

THE IPPERWASH PAPERS

Summary of Evidence

Queen's Park, March 14, 2007

NOTE: Alpha-numeric notations, i.e. [D14] refer to documents found at The Ipperwash Papers website: www.ipperwashpapers.ca .

According to their website, the mandate of the Ipperwash Inquiry is...

“...to inquire and report on events surrounding the death of Dudley George, who was shot in 1995 during a protest by First Nations representatives at Ipperwash Provincial Park and later died. The Inquiry is also to make recommendations that would avoid violence in similar circumstances.”

[www.ipperwashinquiry.ca – About the Inquiry]

It is safe to say that the public at large believes that the story of Ipperwash represents one month in 1995, that Dudley George was the only victim, and that the Ipperwash Inquiry has left no stone unturned in an effort to discover the complete, unvarnished truth that our leaders require in order to prevent future violence during land claims.

Unfortunately, our investigation reveals – beyond any doubt - that none of this is true. Even worse, it appears that the Ipperwash Inquiry's conclusions may have been determined prior to the end of the inquiry and that any evidence that would contradict those conclusions was deliberately excluded and/or downplayed.

Before I present the evidence to support these most serious allegations, I would like to explain briefly how it is that we came to sit before you today.

On Oct 15/06 I, along with 2000 other people marched with Gary McHale during the first March for Freedom event to protest – peacefully protest – the failure of the OPP to uphold the Rule of Law in Caledonia.

One of the speakers – at a time when few in Caledonia were willing to speak out for fear of intimidation - was the courageous woman who sits before you today: Mary-Lou LaPratte, who told us of the trauma experienced by Ipperwash residents:

“In the West Beach land claim, which was going through a court process, a native anywhere on the properties, for any reason, would not be charged. Our lives became a daily nightmare of threats, intimidation, and harassment tactics which, over the years, became home invasions and physical assaults. We became a community with no policing, no province and no country. No one in the OPP, the Provincial Government or the Federal Government would give us any relief or help with the aggression. At one point after the death of native protestor Dudley George, the police totally deserted our community because they and their families became targets. Our community was in chaos.” [D14]

I am a former Canadian Forces soldier and United Nations peacekeeper who served 6 months in the Middle East to play a small part in restoring peace to people many thousands of miles away only to find the Rule of Law under attack just a few miles from my home.

On December 16th, 2006, Gary McHale and I were arrested by the OPP for trying to exercise our constitutional right to place a Canadian flag on a public utility pole opposite the Douglas Creek Estates in Caledonia.

[www.voiceofcanada.ca, Dec 18/06: “Canadian flag ripped from my hands – VoC goes to jail! See also Jan 21/07: “OPP & OPPA vs. Supreme Court of Canada and the Charter of Rights & Freedoms”]

Just days after our arrest, both the St. Catharines Std. and the Toronto Star issued editorials severely criticizing the Liberal government for its handling of the Caledonia situation and calling for the government and the OPP to uphold the Rule of Law:

[www.voiceofcanada.ca, Dec 22/06 – *History has been made this week!*]

I called Mary-Lou LaPratte on December 22nd to give her the good news.

Joint Investigation by VoiceofCanada and CaledoniaWakeUpCall

During our conversation, Mary-Lou told me scarcely-believable stories of how native crime was being ignored by the OPP in Ipperwash to the detriment of law-abiding residents. Afterward, she sent me a 29 page document that she claimed to have submitted to the Ipperwash Inquiry in 2004, a document that has been included in your media kit along with an affidavit sworn by her. [A1]

Her chronological summary of events in Ipperwash from 1989 until 2004 is a damning indictment of OPP behaviour during the events of September 1995, after the events, and...long before Dudley George was killed.

When I was unable to locate Ms. LaPratte’s document on the Ipperwash Inquiry website, I contacted Gary McHale and we began an investigation. The results of our investigation will be posted at www.IpperwashPapers.ca along with all supporting documents. I have included references to those documents and other VoiceofCanada material in this statement for your convenience.

[http://www.ipperwashinquiry.ca/transcripts/pdf/exhibit_list.pdf]

About ‘The Ipperwash Papers’

The Ipperwash Papers consist of more than 400 pages of documents out of approximately 5,000 available that show - in painful detail – the suffering of innocent property owners due to violent and other criminal behaviour by natives, the failure of the OPP to enforce the law, and the utter paralysis of every level of government to whom they appealed for help.

What we found is – to put it bluntly – sickening. The failure of governmental and policing institutions in Ipperwash was total. As Mary-Lou LaPratte observed, “Ipperwash was a town without a country.”

These documents also show that innocent property owners of Ipperwash were not listened to before Dudley George was killed. They were not listened to afterwards. And, they were not

listened to by the Ipperwash Inquiry. This failure to acknowledge and understand the suffering of the many hundreds of innocent victims of Landclaim Terror could have grave consequences for the people of Caledonia, and for the next innocent town involved in landclaim issues. This is the reason we have come before you today.

Did the Ipperwash Inquiry exclude evidence that did not support pre-determined conclusions?

Before I explain what the Ipperwash Papers reveal about the residents' experiences, let me summarize the evidence that leads us to conclude that the Ipperwash Inquiry's findings may have been determined prior to the end of the inquiry, and that any evidence that would contradict those conclusions was deliberately excluded and/or downplayed.

1. Exclusion of Mary Lou LaPratte

Let us first examine the credentials of the woman who sits beside me today, Mary-Lou LaPratte:

- served as Vice Chair of the Ipperwash Policing Committee. 1993 to 1996
- organized the first Neighbourhood Watch in Ipperwash. 1993 to 1996
- served on the Executive of ONFIRE (Ontario Federation for Individual Rights and Equality). Security, 1995 to 1997
- President of ONFIRE from 1997 to December 2006.
- Public Relations officer for the West Ipperwash Property Owners Association. 1992 to 2001.
- Conducted 700 hours of research and cataloguing for a class action lawsuit.
- Spokesperson for the West Ipperwash Property Owners Association with the Assessment Review Board from 1995 to 2001 during the litigation on the West Beach Land claim.

If you wanted to know anything about land claims and crime against residents, Mary-Lou LaPratte was the person you needed to talk to.

As you can see from Mary-Lou's affidavit [A1], the Inquiry did not call her as a witness even though they had received her chronology in July 2004 and were well aware that she was ready willing and able to testify. This despite being the most qualified person in the Ipperwash area to provide evidence with respect to violence suffered by residents during three land claims, and about the Department of National Defence and OPP failure to enforce the law, and the role this may have played in Dudley George's death.

Derry Millar, the lead counsel for the Ipperwash Inquiry, is a partner in the law firm of WeirFoulds located in The Exchange Tower in downtown Toronto. You may be forgiven for wondering if Mary-Lou's exclusion from the Inquiry was merely an unfortunate oversight on the part of a big city lawyer who was not familiar with the history of the Ipperwash situation rather a deliberate attempt to exclude her.

The truth is the exactly the reverse. Derry Millar and his law firm – then known as Weir & Foulds – successfully defended members of the West Ipperwash Property Owners Association (WIPOA) against a land claim filed on November 10, 1992. [C1-C4]

The case went all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada, and on May 19, 1998, in a decision indexed as “Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point v. Canada” the land claim was held to be invalid. [C4]

Mary-Lou LaPratte served as the Public Relations officer for the West Ipperwash Property Owners Association during the entire period of the land claim case, so the Ipperwash Inquiry’s lead counsel was well aware of both her considerable knowledge, and of the suffering of the Ipperwash property owners by the time he was appointed to serve on the Ipperwash Inquiry.

2. Exclusion of Roland LaPratte

Firstly, let me say that when we began our investigation we had no intention of delving into the Inquiry’s examination of the evidence related directly to the shooting of Dudley George. Our sole interest was to understand how the OPP evolved from a respected police force into its present degenerate role as a violator of Constitutional rights and protector of criminals in Caledonia.

[*www.voiceofcanada.ca*, 1. Jan 21/07: “OPP & OPPA vs. Supreme Court of Canada and the Charter of Rights & Freedoms” 2. Jan 25/07, “VIDEO EVIDENCE: Two Tier Justice – By the Numbers”]

During the course of our investigation, however, we did uncover what could be crucial evidence related to the shooting of Dudley George from a witness that was never called by the Ipperwash Inquiry.

In Mary-Lou LaPratte’s affidavit attached to her chronology [A1], she states that she met with a Mr. Peter Baker who claimed to be working on behalf of the OPP legal team. During their meeting, Mr. Baker discussed an incident witnessed by Ms. LaPratte’s husband, Roland LaPratte, in which he observed Dudley George holding a rifle with four other men after shots were fired at a town work crew.

Mr. LaPratte also claims that, on or about September 13, 1995 he witnessed a group of natives raking the sand where Dudley George was killed and picking objects out of the sand on their hands and knees. He also claimed to have seen other natives prying objects out of trees, fence posts and A-frame shacks that would have been behind and to the right of the OPP Tactical Response Unit during the night the Mr. George was shot. The OPP were not allowed to secure the shooting scene before abandoning Ipperwash to the natives. [A1-38, E1]

The Ipperwash Inquiry never called Mr. LaPratte as a witness even though by 2005 he had told his story to 4 separate investigators and had signed 2 sworn statements.

Exclusion of residents from Part 1 of the Inquiry

The purpose of Part 1 of the Ipperwash Inquiry was “to inquire and report on events surrounding the death of Dudley George, who was shot in 1995 during a protest...”

Despite this, ONFIRE, the Ontario Federation for Individual Rights and Equality, was denied standing for Part 1, the excuse given that it was only founded one month after the death of Mr. George. The fact that it was formed specifically to give residents a voice in the aftermath of George’s death seems to have been irrelevant to the Inquiry.

According to the Inquiry's website, out of 139 witnesses for Part 1 not a single one was a full time resident. Other than government officials, politicians, OPP officers and doctors, the only non-native who testified was a part-time cottager named Fran Hannahson who huddled in her cottage with her grandchild while the bullets were flying across the street from her.

The effect of the Inquiry's exclusion of the residents from Part 1 was that the issue of whether the DND and OPP's failure to enforce the law against native criminals in the years preceding Mr. George's death may have contributed to his death was never explored.

Unfortunately, the Inquiry's failure to address this important question could ultimately have grave implications for towns like Caledonia where criminals who happen to be of native heritage are currently permitted to commit offences in front of OPP officers and walk away without being arrested or even identified.

[www.voiceofcanada.ca, Jan 25/07, "VIDEO EVIDENCE: Two Tier Justice – By the Numbers"]

Exclusion of residents from Part 2 of the Inquiry

Part 2 of the Ipperwash Inquiry mandate was to "make recommendations that would avoid violence in similar circumstances." The actions of the Inquiry during this phase of its mandate are especially troubling.

Inquiry's failure to address issue of violence against innocent residents during land claims

One of the most glaring omissions from Part 2 from the residents' point of view – and those of us involved in the Caledonia struggle – is the Inquiry's failure to explore issues related to the prevention of violence against innocent third parties during land claims. Not a single symposium was devoted to this most vital issue. As Mary-Lou noted in her response to an OPP seminar held in January 2006:

"I wish to comment on an area of policy that I did not see discussed at these meetings."

"I appreciate all that the OPP have done in relations with the First Nation to date. I would hope that in the future the lives of innocent persons will be a priority in regards to their person and possessions. It leaves a very bad taste in the mouth to see and live through a situation where in the end nothing mattered but the safety of government officials and police." [D11]

Ms. LaPratte's comments are not published on the Inquiry's website, but she was recently assured that they would be read by the Commissioner.

Mary-Lou LaPratte's submission not included in list of 'Projects Prepared by Parties'

Parties who were given standing for Part 2 of the Inquiry were permitted to submit 'projects' to the Inquiry, and could receive funding for them upon application. These projects are listed on the Inquiry's website under Policy & Research > Projects Prepared by the Parties.

[http://www.ipperwashinquiry.ca/policy_part/projects/index.html]

Mary-Lou LaPratte's chronological history [A1] of the suffering endured by the residents at the hands of native criminals and OPP failure to enforce the law – the 29 page document you have in your hands – the ONLY project that reveals the extent of crime and violence committed by natives against innocent people caught in 3 land claims - is missing from the list.

Ipperwash Inquiry's effort to downplay effects of native crime on residents

If you would please refer to the document in your kit entitled 'IPPERWASH INQUIRY COMMUNITY CONSULTATION.' [O3]

This is the Inquiry's recollection of the ONLY opportunity during which individual residents were able to speak directly to the Commissioner, Justice Sidney Linden. It took place on June 21, 2006 and lasted all of 90 minutes. A public Inquiry that began in November 2003 and still has not released its findings – an Inquiry that has cost the taxpayers more than twenty million dollars - allotted just one and one half hours to the residents of Ipperwash who were victimized before, during and long after the events of September 06, 1995.

Apparently, however, even 90 minutes was too much time to devote to listening to the residents who suffered in Ipperwash. When Mary-Lou LaPratte raised the issue of preserving the Rule of Law during land claims, Derry Millar, the Inquiry's lead counsel, felt it necessary to defend the actions of native protesters who may have committed crimes.

The Inquiry's summary of their 90 minutes of Community Consultation on page 3 is nothing short of breathtaking for its gross mis-characterization of the meeting and residents, its attempt to minimize the suffering of residents, and for the not-so-subtle hint that the Inquiry's findings quite possibly had already been determined:

“Although some participants described difficulties between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities before and after September, 1995, several others stepped forward to note that they and their families had always enjoyed good relations with local First Nations people. One man described his family having lived, peacefully, adjacent to Stoney Point for six generations. He noted that there were people living in the area who hated Aboriginal people, and did not understand Aboriginal culture or traditions. He believes that the OPP overreacted to the occupation of the Park, and that the Stoney Point people have got a “raw deal”.

“Several participants attended Part I proceedings, and the Indigenous Knowledge Forum in 2004, and observed that they had learned a great deal from doing so.”
[O3]

The Inquiry's summary of this meeting seems to be offering the following conclusions:

1. There weren't any serious problems between natives and residents.
2. Residents are racist and/or ignorant of native culture.
3. Natives were blameless for the events at Ipperwash.

The comparison between the Inquiry's 'minutes' of this so-called 'Community Consultation' and those of a reporter who was present at the meeting are shocking. This is a small sampling from an

article written by Lynda Hillman-Rapley dated June 28, 2006 [O4]. I actually felt compelled to contact Ms. Hillman-Rapley to confirm that she was – indeed - writing about the same meeting:

“Mary-Lou LaPratte has lived in the Ipperwash area for 17 years. Her suggestions began with ‘rule of law’ being observed. That became an entire theme for the people in the audience, including former Forest mayor and present Lambton Shores councillor Gord Minielly who said there are two laws here just as there are in the land struggles of Caledonia.”

“It is time for Native occupiers who willingly damage Hydro service, water service, or the land to be occupying to be made financially responsible for the repairs, not the innocent taxpayer.”

“I have listened to all of the seminars, and am most aggrieved that all the work in the last ten years among the governments, OPP and the Natives was of no help in the Caledonia dispute. Violence must not be tolerated. It only serves to leave the area in question paralyzed by fear and a sense of hopelessness.”

“Jean Putthoff said the police asked her to evacuate in 1995, for her own safety. She said she thought the OPP did the best they could, under the circumstances but she said if “they” did some of these criminal acts, they would be arrested in a second.”

“[Councillor Minielly agreed with LaPratte saying this area was abandoned by the provincial and federal governments and were told nothing. He said the unlawfulness is still going on and the crime trail usually leads to the former base where the OPP are not permitted.

“Speaking on behalf of some of those people in the gallery, Minielly asked how many people had heard gun shots before 1995. Many people responded by raising their hands. He said he wanted that on the record and that since the people had often heard gun shots, there was ample reason for the police to be armed.”
[O4]

“Resident Jim Hansen said there was destruction of possible evidence in 1995.”
[See O1]

It certainly appears that the author of the minutes for the ‘Community Consultation’ left out some important information for those of us who weren’t there that night.

Summary

In summary, the Ipperwash Inquiry failed completely to address the issue of preserving the Rule of Law during land claim issues. They refused to allow Mary-Lou LaPratte to testify, and have so far not published her chronological history submission on the website. They did not call Roland LaPratte despite his claim to have vital information. They showed complete and utter contempt for the residents by allowing a mere 90 minutes for them to speak to the Inquiry, by downplaying their concerns and by mischaracterizing the meeting in such a way as to give the impression that their minds had already been made up.

What really happened in Ipperwash before and after the death of Dudley George?

The Ipperwash Papers show that the OPP practiced racial profiling to the detriment of residents at least as far back as August 1990 according to a document prepared by Mary-Lou LaPratte and submitted to the Ipperwash Inquiry in 2004. [A1-4]

By 1993 things got so bad for residents that the Sarnia Observer ran an editorial entitled, “Police must enforce laws.” [K4]

Two years later Dudley George was dead, and the residents of Ipperwash continued to suffer thanks to the OPP’s ‘hands-off’ approach to crime by natives. [A1]

The OPP were not the only organization to abandon the Rule of Law in Ipperwash. In a letter dated March 13, 1996 the Town of Bosanquet (now Lambton Shores) writes:

“DND [Department of National Defence], through its [sic] failure to remove illegal occupiers, failure to permit the law to be upheld, failure to protect its boundaries, failure to ensure safety at one of its military facilities and ultimate retreat from and desertion of Camp Ipperwash in the middle of the night has created a situation that led to the death of at least one individual, the takeover and destruction of public property, terrorizing of a municipality, destruction of property values, and the tearing apart of a community and its way of life.” [F34]

The town’s Chief Administrative Officer goes on to say:

“Repeatedly, over the two years preceding the fatal shooting of Dudley George, Town officials advised provincial and federal government cabinet ministers, politicians and bureaucrats of the real potential for injury and death in the area.” [F34]

In 1996 hundreds of Ipperwash residents put down their thoughts and feelings on paper and sent them to Mr. Robert Reid who had been appointed by the Government of Canada to act as a ‘special advisor’ for third parties caught up in the Ipperwash saga [G1] . He was later criticized by Mary-Lou LaPratte for not informing residents what was done with the letters [A1-57, G6, G9].

The Ipperwash Papers include 32 of these impact statements with all identifying information removed. These excerpts are representative:

March 15, 1996

“We need to feel safe in our homes. We need the security to know that our children will not be harmed when they go outside. We need to know that if we have to go to work that our homes will not be robbed and vandalized while we are away. As a working mother, I need to know that it is safe for my children to walk from their school bus stop to our home even if I cannot be there.

“Why don’t we feel safe? How can we feel safe in homes from which we were evacuated from last September because of the Indian uprising in Ipperwash? How can anyone feel safe in an area where there are repeated acts of random vandalism against homes and property? How can we feel safe, when the majority of these acts of violence can be traced back into the old Army Camp, and the police tell us they cannot go in there? How can we feel safe when we hear that no

one is in charge of the people occupying the camp? No one Federal, Provincial or Indian, will accept responsibility for the lawless behaviour emanating from a no man's land that is being used as a sanctuary for criminal activities in our communities. How can we feel safe, when we hear from our neighbours that they are tired of being afraid and have armed themselves?

“How can we continue to teach our children that laws are made for all and they must be obeyed? That those who break the law will be punished, when they see, with their own eyes, that no one is being pursued, much less being caught and punished for wrong-doing.” [F15]

March 16, 1996

“For three years my wife and I who reside in Port Franks have suffered much stress. We have heard automatic gunfire in our back yard plus have had gun shot-gun pellets strike our home. In the winter of 1993 crime increased dramatically with 9 break ins one night on either side of our home. All footmarks come from the army base and return to the army base. Never in my wildest dreams did I ever think that my country would turn their back on me when I needed them the most!” [F18]

March 19, 1996

“The police action, confrontation and subsequent evacuation of early September were a disaster, few would now dispute. However, the ramification of those events have been profound. We realized that those who, in this peaceable realm, were pledged to protect us, would not do so.” [F21]

March 19, 1996

“The decision in December 1994 by the Ontario Court...has been appealed by the First Nations and we have been warned the case will probably go on for years. This will drain our retirement funds...”

“[We experienced] fire blockades of roads and highways into the area which was our way out. Ontario Provincial Police withdraw leaving the area without proper police protection. [I was advised] by my insurance company that these circumstances are considered a rebellion and an insurrection therefore, no coverage for damage etc., arising from these acts. We therefore decide to stay in our residence and defend.” [F22]

Undated

“Firstly, during the hostilities of Sept 4th, 1995, the residents of this community were trapped in their homes and told to remain invisible until further notice. This situation lasted for 20 hrs before evacuation took place. At that time, we were told to evacuate but we were on our own. Upon leaving our homes we found that the Ontario Provincial Police had been withdrawn to a perimeter of 3 to 4 kms. This meant that there was NO protection between us and the Native Hostilities. We must never be placed in jeopardy again and MUST be able to expect police protection at all times.” [F26]

Undated

“We were told for our own safety we should vacate our home until the situation improved. Following this, the natives demanded the withdrawal of the OPP from the area, and that security be entrusted to the Kettle Point police.” [F29]

Undated

“They [native occupiers on the old Army base] have no fear of the law, why should they, the O.P.P. does not interfere, so they are free to help themselves.” [F30]

Undated

“There have been incidents after which the persons involved merely returned to the sanctuary of the Army Base where the OPP cannot take appropriate action. Thefts and break-ins in the area have increased dramatically. There are still vehicles being burned, buildings being damaged etc. without any repercussions. This select group feels they are protected by a reserve boundary (which they appear to be). You must be able to see how insecure this makes us feel as well as frustrated at the appearance of two laws. Whether the law is enforced by the OPP, the Native Police or the RCMP, the offenders must be told that they will be prosecuted to the fullest and their activities will not be tolerated.” [F32]

In her submission to the Ipperwash Inquiry Mary-Lou LaPratte relates a personal experience of intimidation she suffered more than one year before the death of Dudley George:

“In April/94 a native invaded our home at 2a.m. by climbing up a two storey deck and entering our bedroom by the patio door on the upper deck. Roland called the OPP. He was told on the phone not to touch the Native in any way. It took the OPP 23 minutes to respond to the call. By that time the native had left. We did not know who he was. He just wanted us to know that we could be gotten to at any time. It terrified me and I told my husband that I would not live here anymore that he had to get me out of this house.” [A1-17]

Ms. LaPratte sums up her feelings about the OPP’s performance:

“Thomas O’Grady [OPP Commissioner] answered our letter in August denying us the RCMP policing and stating that the OPP were doing a good job. We were all completely fed up with this useless rhetoric. Our lives were being ruined with worry, stress, lack of sleep, financial problems due to lack of business and plummeting real estate values, and being victims of crime. We did not have peaceful enjoyment of our homes and properties. We did not have safety of our person and possessions. Somehow the law is not here for us and yet no one could tell us why we had to endure this mess of lawlessness to placate the native agenda.” [A1-63, J2]

Government paralysis in the face of OPP failure to enforce the law

As the excerpts below show, every level of government knew that it was the responsibility of the Ontario Provincial Police to enforce the law both on and off the former Army base:

Letter from Minister of Indian Affairs, April 02, 1996

“I can assure you that the federal government does not agree with use of illegal activity or violence to achieve political or social ends. The occupation of the land at Camp Ipperwash was by a small group of dissidents and was not supported by the Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point First Nation. Aboriginal people are subject to...the Criminal Code of Canada. Enforcement of the Code is a provincial responsibility and, therefore, the approach taken during incidents of infractions of the Code...is determined by the relevant local police force.” [H7]

Letter from MPP Marcel Beubien, April 26, 1996

“I do understand your frustration with this issue. I agree that laws must be enforced, however it is beyond my jurisdiction and the Premier’s to instruct the O.P.P.. Simply put, **we cannot give direction to the O.P.P.** The deployment of the officers and the enforcement of the law rests solely with the OPP. Look at what happened at Queen’s Park a month ago. The media and the opposition are insinuating that the Premier call[ed] in the O.P.P., and for that we have to have an inquiry into the incident.” [H9]

Letter from MP Rose-Marie Ur, May 6, 1996

“I must also reiterate that the province of Ontario is constitutionally responsible for policing at Ipperwash Park and for the administration of justice. The federal government can get involved in policing issues only if the Ontario government requests our assistance. This could involve either the RCMP or the Armed Forces...” [H10]

Letter from Solicitor General of Canada, August 13, 1996

“...the Province of Ontario and police forces operating under its authority are responsible for the police response to criminal acts at Camp Ipperwash. I note that the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces understand and recognize that the Ontario Provincial Police has responsibility for exercising law enforcement activities at Camp Ipperwash. Any complaints should therefore be registered with the local police detachment. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police might only become involved in such investigations at the request of the Ontario Provincial Police or other police service...” [H11]

Letter from Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, May 08, 1998

“Mrs. LaPratte also mentions thefts and other threats to public safety that are taking place outside the camp. The Government of Ontario has policing jurisdiction throughout the Province of Ontario. Any criminal activity outside of the camp should be reported to the Ontario Provincial Police for investigation.” [H16]

Letter from Deputy Prime Minister, undated

“...the Government of Ontario has policing jurisdiction throughout the Province of Ontario and the Ontario Provincial Police will investigate and enforce any infractions of the law that are reported to them.” [H17]

Letter from Deputy Prime Minister, June 15, 1998

“...the Province of Ontario and police forces operating under its authority are responsible for the police response to criminal acts at the former Camp Ipperwash and neighbouring lands. Where circumstances are beyond the power of the civil authority to deal with, the Provincial Attorney General may request the assistance of the Canadian Forces in aid of the civil power. No such request has been received or is anticipated.” [H18]

Letter from Minister of National Defence, June 16, 1998

“It is the Province of Ontario and police forces operating under its authority that are responsible for the police response to criminal acts at the former Camp Ipperwash and neighbouring lands. Should there be any questions or concerns regarding criminal activity or police matters, they should be directed to the Commander of the local Ontario Provincial Police Detachment.” [H19]

Letter from Ontario Solicitor General, Sep 15, 1998

“I am assured by Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) Commissioner Gwen Boniface that the OPP continues to enforce the law in Ipperwash, whether involving First Nation or non-First Nation residents. I am advised that the OPP...ensures the appropriate charges are laid against anyone found committing a crime. In your letter, you cite a number of occurrences which have taken place over the past several years. You may wish to raise your concerns about each particular occurrence with...[the] North Lambton OPP Detachment.” [H21]

Every level of government said that it was the responsibility of the OPP to enforce the law in Ipperwash, but the residents say they refused to do so in a fair and impartial manner. Even today, the OPP does not police the occupied former Army Camp. At least two dismembered bodies have been found there [L22, L23], and local residents call it the ‘Homefree Zone’ because suspects who make it through the gates are untouchable by the law.

Summary of the Ipperwash Papers

1. The Department of National Defence refused to uphold the Rule of Law in the time preceding the death of Dudley George. The OPP failed to enforce the law equally before, during and after the events of September 1995. They completely abandoned the residents when they were most needed, sacrificing the safety, security and peace of mind of innocent civilians in order to appease leaders of a violent insurrection. The actions of the OPP have destroyed lives in Ipperwash just as they are destroying lives today in Caledonia. The Ipperwash Papers clearly show that Dudley George was not the only victim of the Ipperwash rebellion.
2. The people of Ipperwash were not listened to before Dudley George was killed. They were not listened to afterwards, and they were not listened to by the Ipperwash Inquiry. Our evidence suggests that there was a consistent effort by the Inquiry to both exclude and downplay evidence from residents that might paint natives in a negative light.
3. The Ipperwash Inquiry can never provide recommendations for preventing violence against innocent people caught up in land claims because they never addressed the issue. The Inquiry, therefore, was a colossal waste of time and resources so far as the people of Caledonia and future innocent victims of Landclaim terror are concerned.