



“Plus Ten Percent for Forcible Taking:”¹ Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway as Environmental Racism on Kahnawà:ke²

HPS: The Journal of
History & Political
Science

2017, Vol. 5 13-25
© The Author(s) 2017

Lily Ieroniawá:kon Deer

Carleton University, Canada

The construction of massive economic development projects disproportionately impacts Indigenous communities in what is now Canada, and is defined by Melissa Checker as environmental racism. This paper explores the imposition process of the St. Lawrence Seaway on the Kanien'kehá:ka community of Caughnawaga, Quebec. The colonial relationship Glen Coulthard describes is used to frame the power dynamics between the state and the community of Caughnawaga in the conception, construction, and compensation phases of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The initial location of the Seaway was on the southern part of the island of Montreal, though shifted on Caughnawaga in future development interests of the city, as uncovered by a draft report completed by Joan Holmes and Associates in 1999. The cabinet conclusions from the Parliament of Canada between 1955 and 1956 discussed concern of legality surrounding the expropriation of reserve land. Ministers declared the legal incongruity could be resolved with amending the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act to define the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority as a corporation. The amendment allowed for the Authority to forcibly take lands within Caughnawaga via Section 35 of the Indian Act, removing non-consenting families from their homes. The oral history accounts conducted by Kahnawà:ke community members Stephanie K. Phillips and Dwayne Stacey emphasized the unjust nature of the Seaway. Joan Holmes & Associates confirmed lack of notification of the expropriation to Caughnawaga, often following the actions, and compensation was insufficient when able to compare to private appraisers.

² The author would like to thank John Carlson, Dr. Kahente Horn-Miller, Kristine McCorkell, and Steve McLeod for their assistance in providing comments to previous editions of this paper; Hamda Deria and Dr. Zoe Todd for their ongoing support.

Introduction

In the past four-hundred years, the construction of transportation networks, including railways and seaways, along with energy-harnessing constructs, have been conflated with natural progression of the modern nation-state in achieving the goal of “development.” These massive undertakings are viewed as necessary for prestige in terms of “progress” to compete with other nation-states at the global level. Further, these development constructs, which are part of the international movement towards industrialization in the post-Cold war era, are also driven by desires for economic gain. Signature to industrialization, resource extraction and energy production is a blatant disregard for the environmental disruption of such projects cause, though there has been a slight increase in consciousness with the rise of environmental awareness.

Canada is not immune to such trends of ignoring the impact of these development constructs on the land or the people whom it will affect; the nation-state has participated, and actively partakes, in these development projects in pursuit of nation-building, capital gain, and energy harvesting. Often, these structures are constructed disproportionately on the lands of racialized communities because the lives of those impacted are valued less than the lives that make up the dominant society.³ Further, those in power to make these decisions are at a higher position on the social hierarchy, enabling domination.⁴ This concept is known as environmental racism. In the case of Canada, environmental racism has occurred, and *continues* to be, pushed on Indigenous peoples and other racialized communities when energy-harnessing projects, and transportation networks such as railways and seaways are built. This paper explores how the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway was an act of environmental racism against the Kanien'kehá:ka⁵ community of Kahnawà:ke,⁶ formally known as Caughnawaga.⁷ Kahnawà:ke is located on the south shore of Tio'tià:ke,⁸ Québec, Canada. The community's land base is presently 12,000 acres approximately, though it was originally around 40,000 acres.⁹¹⁰ This case study is significant to the field of anthropology because it is part of the larger trend of how Canada has treated and continues to treat Indigenous peoples unjustly en masse, specifically in regards to land dispossession.

To outline how the St. Lawrence Seaway was an act of environmental racism on the Mohawk people of Kahnawà:ke, this essay will examine the stages of the Seaway: conception, construction, and compensation. To begin, the definition of the colonial relationship Dene scholar Glen Coulthard describes as existing between the Canada and Indigenous peoples, will be used to frame the power dynamics that facilitated the Seaway being pushed onto Kahnawà:ke. These dynamics facilitated environmental racism on the Kanien'kehá:ka community, starting from the proposed, and later changed, location of the Seaway. To continue, the unethical approaches in the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway will be explored, stemming from the lack of consideration for the people of Kahnawà:ke by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority (SLSA) prior to, during and following construction. Further, legal amendments made by the federal government of Canada were made to secure “legal soundness” of such land expropriations following the

acknowledgement of legal incongruity.¹¹ In discussing how the amendments made to facilitate the dispossession of Kahnawà:ke's land, the Canadian Parliament's Cabinet Conclusions from 1955 to 1956 will be used. I demonstrate how those in Parliament changed the *St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act* to recognize the Seaway Authority as a corporation, allowing for the expropriation of Indian reserve lands. To conclude, some considerations on future implications of the St. Lawrence Seaway on the community will be explored.

Situating Myself

I am a twenty-two year old Kanien'kehá:ka woman from Kahnawà:ke. My relationship with my community is one defined by renewal; I have not always lived within my community. I was raised in my community from birth until I was about four years old, when I moved to a sister community to Kahnawà:ke, Kanehsatà:ke, moving back to Kahnawà:ke for a short time while I was ages seven and eight, followed by moving to an Ojibwe reserve, Couchiching First Nation, in northern Ontario. I moved back to my community when I was fourteen, and I have been in the process of re-connecting to the land, culture, and people of my community ever since.

I don't remember much about my time following the move back to Kahnawà:ke, but I do remember being fascinated by the ships passing through the St. Lawrence Seaway. I'd see large cargo ships whose length was greater than the height of some of the skyscrapers in Tio'tià:ke (Montréal). A wave of excitement would wash over me every time I saw a ship go by—I had never been this close to such a massive vessel or structure. This was new to me, and I stared in awe.

In the following two years I would come to learn bits of Kahnawà:ke's history while attending the local high school, Kahnawà:ke Survival School. We discussed the Seaway, though the focus on the discussion remained on compensation for the continual diminishing of our land base, known as the Seigneurie du Sault St. Louis land claim, the community continues to fight for in the colonial judicial system.

Though I understood the St. Lawrence Seaway and the passing of large cargo ships to be man-made because I had learnt about its construction in high school, its existence still seemed natural. The St. Lawrence Seaway has become normalized within the younger generation – so much so that its impact is often discussed. I know I have internalized this assumed naturalized state of the Seaway. The older generation, however, who have lived in Kahnawà:ke prior to the construction of the Seaway, understand the effects it has had, and continues to have, on our community on a larger scale. Their voices are included in this work.

Geographical and Temporal Location

Starting in 1680 onward, Kahnawà:ke's land was taken by the Jesuits and the Department of Indian Affairs, largely associated with Canada's nation-building projects.¹² Half of Kahnawà:ke's initial land base, 20,000 acres, was unjustly given to the French workers by

the British in 1762, as a consolation prize for being conquered.¹³ The land transfer occurred, despite recognition of Indian title to land in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, and the Quebec Act of 1774, both of which applied to Kahnawà:ke.¹⁴ The recognition of that land as belonging to the Kanien'kehá:ka at Caughnawaga was specifically proclaimed by France's King Louis XIV, applicable “[when] the Iroquois will leave.”¹⁵ Refer to Appendix A for present-day map of Kahnawà:ke.

The construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway took place along the northern part of Kahnawà:ke's territory, removing ten percent of the land base as of 1954.¹⁶ Over 1,300 acres of Kahnawà:ke's land was expropriated for the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway between 1955 and 1956.¹⁷ The physical construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway took place from 1954 to 1959, a project facilitated by Canada and the United States.¹⁸ The conception of the Seaway as a project was much older, however, as plans existed as early as 1895.¹⁹ There were numerous reasons for the delay in the actual construction, such as disagreement by railway companies, the two World Wars, and political tensions between the countries.²⁰ These hindrances will not be discussed in significant detail, as they are not relevant for the purposes of this paper.

“Stakeholders”

In discussing the stakeholders of the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, it is of extreme significance to note the lack of equal value in each “stakeholder”. Those impacted included human beings of Caughnawaga (Kahnawà:ke), the fish life, the water surrounding the community, and the environment: erasure of natural shoreline, loss of islands, swampy areas, and ultimately, the severing of Kahnawà:ke from the rapids. Removing the community from the connection to the natural rapids through the imposition of the Seaway is of significance because the word “Kahnawà:ke” is directly linked to the community's relation to the surrounding environment.²¹ The closest translation of the word to English is “by the rapids,” therefore the construction of the Seaway impacted the community's relation to specific place.²² The stakeholders perpetuating this situation were the Canadian and American governments, the Indian Affairs Branch of the federal government (Canada), the Department of Transport (Canada), the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, among numerous other government bodies and officials within Québec. For the purposes of this paper, the focus will remain on branches of Canadian government rather than the involvement of the United States government, as it was Canada that dealt with the expropriation of lands at Kahnawà:ke.

The Colonial Relationship

When discussing Canada, discussion of settler-colonialism is vital because it historically and continually structures the relationship between Indigenous peoples of this land, and the nation-state of Canada. Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard defines the colonial relationship as characterized by domination, “where power—in this case, interrelated discursive and nondiscursive facets of economic, gendered, racial, and state power—has

been structured into a relatively secure or sedimented set of hierarchal social relations that continue to facilitate the *dispossession* of Indigenous peoples from their land and self-determining authority.”²³ If we relate this definition Coulthard provides to Canada, it is applicable because the existence of Canada as a nation-state is founded upon domination and power, much like he describes. The exertion of power then, by the Canadian state, easily allows for the taking of Indigenous lands through violent dispossession.²⁴

The colonial relationship that exists between Indigenous peoples and the governments of colonial countries allows for the imposition of development projects on Indigenous peoples, often without their consent. When the Canada is determining where such constructs will take place, the state acts with such authority that is near impossible to contest. An important piece of legislation that outlines this relationship is the *Indian Act of 1876*, which has undergone amendments, though colonial dominance remains at the core.

The colonial relationship that Coulthard outlines is visible in Section 35 of the *Indian Act*, which was in existence at the time of the Seaway’s conception and construction. Further, Section 35 “Lands Taken for Public Purposes” was used to justify the construction of the Seaway:

Where by an Act of Parliament or a provincial legislature Her Majesty in right of a province, a municipal or local authority or a corporation is *empowered to take or to use lands or any interest therein without the consent of the owner*, the power may, with the consent of the Governor in Council and subject to any terms that may be prescribed by the Governor in Council, be exercised in relation to lands in a reserve or any interest therein.²⁵

In the case of Kahnawà:ke, Section 35 was used alongside Section 18 of the *St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act* to allow for the legal expropriation of the reserve lands for the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway.^{26 27}

“Concern for future development:”²⁸

Conception of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Disregard for Kahnawà:ke

The original proposed location of the St. Lawrence Seaway was not on the territory of Kahnawà:ke, rather, authorities desired the location initially was to be at the southern shore of Tio’tià:ke (Montréal) Québec.²⁹ The official reason for the abandonment of this idea was concern for “contemporary conditions at Montreal, and concern for *future* development,” in particular, “railway congestion, *potential* use of harbor facilities at Montreal, and provincial interests in *possible* power development,” therefore the new location of the Seaway was decided to be at Kahnawà:ke.³⁰ However, in an interview conducted by Dwayne Stacey in 2008, Kahnawakeró:non³¹ Billy Two Rivers attributed the shift in location to a significant difference in land value in Lasalle, Montréal.³² Mr. Two Rivers stated, “Indian land was cheaper,” which would be demonstrated by what Kahnawà:ke residents were given in compensation following expropriation.³³ Regardless of what the deciding factor to change

the location of the Seaway was, the future prosperity of Montréal and the province of Québec were the sole bodies taken into consideration. In fact, a draft report prepared for the Mohawk Council of Kahnawà:ke in 1999 notes, “no documentation has been located that reflects consideration of the impact on contemporary or future land use on the Caughnawaga reserve,” indicating a blatant disregard for Kahnawà:ke in all aspects.³⁴ The first reason why the imposition of the Seaway on Kahnawà:ke was an act of environmental racism was the ignorance of the impact on the Kanien’kehá:ka community versus the significant consideration for the prosperity of Montréal and Québec. The late-Peter Blue Cloud/ Aroniawenrate, my godfather and Mohawk poet from Kahnawà:ke, described the Seaway as a “stagnant sewer... brought to us by foreign thought and deed.”³⁵ Refer to Appendix B for full poem, *Reflections on the St. Lawrence Seaway*.

“Legal Soundness”³⁶ of Environmental Racism: Construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway

The second reason the St. Lawrence Seaway was an act of environmental racism on Kahnawà:ke was the lack of consultation and disregard of opposition that community members voiced regarding the decision made by Canada. Kahnawà:ke was rarely notified throughout the process of the St. Lawrence Seaway’s construction—though construction began in 1954.³⁷ The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority (SLSA), the organization created to facilitate the Seaway project, was created by in passing of the *St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act* in the Senate in 1951.³⁸ The circumstances surrounding the introduction of the *St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act* are peculiar because the ability of then-Minister of Transport Lionel Chevrier to introduce this Act in Senate was solely due to a “temporary loophole” which set a precedent at a time when individuals were not allowed propose legislation.^{39 40} Chevrier was later appointed president of the Seaway Authority. Once established and in the process of carrying out their mandate, the SLSA did not notify Kahnawà:ke residents immediately about how they would be impacted.⁴¹ The Band Council of Kahnawà:ke were aware of the community being ignored. The Council inquired about the details concerning the land to be expropriated for the Seaway by writing to the Indian Superintendent, J.A. LaPlante, in 1954, and were told by L.L. Brown, the Superintendent of Reserves and Trusts in the Department of Indian Affairs, that they were concerned prematurely as there was “only a preliminary estimate of the land requirements.”⁴² The Seaway Authority may not have finalized the details regarding how the community would be affected, but the decision to impose this on Kahnawà:ke was already decided when the SLSA “*notified* the Indian Affairs Branch that it required land on the Caughnawaga Reserve for seaway purposes” in the initial plans earlier that year.⁴³

The construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway was also an act of environmental racism on Kahnawà:ke because of the lack of proper notification to Kahnawà:ke residents. One of the reasons the Seaway Authority lacked a timely and proper consultation process with residents of Kahnawà:ke was the question of “legal soundness” concerning the SLSA’s powers to expropriate land in the reserve.⁴⁴ The expropriation of land at Caughnawaga and

the question of the Seaway Authority's power to do so legally was discussed in numerous Cabinet meetings in Parliament by the Ministers, with the first being on May 26th 1955. In this meeting, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated, "before proceeding further with this matter, he [the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration] suggested that a formal opinion be sought from the Department of Justice as to the *legal soundness* of the proposed expropriation procedure."⁴⁵ The Cabinet acknowledged this unethical and potentially illegal action, and agreed to seek the opinion of the Department of Justice.⁴⁶ In a meeting on June 2nd 1955, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration reported the discussion he had with the Deputy Minister of Justice, from which he understood "that *existing statutory powers were insufficient* to expropriate certain lands in the Caughnawaga reserve near Montreal for the purposes of the St. Lawrence Seaway."⁴⁷ Later in the same meeting, the Cabinet discussed the possibility of amending the *St. Lawrence Seaway Authority Act* "to provide whatever powers were necessary," and the rendering of an official decision was deferred.⁴⁸ On June 8th 1955, the Cabinet met again, and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration reported the Deputy Minister "doubt[ed] whether section 35 of the Indian Act authorized expropriation."⁴⁹ The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated that the Seaway Authority:

...could get the necessary powers to expropriate the interests of the province and extinguish the Indian title...by adding the following words: "The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority is, *for all purposes under section 35 of the Indian Act*, deemed to be a corporation empowered to take or to use lands or any interest therein *without the consent of the owner*."⁵⁰

The Seaway Authority did not officially have the powers to expropriate lands at Kahnawà:ke (yet), and the Cabinet acknowledged the potential for litigation and injunctions, which would lengthen the construction process.⁵¹ The Cabinet stated that "no action should be taken" before the law was amended, giving the Seaway Authority the legal authority to expropriate Kahnawà:ke land.⁵² One month later, in July 1955, the Band Council of Kahnawà:ke requested, yet again, more information in regards to the Seaway, and put forth their concerns and demands regarding the imposition of the St. Lawrence Seaway in a letter to the Department of Indian Affairs.⁵³

Construction began in Kahnawà:ke on the St. Lawrence Seaway by the Seaway Authority in December of 1955, but the SLSA did not officially communicate with residents regarding the expropriation of their lands, and monetary compensation was never discussed at that point.⁵⁴ Further, some community members whose lands were deemed necessary for the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway were forced to leave their properties before official settlements were reached with the Seaway Authority and the Department of Transport.⁵⁵ When speaking to my grandmother, Phyllis Montour, about the Seaway, she recounted that some community members were forced to leave before being offered any money.⁵⁶ I had recently come to learn that her grandparents, who were my great great grandparents, were offered a sum of \$17,000 to relocate, which they accepted due to their having twelve children.⁵⁷ My grandmother highlighted the negative impacts of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the irreversible change it brought about: "what good is the Seaway when they pass by and put their garbage in it. We used to be able to swim when I was a kid...they may call it 'progress,' but the St. Lawrence River will never be the same."⁵⁸

“Plus Ten Percent for Forcible Taking:”⁵⁹

Compensation as Conciliation

Following expropriation, compensation was given by the Department of Indian Affairs on behalf of the Seaway Authority to individuals and the Band Council of Kahnawà:ke for the lands taken.⁶⁰ Officials in the Department of Indian Affairs, in conjunction with the Department of Transport and the Warnock Hersey Company, developed a formula to calculate compensation: “\$0.06/square foot for village land, *plus ten percent for forcible taking*; \$1,000/acre for reserve land; the DOT’s appraised value of improvements, *plus ten for forcible taking*.”⁶¹

In the above equation, there is clear understanding and admittance by all parties—the Department of Indian Affairs, the Department of Transport, and Warnock Hersey Company—that the land at Kahnawà:ke was being expropriated *forcibly*. The Seaway Authority’s offer of “ten percent for forcible taking” was a conciliatory justification for the usurpation of Kahnawà:ke’s land for committing this gross act of environmental racism. Further, due to the few records, researchers were unable to calculate if this formula even matched the one used in settlement offers given to community members whose land was being expropriated for the Seaway.⁶² Some community members who had the means available hired independent appraisers, and these second-opinions proved to be of a higher value than the offers given by the Seaway Authority.⁶³

The Band Council of Kahnawà:ke also sought legal action for the injustices they were being forced to endure with the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, petitioning for a legal injunction to stop construction.⁶⁴ The Council also sought support at the international level, appealing to the United Nations, with no success.⁶⁵ In March 1957, at least six families were forcibly removed from their properties to make way for the new approaches to the Mercier Bridge.⁶⁶ Though Kahnawà:ke residents were evicted from their land, the Cabinet was aware of ongoing “litigation...as to whether the Seaway Authority had the power to expropriate from the reserve,” noted in a meeting on October 11th 1956.⁶⁷

Conclusion

The St. Lawrence Seaway, which was built between 1954 and 1959, was an act of environmental racism on the Mohawk community of Kahnawà:ke. Numerous bodies—the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, the Indian Affairs Branch, and the Department of Transportation—facilitated this gross act from the shift in the initial proposed location on the shore of Montréal.⁶⁸ ⁶⁹ Subsequently, the voices of Kahnawà:ke, whether as individuals or represented by the Band Council of Kahnawà:ke, were disregarded completely, or ignored. Further, communications carried out by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority were lacking detail and were timely, occurring after actions had been taken.⁷⁰ Furthermore, the Cabinet Ministers raised concerns about the “legal soundness” of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority in expropriating the lands in Kahnawà:ke because of their status as crown lands.⁷¹

⁷² ⁷³ ⁷⁴ It was noted that such powers could be given to the Seaway Authority by granting

them the power of a corporation.⁷⁵ The question of “legal soundness” remained in October 1956, though expropriations had already taken place.⁷⁶ Moreover, compensation rates offered by the Seaway Authority were significantly less than outside appraisers, and ten percent of what was being offered was used as consolation for environmental racism. Finally, support sought from the Band Council of Kahnawà:ke to the United Nations were unsuccessful.⁷⁷

The St. Lawrence Seaway continued to impact the community following the completion of construction; it severed Kahnawà:ke’s relationship with the rapids, both physically and spiritually. Further, the Seaway is a physical representation of the colonial relationship Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard demonstrated. I believe the impact the Seaway will have on Kahnawà:ke in the future is the same we are presently facing: environmental pollution from industrial waste irresponsibly discarded by passing cargo ships, further disruption of the natural environment, and a different relationship to the rapids than our ancestors once had.

APPENDIX A



Present-Day Geographical Representation of Kahnawà:ke (Google Maps).

APPENDIX B

Reflections on the St. Lawrence Seaway

Peter Blue Cloud (Aroniawenrate)

Ships that pass in the night
do so often before
my front window, calling
out prehistoric challenges
just before their lighted
bodies pass through
one another, like mirages
meeting in a dream
leaving wakes of undulations
dark, synthetic storms
which toss violent waves
against the seawall.

These man-made tempests are
fictions written by machines,
as are the seawalls, gouged out
of naked granite and slate
to fashion this stagnant sewer
of zebra mussel beds and other
filthy matter brought to us
by foreign thought and deed
to lend temporary wealth to
those who dare not dream
of possible tomorrows based
upon their own generosity.

Ships that pass in the night
are reflection of modern man
resting only to feast upon
the resources of this earth,
then quickly moving on, seeking
further tribute from any of
the floating plates of land upon
this planet once held sacred,
envisioning riches even there
among the very stars, as they
plunder and rape their only source
of sustenance and possible peace.

They would all grow rich today
and fatten egos and purses at
the expense of their own children.
But tomorrow will not take care
of itself, as once was thought.
And when men finally disappear,
taking countless species with them,
the earth will continue on her trip
among the galaxies, perhaps wondering
just what went wrong with that
short-lived species, Man, which
threw away the gift of life.⁷⁸

NOTES

¹ Joan Holmes & Associates, *Draft Report: The St. Lawrence Seaway Expropriations on the Kahnawake (Caughnawaga) Reserve No. 14 (1954-1978)*, prepared for the Mohawk Council of Kahnawà:ke, (Ottawa: Joan Holmes & Associates Inc., August 1999), iii. This statement was part of the equation used to calculate compensation for land usurped from Kahnawà:ke by the St. Lawrence Seaway construction.

³ Melissa Checker, *Polluted Promises: Environmental Racism and the Search for Justice in a Southern Town*, (New York: New York University Press, 2005), 11.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Kanien'kehá:ka is "People of the Flint" in Mohawk and is used to refer to the Mohawk people of the Six Nations or Iroquois Confederacy.

⁶ Stephanie K. Philips, "The Kahnawake Mohawks and the St. Lawrence Seaway," (MA thesis, McGill University, 2000), 4. Kahnawà:ke is Kanien'kéha for "on the rapids" and replaced Caughnawaga as the name of the community in 1982.

⁷ Ibid. Caughnawaga is the Anglicized name for Kahnawà:ke, which was used up until 1982.

⁸ Sedalia Kawenno:ta's Fazio, *Tio'tia:ke – Montreal*, directed by Amanda Roy, (Montreal: Wapikoni Mobile, 2013), web. <http://www.wapikoni.ca/films/tiotiake-montreal>. Tio'tià:ke is the Kanien'kéha name for what is now Montréal, meaning "where the currents meet."

⁹ Phillips, 1.

¹⁰ Omar Z. Ghobashy, *The Caughnawaga Indians and the St. Lawrence Seaway*, (New York: The Devin-Adair Company, 1961), 23.

¹¹ Library and Archives Canada, Privy Council Office, "Caughnawaga Indian Reserve lands: expropriations by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority," *Cabinet Conclusions*, (Ottawa: Privy Council Office, 26 May 1955), reference number RG2, series A-5-a, volume 2658, access code 12, item number 14378, microfilm number T-12184.

¹² Phillips, 1.

¹³ Ghobashy, 23.

¹⁴ Ghobashy, 23-25.

¹⁵ Ibid., 23.

- ¹⁶ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 26 May 1955, 2.
- ¹⁷ Joan Holmes & Associates, i.
- ¹⁸ Phillips, 1.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 20.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 20.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, 32.
- ²² *Ibid.*
- ²³ Glen Coulthard, “From Wards of the State to Subjects of Recognition? Marx, Indigenous Peoples, and the Politics of Dispossession in Denedeh,” in *Theorizing Native Studies*, ed. Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 57.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 58.
- ²⁵ *Indian Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c.I-5, ss. 35, <http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/I-5/FullText.html>.
- ²⁶ Joan Holmes & Associates, i.
- ²⁷ Library and Archives Canada, Privy Council Office, “Caughnawaga Indian Reserve lands: expropriations by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority,” *Cabinet Conclusions*, (Ottawa: Privy Council Office, 8 June 1955), pages 12-13, reference number RG2, series A-5-a, volume 2658, access code 12, item number 14422, microfilm number T-12184.
- ²⁸ Joan Holmes & Associates, i.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, emphasis added.
- ³¹ Phillips, 4. Kahnawakeró:non is Kanien’kéha for “those who reside on the rapids,” referring to members of the community of Kahnawà:ke.
- ³² Billy Two Rivers, *Seaway*, interview by Dwayne Stacey at the Mohawk Council of Kahnawà:ke, March 7, 2008.
- ³³ *Ibid.*
- ³⁴ Joan Holmes & Associates, i.
- ³⁵ Peter Blue Cloud/Aroniawenrate, “Reflections on the St. Lawrence Seaway,” *Clans of Many Nations: Selected Poems 1969-94*. White Pine Press, 1995), 153.
- ³⁶ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 26 May 1955.
- ³⁷ Phillips, 20.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*
- ³⁹ David Twiston Davies, ed. *Canada from Afar: The Daily Telegraph Book of Canadian Obituaries*, (Toronto: Dundurn, 1996), 58.
- ⁴⁰ Library and Archives Canada, Privy Council Office, “Legislation: St. Lawrence Seaway and power project,” *Cabinet Conclusions*, (Ottawa: Privy Council Office, 4 December 1951), pages 1-2, reference number RG2, series A-5-a, volume 2649, access code 20, item number 11528, microfilm number T-2368.
- ⁴¹ Phillips, 20.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*
- ⁴³ Joan Holmes & Associates, i, emphasis added.
- ⁴⁴ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 26 May 1955.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, emphasis added.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ Library and Archives Canada, Privy Council Office, “Caughnawaga Indian Reserve lands: expropriations by the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority,” *Cabinet Conclusions*, (Ottawa: Privy Council Office, 2 June 1955), pages 4-5, reference number RG2, series A-5-a, volume 2658, access code 12, item number 14403, microfilm number T-12184. Emphasis added.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

- ⁴⁹ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 8 June 1955.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Ibid.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ Phillips, 20.
- ⁵⁴ Joan Holmes & Associates, ii.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid.
- ⁵⁶ Phyllis Montour, in discussion with the author, 22 May 2017.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵⁹ Joan Holmes & Associates, iii. This statement was part of the equation used to calculate compensation for land usurped from Kahnawà:ke by the St. Lawrence Seaway construction.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., iii.
- ⁶¹ Ibid., emphasis added.
- ⁶² Ibid.
- ⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., iv.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid.
- ⁶⁷ Library and Archives Canada, Privy Council Office, “St. Lawrence Seaway: expropriation of additional lands on the Caughnawaga Indian Reserve,” *Cabinet Conclusions*, (Ottawa: Privy Council Office, 11 October 1956), pages 12-13, reference number RG2, series A-5-a, volume 5775, access code 12, item number 15362. microfilm number T-12185.
- ⁶⁸ Joan Holmes & Associates, i.
- ⁶⁹ Two Rivers, 2008.
- ⁷⁰ Joan Holmes & Associates, iii.
- ⁷¹ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 26 May 1955.
- ⁷² Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 2 June 1955.
- ⁷³ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 8 June 1955.
- ⁷⁴ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 11 October 1956.
- ⁷⁵ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 8 June 1955.
- ⁷⁶ Privy Council Office *Cabinet Conclusions* 11 October 1956.
- ⁷⁷ Joan Holmes & Associates, iv.
- ⁷⁸ Peter Blue Cloud/Aroniawenrate, “Reflections on the St. Lawrence Seaway,” in *Clans of Many Nations: Selected Poems 1969-94*, (White Pine Press, 1995), 153-154. Reproduced with permission.