

The following submission containing personal information and reference excerpt
was made by T. Vincent on behalf of C. Vincent
in support of the inclusion of Ancestor Hannah Mannell.

Email Correspondence from January 24, 2023

I am submitting this information to the Tribunal on behalf of my wife Christina Vincent. Bonnechere Algonquins First Nation ID10-6705 Her grandmother was Rebeca Sunstrum daughter of Hannah Mannell. The following is submitted for your information into the enquiry into the ancestry of Hannah Mannell also spelt Mannal to list of Algonquin ancestors

In which after hearing all sides The ruling of the Honourable James B Chadwick after hearing all evidence presented in 2010 and 2013 that Hanna Mannell met the definition of Algonquin as the records suggest.

Regarding the location of Hannahs birthplace in Kenagamissi house NWT 31 August 1795 her father John Mannall had been posted as Master at that location for HBC in 1795 and stayed until 1797 this post was located at the head branch of Moose River this was Algonquin Territory. There is no record of Baptism recorded as none of the eight children on John Mannall family were ever baptised but written records show she was born at that location. Also in reports Frederick House ,Abatibi River and Kenagamissi are historically Algonquin territory. HBC documents show That John Mannall along with six Algonquin Indians and family set up post there. In doing research myself on maps and written reports of the boundaries in that era were pretty sketchy but would appear to show Algonquin territory was prominent in that area. John Mannall appeared to be very involved with Algonquin tibe so I would concur that Hannah Mannall was born Algonquin. Some members of previous board seem to feel that because he moved from Cree land for HBC that his child was conceived in Cree territory but there is no doubt she was born in Kenagamissi HBC post in Algonquin territory. I believe the numerous previous investigations into her birthright show Hannah Mannall is Algonquin and her ancestors my wife being one should have that right that was given to her retained that the burden of proof should ne on her side not be dismissed by ongoing enquiries into Hannah Mannall status and birthplace.

I thank you for accepting this E Mail for your tribunal.

Anthony Vincent for Christina Vincent
473 Long Beach Rd Cameron Ontario K0M1G0
705 340 8839
Attention Ralph Lance Chair Algonquin Tribunal

Submitted by:

Anthony Vincent on behalf of Christina Vincent

Toniv13@hotmail.com

Email Correspondence from January 26, 2023

Thank you just a further notation to e mail for you review of information . Thesis sept 2020 submitted by Rebeca Ann Major University of Saskatchewan pages 106 107 [and page 169] relate to location of Algonquin settlements in area, and her conclusion.

Link to thesis: <https://harvest.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/13047/MAJOR-DISSERTATION-2020.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Submitted by:

Anthony Vincent on behalf of Christina Vincent

Toniv13@hotmail.com

SHIFTING INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL: CHANGING INDIGENOUS POLICY GOALS
THROUGH MÉTIS AND FIRST NATIONS IDENTITY ASSERTIONS

A Thesis Submitted to the
College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
In the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon

By

REBECCA ANN MAJOR

© Copyright Rebecca Ann Major, September, 2020. All rights reserved.

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis/dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis/dissertation in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis/dissertation work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis/dissertation or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis/dissertation.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or in part shall be addressed to:

Executive Director

Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy University of Saskatchewan

101 Diefenbaker Place

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5B8

Canada

OR

Dean

College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

University of Saskatchewan

116 Thorvaldson Building, 110 Science Place

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5C9

Canada

ABSTRACT

The late 20th and 21st centuries witnessed the mobilization of Indigenous peoples who have engaged with the federal government to assert identity-based rights and title to land in Canada. Indigenous political engagement with the federal government on behalf of the Crown is built upon a colonial model that protects the interests of non-Indigenous peoples and colonial knowledge systems. By asserting identity through collectives and expanding the definition of who is considered to be Indigenous and is entitlement rights, Indigenous peoples have eroded the federal government's control of Indigenous identity. This dissertation demonstrates the institutional and policy impact that Indigenous peoples create through legal challenges and negotiations, leading to a third order paradigm shift in policy and institutional change.

Previous research paid limited attention to the motivations for Indigenous engagement and to the process by which Indigenous ideas have affected policy outcomes. Positioning Indigenous motivation, and Indigenous ideas as central to the collection and analysis of data, this thesis poses the question "*How do Indigenous assertions of identity demonstrate efforts to control or change policy development in Canada?*" The question is addressed using participant observation in a longitudinal study of Indigenous-Crown engagement combined with Indigenous methods of reflexivity. The research explores the topic to reveal the story and results of the engagement.

Using the policy theory of historical institutionalism, as well as Peter Hall's framework of three levels of change and social policy learning, this thesis analyzes three case studies to illustrate Indigenous policy change: the Mi'kmaq peoples of Newfoundland, Métis and non-status First Nations, and the Algonquin of Ontario. I argue that although Hall's framework is an appropriate starting point for building an Indigenous model of institutional change, although paradigmatic (third order) change as posited by Hall does not precisely fit the pattern of Indigenous-led change. This research contributes to the understanding of institutional and policy change in Canada by providing insight into worldviews essential to understanding Indigenous policy and institutional changes and by demonstrating the source of the desire for engagement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the Métis Nation of Ontario for the financial contribution that assisted in the final year of my education; it is truly appreciated.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Ken Coates. I came to him determined to continue my academic career, and he took a chance on me. I also greatly appreciate my other committee members: Dr. Bonita Beatty, Dr. Daniel Béland, Senator Dr. Yvonne Boyer, and Dr. Bruno Dupeyron, for their support in my research. All of you bring different and valuable perspectives that are critical in my growth.

In my supports beyond my committee, I want to acknowledge Dr. Janice Acoose, Dr. Loleen Berdahl, Dr. Elizabeth Cooper, Dr. Robert Innes, Kelley Ann Butler, Lynn Hanley, and Heather McWhinney. Additionally, Dr. Allison Block, Dr. Sara McPhee-Knowles, Danette Starblanket, the President's Indigenous Peoples Scholars at the University of Windsor, and my Métis sisters Charlene Lavallee and Mary Ann Morin were significant in completing my work. I would also like to thank both Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy at the University of Saskatchewan, and the Political Science department at the University of Windsor along with the upper administration as I finished my work. My journey in life, as well as this dissertation, was guided by my community and the teachings of my elders Nora Cummings, Frank Tomkins, May Henderson, and Rose and Ric Richardson.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my relations who helped me know our family, specifically, Auntie Ursula Major Daigle, my dad Robert J. Major, my cousin Keith Boucher, my maternal grandmother Marion Carswell Simpson, and my cousin Lynn Hanley. It is through my family that I know myself and knowing myself was an integral part of this research.

Last but not least, I want to thank my family. My partner Dale Halldorson listened to my ramblings, let me talk through things, and provided the most amazing support for myself and our son Nathan. My mother supported my academic career from the beginning, working with me to be a better writer, along with all the emotional support that came through her love.

DEDICATION

“This paradigm-shift must come from all levels of government and public institutions..... Ideologies and instruments of colonialism, racism and misogyny, both past and present, must be rejected.... A complete change is required to dismantle colonialism in Canadian society.”¹

- Marion Buller, MMIWG2S Chief Commissioner, Nêhiyaw-iskwew from the Mistawasis First Nation in Saskatchewan

¹ Kristy Kirkup, "Trudeau avoids calling the violence against Indigenous women a genocide," *National Post* (June 3, 2019), <https://nationalpost.com/news/canada/newsalert-inquiry-on-missing-murdered-indigenous-women-released> (accessed July 7, 2019).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>PERMISSION TO USE</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>ABSTRACT</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>DEDICATION</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>TABLE OF CONTENTS</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>CHAPTER 1 – THE CASE FOR RE-EXAMINING INDIGENOUS POLICY CHANGE IN CANADA</i>	<i>1</i>
Introduction	1
Policy Problem – Standard Models Just Don’t Cut It	2
Methods	6
Limitations	9
Plan of the Dissertation	10
<i>CHAPTER 2: LEGISLATING INDIGENOUS IDENTITY AND THE PUSHBACK</i>	<i>11</i>
Introduction	11
Legislating Indigenous Identity in Canada and Indigenous Challenges to the Legislation	11
Indigenous Peoples Creating Influence in Colonial Institutions and Policy	21
Expanding Colonial Institutions and Policies	25
The Newfoundland Mi’kmaq Community’s Band Creation.....	25
The Métis Case.....	28
Land Claims and the Algonquin	31
Policy Learning: Goals of Certainty Surrounding Identity and its Effects	35
The Judiciary and the Role of Indigenous Ideas in Institutional and Policy Learning in Canada	42
Conclusion	43
<i>CHAPTER 3 – APPROACHING INDIGENOUS-LED CHANGE FROM A POLICY PERSPECTIVE</i>	<i>45</i>
Introduction	45
Why Historical Institutionalism?	47
Policy Learning within Historic Institutionalism	56
Substantive and Symbolic Change in the <i>Indian Act</i>	66
The Paradigm Shift	71
Capacity to Incite Change	74
Methods and Application of Historical Institutionalism to the Case Studies	75
Conclusion	76
<i>CHAPTER 4 – THE MI’KMAQ PEOPLE OF KTAQMKUK (NEWFOUNDLAND) AND THE RECOGNITION OF NEW INDIAN ACT BANDS</i>	<i>79</i>
Introduction	79

History of the Mi'kmaq People	81
The Rise of Indigenous Organizations in Canada and Newfoundland.....	82
Miawpukek First Nation's Engagement.....	88
Qalipu Mi'kmaq First Nation's Engagement	91
Legal Issues in Qalipu Band Creation.....	95
Conclusion	102
<i>CHAPTER 5 – MÉTIS PEOPLE, CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE AND INDIGENOUS RIGHTS.....</i>	<i>105</i>
Introduction	105
Background	106
Policies Mobilized Against the Métis People and Early Stages of Diplomacy	108
A New Era – A New attack on Métis Lifestyle and a New Diplomacy.....	110
Policies Culminate with the Sayer Trial.....	113
Diplomacy to Create Change.....	114
Manitoba Act, 1870.....	114
Batoche.....	120
Métis Settlements (Alberta)	124
Constitution Act, 1982	126
Cases Changing Institutions and Policies.....	129
Powley.....	130
MMF land claim.....	132
Daniels.....	135
Policy and Institutional Impact and Implications	138
<i>CHAPTER 6 – THE ALGONQUINS OF ONTARIO AND NON-STATUS FIRST NATIONS LAND CLAIMS.....</i>	<i>141</i>
Introduction	141
Background	142
Historical Engagement with Colonial Institutions	144
Modern Engagement with Colonial Institutions.....	154
Claims Policy Implementation Background	155
The Modern Claim History of the Ontario Algonquin People.....	157
<i>Some Key Elements in the Agreement-in-Principle</i>	<i>170</i>
Land.....	171
Self-Government	172
Co-Management	173
Cultural Components	174
Beneficiary-Membership.....	174
The Membership Debate	175
Conclusion	176
<i>CHAPTER 7 – INDIGENOUS WORLDVIEWS AND POLICY CHANGE.....</i>	<i>179</i>
Introduction	179
Identity and Worldview	181

Land and Identity	188
Sovereignty and Worldview.....	197
Conclusion	206
<i>CHAPTER 8 – INDIGENOUS IDENTITY AND A NEW THIRD ORDER CHANGE</i>	<i>209</i>
Introduction	209
Background	211
Research Focus – Cases and Their Impact	213
The Newfoundland Mi’kmaq People	214
Métis and Non-Status Institutional Impact	216
Algonquin People of Present-Day Ontario	219
Discussion	221
The Research and Objectives	227
Contributions – How We Study Indigenous Policy and Change.....	228
Policy Recommendations	232
Better Outcomes.....	234
Conclusion	235
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</i>	<i>237</i>
Primary Sources.....	237
Secondary Sources	248

in its certainty of who is and who is not an Indigenous person, and which allows for identity-based policy development.

Background

In central and western Canada, ethnogenesis stemmed from the fur trade, creating Constitutionally recognized and distinct Métis People. Métis, Michif, ‘half-breed,’ and ‘bois brûlée’ are all names used for those that descended from the fur traders and Indigenous Peoples in Western Canada. Historically, the population was often referred to as half-breeds by fur trade employees and colonial governments. Initially, the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) discouraged relations between employees and Indigenous Peoples, although the Northwest Company (NWC) encouraged intermarriage as a means of relationship building.⁵²³ Eventually, the HBC also encouraged relationships as the Company started to view the Métis People as a potential source of general labourers.⁵²⁴ In 1821, the two major trading companies—the NWC and the HBC—amalgamated, creating a monopoly in the territory.⁵²⁵ Before the amalgamation, tensions were high as the HBC had started to exert control over the lives of Métis People, and competition between the companies resulted in violence. Once the amalgamation took place, through proclamations and policy limitations on economic opportunities, the Company tried to exert stronger control over Métis People's lives. Many Métis families originated from relations between Company chief factors (head traders at a trading post) and women from Home guard populations.⁵²⁶ These unions were the start of a culture and people, many of whom settled in the Red River district Settlement, who had education and experience of colonial institutions through the fur trade companies. My own family is an example of this fur trade history.

In my maternal grandmother's family, Charles Thomas (b. 1793) was born of a relationship between a chief factor and a Moose Factory Mosoniwililiw (Moose Cree) Iskwew (woman). Charles' father, the chief factor named John, married Margaret from the James Bay area (Moose

⁵²³ Carol Judd, "Mixed Bloods of Moose Factory, 1730-1981: A Socio-Economic Study," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 6, no. 2 (1982), 70.

⁵²⁴ Judd, 67.

⁵²⁵ Hudson's Bay Company, *The Northwest Company* (2016), <http://www.hbcheritage.ca/history/acquisitions/the-north-west-company> (accessed December 7, 2019).

⁵²⁶ Homeguard Indians were the Indigenous peoples that lived around the trading forts. Government of Canada, TERMIUM Plus, *Homeguard Indian* (January 27, 1986). <http://www.btb.termiumplus.gc.ca/tpv2alpha/alpha-eng.html?lang=eng&i=1&index=alt&srchtxt=HOME GUARD%20INDIAN> (accessed July 4, 2019).

Factory). Charles' wife, Hannah Mannall, was also the product of such a relationship: her father, John Mannall, was the chief factor of Kenogamissi House, and her mother was an Indigenous woman connected to the Algonquins of Ontario.⁵²⁷ As was the case in my family, many HBC families worked throughout Rupert's Land and transferred as needed. John Thomas, an HBC employee from England and father of Charles, worked in northern parts of Ontario in the James Bay region until his retirement, when he was dishonourably discharged and consequently refused his claim to land in Red River.⁵²⁸ At the time, Red River developed as a retirement community for HBC employees. John was offered land in Red River to settle with his Indigenous wife, but he did not claim it according to government records.⁵²⁹ Although taking leave from the Company around the time his father John retired in disgrace, Charles returned to HBC shortly thereafter and worked in Northwestern Canada before concluding his employment in the Montreal region.⁵³⁰ With skills beyond those of a labourer, he spent most of his career as a clerk and at times a trader. While Charles was stationed in various locations, his children were born across Rupert's Land.

Charles's father encouraged the HBC to educate Métis children and requested that teachers and materials be sent to the forts. His journals acknowledge that he was one of the first to write about the new population and treat them as essential parts of the community.⁵³¹ In the 19th century, John Thomas, his Indigenous wife, and their children created a new culture in the HBC, as it became common practice to educate the children of the mixed unions.⁵³² When his son Charles eventually retired from the HBC, the Company offered him a small trading post in the east,

⁵²⁷ Greater Golden Lake, *2014 Elections for Algonquin Negotiation Representatives* (January 24, 2014), <https://studylib.net/doc/5214321/2014-elections-for-algonquin-negotiation-representatives?fbclid=IwAR06uC8ZRS4vQkoJ0AcmOwjfJRnt6IPqKQuHxW-vkSy9191-VBLfqRH53PA> (accessed January 22, 2019).

⁵²⁸ John Sr. Thomas, (1751-1822) (fl. 1769-1814) JHB/nt August 25, 1989; rev. August 1992; rev. May 2009; SB rev. Nov. (2016). Elaine Allan Mitchell, "THOMAS, JOHN," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 6, University of Toronto/Université Laval (2003), http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/thomas_john_6E.html (accessed December 12, 2019).

⁵²⁹ Elaine Allan Mitchell, "Thomas John," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* Volume 6 (1987), http://biographi.ca/en/bio/thomas_john_6E.html (accessed June 3, 2020).

⁵³⁰ Charles Thomas, (1793-1895) (fl.1808-1832) JHB Oct. 1986; rev. August 1992; rev. and reformatted November 1999 CAW; rev. April 2009 LF, Archives of Manitoba, <https://www.gov.mb.ca/chc/archives/hbca/biographical/index.html> (accessed July 4, 2019).

⁵³¹ Judd, 71.

⁵³² Judd, 72.

which came to be known as Charlie's Hope at Golden Lake, Ontario.⁵³³ There he spent the remainder of his life under the scrutiny of the company. Today, this community, as well as our Thomas family, is one of the researched communities under the Métis Nation of Ontario. This family, now spread throughout the Métis homeland, has maintained enduring familial connections through Charles Thomas's siblings, who were extremely independent much to the government's displeasure (Simpson's Athabasca Journal).⁵³⁴ My maternal grandmother's family remained in the area for generations, and for economic reasons, my mother was the first generation raised outside the community. Working in the fur trade for generations and educated through colonial systems, Métis People were familiar with colonial processes and engagement with the institutions. The assertion of identity and rights began with HBC policies raised against Métis activities. The people engaged administrative structures to assert their rights and place in Canadian Constitutional frameworks.

Policies Mobilized Against the Métis People and Early Stages of Diplomacy

Reviews of policy and institutional engagement of Métis People with the colonial institutions, such as the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) and the Crown, are scarce in the literature. What can be extracted from available sources is that the Hudson's Bay Company was the first to use policies against the Red River colony Métis. Established in 1812 by Lord Selkirk as a fur trade centre, Red River, as mentioned, later became an agricultural and retirement colony for Company employees and displaced Highland Scots.⁵³⁵ Although it was initially necessary to the fur trade and commerce, the area did not attract year-round settlement, possibly because locals were aware of the potential for flooding. Red River was the second settlement Lord Selkirk established on a flood plain, the first being the 1804-1818 Baldoon Settlement in Southwestern

⁵³³ Bonnechere Museum, "The Story of Charles Thomas," *Cultural History* (2019), <http://www.bonnechere.ca/cultural-history/the-charles-thomas-story/> (accessed January 27, 2019).

⁵³⁴ E.E. Rich, ed. *Simpson's Athabasca Journal* (London: Hudson's Bay Record Society Vol. 1, 1938), Biography, 471.

⁵³⁵ Ruth Swan, *The Crucible: Pembina and the Origins of the Red River Valley Métis*, Doctor of Philosophy Thesis (Department of History, University of Manitoba, 2003), 15-17, 38. David H. Whiteley, *Manitoba History: Letters Home: Correspondence To and From the Red River Settlement 1812-1879*, Manitoba Historical Society, http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/mb_history/26/lettershome.shtml (accessed January 18, 2019).

Anne Farrar Hyde, *Empires, Nations, and Families: A History of the North American West, 1800-1860*, History of the American West (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), 101. Hughs, 519-520. Bicentenary of the Red River Selkirk Settlement Committee, *Lord Selkirk's Settlers* (October 19, 2011), <http://www.mhs.mb.ca/info/selkirk/settlers.shtml>. (accessed January 18, 2019).

Ontario Consultation Office opened in Pembroke in January 2010 with duties related to coordinating matters for the land claim negotiation.⁸⁷³ Once all this was in place, the institutional structure, human capital, and land claims process was structured and consistent in development.

In 2011, the chief negotiator began providing regular updates on the negotiation process as the negotiators approached an *Agreement-in-Principle (AIP)*. The first update provided by Potts explained multiple aspects of the negotiation. It addressed the initial voter enrolment process, as those registered were eligible to vote on the *AIP*. Upon review by the ratification committee established under the AOO, the preliminary voter list was posted in March 2011, followed by a supplemental list in April 2011.⁸⁷⁴ Potts announced Joan Holmes as the enrolment officer.⁸⁷⁵ Holmes is a respected researcher on the history of Algonquin People of Ontario, and much land claim research relies on her work, such as research conducted by Lawrence and Gehl. Upon verification by the enrolment officer, the next stage was the approval of a beneficiary by the ratification committee. As a means to address protests associated with the voter enrolment decisions, the negotiators created a review committee in 2011.⁸⁷⁶ Included in an update report by Potts was notice of ongoing discussions for tentative land selections.⁸⁷⁷ This update came when negotiators began talking about the *AIP*.⁸⁷⁸ Although the claim was moving along, after the update, there were delays in the process. However, as progress bulletins illustrate, the institutional setting accommodated issues in a way that allowed for continued progress.

In the July 2012 update, Potts provided details of the delay in the claim processes. All levels of government involved in the land claim—Indigenous and non-Indigenous—underwent elections. Potts addressed reinstating the enrolment process, explaining there were benefits as the

⁸⁷³ Algonquins Of Ontario (AOO), *Strengthening the Algonquin Presence throughout our Traditional Territory*. Lawrence, 292.

⁸⁷⁴ Algonquins Of Ontario (AOO), *Overview of Treaty Negotiations*.

⁸⁷⁵ Mattawa/North Bay Algonquin First Nation, *Land Claim Updates*, <http://www.mattawanorthbayalgonquinfirstnation.com/LandClaim.html>, (accessed May 1, 2019).

⁸⁷⁶ Laura Sarazin, *Algonquin Agreement-in-Principle Ratification Voter Enrolment Process*, Letter (December 13, 2010), <http://www.bafn.ca/aipapplication.pdf.%20Accessed%20July%207,%202019>. (accessed July 7, 2019).

Agreement-in-Principle among: the Algonquins of Ontario and Ontario and Canada (AIP), (2015), <http://www.tanakiwin.com/our-treaty-negotiations/proposed-agreement-in-principle-3/>, (accessed March 12, 2019).

⁸⁷⁷ Mattawa/North Bay Algonquin First Nation, *Land Claim Updates*.

⁸⁷⁸ Lawrence, 167.

communities prepared to vote on a draft of the *AIP*.⁸⁷⁹ In May 2012, the community posted an updated voter list, resulting in challenges by those with enrolment status and by those denied enrolments.⁸⁸⁰ One judicial challenge was mounted by Lynne Hanley (my relation) and others to reinstate Hannah Mannell, a root ancestor removed in 2010 on the basis that Mannell may have been Cree rather than Algonquin.⁸⁸¹ Those bringing the challenge provided sufficient evidence that Mannell was in all probability Algonquin, and she was reinstated as a root ancestor in 2013.⁸⁸² By providing people with an apparatus for addressing issues of concern such as the beneficiary appeals process, the negotiations were able to progress without interruption.

The updates continued, and in July 2013, Potts announced the release of the *AIP* preliminary draft and informed voters of the next steps. Consultation efforts made throughout 2012 and 2013 involved nine tripartite information sessions. At this time, the AOO held meetings to review the preliminary draft with the voting members of the Algonquin land claim.⁸⁸³ When the negotiators released the *Preliminary Draft Agreement-in-Principle* for public review and comment in 2012, they added a new element to this land claims process by indicating that "the public input at this stage of negotiation is unprecedented."⁸⁸⁴ Although the *AIP* is not a legally binding agreement, it is part of the process for moving the claim forward.⁸⁸⁵ This public consultation process is another form of growth in land claims development. It is not a formal policy process in claims but functions as policy learning as a way to incorporate new information.

Following the consultations, the AOO proposed *AIP* was made public in 2015.⁸⁸⁶ After Algonquin communities voted on the *AIP*, the province of Ontario, the federal government, and the AOO signed it on October 18, 2016.⁸⁸⁷ As understood by the AOO, "It opens the way for continued negotiations toward a Final Agreement that will define the ongoing rights of the

⁸⁷⁹ Mattawa/North Bay Algonquin First Nation, *Land Claim Updates*.

⁸⁸⁰ Algonquins Of Ontario (AOO), *Overview of Treaty Negotiations*.

⁸⁸¹ Lawrence, 122-123.

⁸⁸² The Honourable James B. Chadwick, Q.C., *Judicial Decision RE: Hannah Mannell*, <http://www.gretergoldenlake.com/adob/HannahMannelDecisionMay14.pdf>, (accessed April 13, 2019).

⁸⁸³ Government of Ontario, *The Algonquin Land Claim*.

⁸⁸⁴ Government of Ontario, *The Algonquin Land Claim*.

⁸⁸⁵ Algonquins Of Ontario (AOO), *Overview of Treaty Negotiations*.

⁸⁸⁶ Government of Ontario, *The Algonquin Land Claim*.

⁸⁸⁷ Algonquins of Ontario (AOO), *Agreement-in-Principle* <https://www.tanakiwin.com/our-treaty-negotiations/agreement-in-principle/>, (accessed April 19, 2019).