreement.
28. The Chiefs of the Anishinaabe First Nations recognized the importance of receiving farming implements and crop seeds in order to enhance their agricultural pursuits, and

how the issue of agriculture was a major component in the negotiation and signing of Treaty 3.

29. A shorthand reporter's account of the negotiations leading to Treaty 3 indicates that Lieutenant Governor Morris informed the assembled Chiefs near the commencement of the treaty negotiations that the Anishinaabe First Nations would receive "lands for farms" in addition to "reserves" for their own use. The statement made by Lieutenant Governor Morris expressly promised farming land as a component of the terms of a treaty agreement.
30. The shorthand reporter also recorded that during discussions pertaining to the provision of agricultural assistance that Lieutenant Governor Morris expressed a wish that all Anishinaabe First Nations would commence farming.
31. On the final day of negotiations Commissioner Provencher, speaking in the absence of Lieutenant Governor Morris, assured the Chiefs that "*they will have enough of good farming land, they may be sure of that.*"
32. The above discussions and promises are also recorded in the set of notes taken by Mr. Dawson, one of the treaty commissioners for Treaty #3. Taken together, the shorthand reporter's records and the notes taken by Mr. Dawson clearly demonstrate the intentions of both the Crown and the Chiefs of the Anishinaabe First Nations. Both the official Crown representative and the Chiefs of the Anishinaabe First Nations viewed agriculture, the necessity of the reserving of appropriate land conducive to the cultivation of crops, and the provision of necessary farming implements and crop seed as an important component of a treaty agreement. Consequently, within the context of the written terms of Treaty 3, this pre-treaty extrinsic evidence supports the conclusion that the Crown was obligated to provide the First Nation with land conducive to agricultural pursuits.

The Post-Treaty Extrinsic Evidence of the Promises of Treaty #3 Pertaining to Farming

Implementation and Surveying of Reserves

33. After the Treaty was signed and to be implemented, Mr. Dawson reported to the Minister of the Interior on the progress of the implementation of the treaty provisions. In his report he clearly sets out that he believed the terms of the treaty required that two types of reserves were required to be set aside, farming, and wild lands. In this report, Mr. Dawson also cautions against confusing the two.
34. Mr. Dawson's report not only confirms his post-treaty understanding of the terms of Treaty 3 as they relate to reserves and "farming lands", but also confirms and supports the text of the treaty and provides, albeit indirectly, evidence as to the intentions of Crown and the First Nations. From Dawson's report it is clear that an understanding was reached during the negotiations of Treaty 3, and was later incorporated into the text of Treaty #3, that there were to be two distinct classes of reserves set aside for the Anishinaabe First Nations, "farming lands" and "wild lands."
35. The creation of reserves for "farming lands" played a large role in the negotiations leading up to the signing of Treaty 3, and consequently there was an expectation on the part of the First Nations that the promises made orally, and the subsequent written text of the treaty, would be honoured by the Crown. To illustrate this, on March 19, 1874 the Chiefs of the Lake of the Woods complained in writing to Lieutenant Governor Morris about the slow progress of reserve selection highlighted the importance of the need for the creation of reserves, the equal importance of agriculture in such creation, and the need for agriculture to aid in the sustenance of the First Nations.
36. The First Nations' dissatisfaction at the slow pace of reserve selection was again noted by Lieutenant Governor Morris on May 31, 1874, when two chiefs forwarded him a statement of their preferred procedure for reserve selection, and emphasizing that the creation of the reserves, which would have included lands set aside for agriculture, "*were the most important part of the treaty.*"

37. Another report authored and signed by Mr. Dawson clearly shows that the First Nation were to have set aside reserves of “*wild and farming lands*”, and that the surveyor in his description of the reserves “*should distinguish between the farming and wild lands, as the latter are to be administered by the Government while the former are to remain in the permanent possession of the Indians.*”
38. Lieutenant Governor Morris recounted his role in the negotiations of Treaty 3, and expressed optimism about the future of Anishinaabe agriculture and stated that encouraging and enhancing the pursuit of agriculture among the “Indians” was a “*very important feature of all treaties.*”
39. In June of 1875 Surveyor Robert Ross’ surveying and reporting further confirm that the First Nation was to be provided with “farming lands” as distinct from its “wild lands”. Surveyor Ross noted and recorded the Plan of Indian Reserve 22A1 as the First Nation’s farming lands which was signed on December 18, 1875. Despite the intention to provide the First Nation with farming land Surveyor Ross reported that only a small portion of the reserve 22A1 was arable and very little of reserve A2 was “fit for cultivation”.
40. Canada provided no contemporaneous justification for selecting lands overwhelmingly unsuitable for agriculture, despite the surveyor’s explicit findings of poor soil quality and the Crown’s knowledge that more arable lands were available to fulfill the Treaty 3 farming lands promise.
41. The persistent and consistent reporting of the First Nation’s farming activity and the inferior soil conditions on the reserve post-treaty is further extrinsic evidence of the parties’ intentions that the First Nation was to be provided with adequate farming land so the First Nation could engage in agriculture. There are many instances where the agents of the Crown specifically observed and reported on these matters which further supports the importance of this commitment to the Crown.

42. Another example of post treaty conduct and extrinsic evidence which supports that the First Nation was to receive an adequate amount of farming land was the post treaty incident concerning the Rainy River First Nations' objection to the small amount of farming land. After intense negotiations concerning how much frontage their lands should be along the shores of the Rainy River, the Rainy River Reserve Agreement when finally concluded in 1875 increased the farming land from 7.25 miles to 40 miles. Despite the fact that this negotiation occurred prior to the surveying of reserve 22A1 and 22A2 there is no record that the agents of Canada informed the First Nation of this concession and acknowledgement it made for the other treaty partners on the Rainy River. They failed to do so despite the Chief's protest of the reserve size and the fact that the Mr. Dennis was aware and reported to his superior that there were also a "*few hundred acres on the North shore*" of Lac des Mille Lacs that was suitable for agriculture which could have easily been set aside from the First Nation.
43. Taken together, these post-treaty reports, recollections and conduct of the Crown representatives responsible for negotiating Treaty 3 clearly demonstrate that there was an understanding between the parties that lands conducive to agriculture would be set aside as reserves such that in the Crown's post-treaty behaviour there is a clear intention to set aside such lands as reserves.
44. From the foregoing it is clear that the Crown's representatives in the negotiations for Treaty #3 had promised the Anishinaabe First Nations, including the First Nation, that adequate land suitable for agriculture would be set aside as reserves. The extrinsic evidence also demonstrates that the farming aid acted as an inducement for the Anishinaabe First Nations to enter into treaty with the Crown.
45. Furthermore, although the term "farming" was used in the extrinsic evidence and the text of Treaty 3, the context in which the term is used indicates that both parties understood the term to refer to agricultural pursuits, and not to husbandry. The Anishinaabe First Nations, including the First Nation, had extensive experience in agriculture and had utilized the production of various crops as a means of sustenance and trade for many years before entering treaty negotiations with the Crown.

Accordingly, the Anishinaabe First Nations, including the First Nation, would have understood the term “farming” as referring to agriculture and not husbandry.

46. In summary, the pre-treaty extrinsic evidence of the negotiations leading up to the signing of Treaty 3, confirms the intentions of the text of Treaty 3 and provides further support that the Crown promised to intentionally set aside two types of reserve, “farming lands” and other reserves or “wild lands.” Additionally, post-treaty extrinsic evidence also supports the interpretation of Treaty 3 as the Crown promising to set aside two types of reserve for the Anishinaabe First Nations. Such post-treaty evidence confirms that the setting aside of reserves for “farming lands”, and the provision of farming implements and seed crops, was an important aspect of the treaty, and the policy of the government at the time of Treaty 3.

Implementation of the Treaty #3 “Farming Provisions”

47. The First Nation has received 12,227.40 acres in satisfaction of the reserve land promises contained in Treaty 3.

48. Of the reserve land allocation set aside for the First Nation under Treaty 3, most of the land is comprised of soils that currently have "no capability for arable culture or permanent pasture." IR22A1 consists of: 74% Class 7 (No capability for arable culture or permanent pasture); 12% Class 5 (very severe limitations that restrict capability to produce perennial forage crops, and improvement practices are feasible); and 11% Class 4 (severe limitations that restrict the range of crops or require special conservation practices or both). Water and Class O (Organic Soils) account for most of the remaining area. CLI Class 3 accounts for a very small portion of the area (.05%). The farming land promise under Treaty 3 has not been met.

49. Accordingly, the Crown failed to fulfill the treaty promise to provide farming lands suitable for cultivation, and failed to act honourably and diligently in the administration and implementation of Treaty #3.

VI. The Basis in Law on Which the Crown is Said to Have Failed to Meet or Otherwise Breached a Lawful Obligation

50. The Crown's failure to provide suitable farming lands constitutes a breach of lawful obligations owed to the First Nation, including the following:

- a. **Breach of Treaty 3 (Non-Fulfilment of a Treaty Obligation):** The Crown failed to fulfill its express and implied promise under Treaty 3 to set aside "reserves for farming lands" suitable for agricultural cultivation, contrary to the written terms, the oral assurances made by treaty commissioners, and the parties' common intentions.
- b. **Breach of the Honour of the Crown:** The honour of the Crown required the diligent, purposive, and faithful implementation of treaty promises. By setting aside land overwhelmingly unsuitable for agriculture despite knowing the First Nation relied on those promises, the Crown failed to act honourably. The honour of the Crown required Canada to diligently pursue the implementation of the Treaty 3 farming lands promise. The Crown failed to take reasonable steps to identify, protect, and set aside lands capable of supporting agriculture.
- c. **Breach of Fiduciary Duty:** The Crown, having exclusive control over reserve creation and the land selection process under s. 91(24), owed a fiduciary duty to select and protect suitable farming lands for the First Nation. By providing lands incapable of supporting agriculture and prioritizing Crown and settler interests, the Crown breached its fiduciary obligations.
- d. **Breach of Legal Obligations Arising from the Administration and Creation of Reserve Lands:** The Crown failed to properly administer the reserve creation process, ignored available arable land, failed to implement known oral promises, and provided lands that defeated the purpose of the treaty provision. This constitutes maladministration and breach of legal duty in the creation of reserve lands.

VII. The Type(s) of Compensation the Claimant(s) Intend(s) to Claim Under Subsection 20(1) of the Act

51. The First Nation seeks equitable compensation, in accordance with the principles set out by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Southwind v. Canada*, for Canada's failure to provide the viable farming lands promised under Treaty 3 and for its breach of fiduciary, treaty, and legal obligations. In accordance with *Southwind*, compensation must reflect the most advantageous use of the lands over time, assessed with the benefit of hindsight and without discounting based on Crown-discretion or minimal statutory obligations. In particular, the First Nation seeks:

- a. Equitable compensation for the loss of the farming lands that ought to have been selected and set aside under Treaty 3, assessed with the benefit of hindsight and without limiting the valuation to minimal statutory obligations or expropriation-based approaches;
- b. Equitable compensation for the loss of use and benefit of those lands from the date the Crown should have provided suitable farming lands to the present, including the loss of agricultural productivity, economic opportunity, community development, housing potential, and food security that the promised lands would have supported;
- c. Compensation for the lost opportunity to develop a viable agricultural economy, including the socio-economic, cultural, and intergenerational benefits that would reasonably have flowed from access to appropriate farming lands;
- d. Compensation for the diminution of reserve value and the adverse impacts caused by Canada's selection of lands overwhelmingly unsuitable for agriculture, contrary to the purpose and intent of Treaty 3;
- e. Compensation for maladministration and breach of fiduciary duty, including Canada's failure to exercise ordinary prudence and loyalty when

selecting reserve lands and its prioritization of non-Indigenous interests over the First Nation's treaty-protected interests;

- f. Equitable interest from the date of breach to the date of judgment, consistent with the principles governing fiduciary breaches;
- g. Such further and other compensation or equitable relief as the Tribunal finds just to restore the First Nation to the position it would have been in had Canada fulfilled its obligations; and
- h. Costs to be awarded on a solicitor-client or substantial indemnity basis pursuant to the Specific Claims Tribunal Rules of Practice and Procedure, SOR/2011-119 section 110(2) in relation to the Specific Claim and this proceeding.

VIII. Other Relief Sought

52. In addition to compensation, the First Nation seeks:

- a. A determination that Canada breached its treaty, fiduciary, and other legal obligations owed to the First Nation; and
- b. Such other relief as this Honourable Tribunal deems just.

Dated this 31st day of December, 2025



Etienne Esquega
Counsel for the Claimant

Esquega Law Office
100 Anemki Drive, Suite 104
Fort William First Nation, ON P7J 1K4
Fax: 807-286-1000

Email: ee@esquegalaw.com