

leave granted  
R7A08, April 12/12  
Wm

2007 01T4955 CP

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
TRIAL DIVISION

**BETWEEN:**

CAROL ANDERSON, ALLEN WEBBER  
and JOYCE WEBBER

PLAINTIFFS

**AND:**

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA

DEFENDANT

Brought under the *Class Actions Act*, S.N.L. 2001, c. C-18.1

**AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM**

**A. RELIEF SOUGHT BY THE PLAINTIFF AGAINST CANADA**

1. The Representative Plaintiffs, on their own behalf, and on behalf of the members of the Survivor Class and Family Class claim:

- (a) an Order certifying this proceeding as a Class Proceeding pursuant to the *Class Actions Act*, S.N.L. 2001, c. C-18.1 and appointing Carol Anderson and Allen Webber as Representative Plaintiffs for the Survivor Class and any appropriate subgroup thereof;
- (b) a Declaration that Canada owed ~~and was in breach of~~ exclusive non-delegable fiduciary, and ~~statutory and common law~~ duties of care to the Plaintiffs and the other Survivor Class Members in relation to the establishment, funding, oversight, operation, supervision, control, maintenance, ~~confinement in, transport of Survivor Class Members to,~~ obligatory attendance of Survivor Class Members at and support of the Lockwood School in Cartwright, Labrador (the "School");
- (c) a Declaration that Canada was negligent in the establishment, funding, oversight, operation, supervision, control, maintenance, ~~confinement in,~~ transport of Survivor Class Members to, ~~obligatory attendance of Survivor~~ Class Members at and support of the School;

Filed Apr 18/12 mw

- (d) a Declaration the Canada was or is in breach of its exclusive and non-delegable fiduciary obligations to the Plaintiffs and the other Survivor Class Members as a consequence of its establishment, funding, operation, supervision, control, maintenance, oversight, ~~confinement in, transport of Survivor Class Members, to obligatory attendance at the School of the School;~~
- ~~(e) a Declaration that Canada was or is in breach of its statutory duties pursuant to the *Indian Act*, R.S.C. 1985, c. I-5 (the "Act") and its Treaty obligations to the Plaintiffs and the other Survivor Class Members as a consequence of its establishment, funding, operation, supervision, control, maintenance, confinement in, transport of Survivor Class Members to, obligatory attendance of Survivor Class Members at and support of the School;~~
- ~~(f) a Declaration that the School caused cultural, linguistic and social damage and irreparable harm to the Survivor Class;~~
- (g) a Declaration that Canada is liable to the Plaintiffs and other Survivor Class Members for the damages caused by its breach of exclusive non delegable, fiduciary and, statutory and common law duties of care and for negligence in relation to the establishment, funding, operation, supervision, control, maintenance, oversight, ~~confinement in, transport of Survivor Class Members to, obligatory attendance of Survivor Class Members at and support of the School;~~
- (h) non-pecuniary general damages for negligence, ~~loss of language and culture, breach of non-delegable~~ exclusive fiduciary and duties of care, ~~statutory, treaty and common law duties~~ in the amount of \$500 million or such other sum as this Honourable Court finds appropriate;
- (i) pecuniary general damages and special damages for negligence, loss of income, loss of earning potential, loss of economic opportunity, breach of non-delegable exclusive fiduciary and, statutory, treaty and common law duties of care in the amount of \$500 million or such other sum as this Honourable Court finds appropriate;
- (j) exemplary and punitive damages in the amount of \$100 million or such other sum as the this Honourable Court finds appropriate;
- (k) damages in the amount of \$100 million or such other sum as this Honourable Court finds appropriate, pursuant to the *Family Law Act*, R.S.N., 1990, and its predecessors;
- (l) prejudgment and post judgment interest pursuant to the provisions of the *Judicature Act*, R.S.N. 1990, c. J-4 ; and
- (m) the costs of this action on a substantial indemnity scale.

## B. DEFINITIONS

2. The following definitions apply for the purposes of this Claim:

- (a) "Aboriginal", "Aboriginal People(s)" or "Aboriginal Person(s)" means a person whose rights are recognized and affirmed by the *Constitution Act*, 1982, s. 35, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act*, 1982 (U.K.), 1982. c. 11, specifically, members of the Metis and Inuit nations;
- (b) "Aboriginal Right(s)" means rights recognized and affirmed by the *Constitution Act*, 1982, s. 35, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act*, 1982 (U.K.), 1982. c. 11;
- (c) "Agents" mean the servants, contractors, agents, officers and employees of Canada and the operators, managers, administrators and teachers and staff of the School;
- (d) "Canada" means the Defendant, the Government of Canada as represented in this proceeding by the Attorney General of Canada;
- (e) "Class" or "Class Members" means all members of the Survivor Class and the Family Class;
- (f) "Class Period" means March 31, 1949 to December 31, 1996 and the date of closure of the Lockwood School;
- (g) "Excluded Persons" means all persons who attended an Eligible Indian Residential School as defined by the Settlement Agreement dated May 10, 2006, executed between Canada, as represented by the Attorney General of Canada (the "Agreement") and all persons who are otherwise eligible, pursuant to the Agreement, to receive a Common Experience Payment or pursue a claim through the Individual Assessment Process, as defined by the Agreement;
- (h) "Family Class" means:
  - (i) the spouse, child, grandchild, parent, grandparent or sibling of a Survivor Class Member;
  - ~~(ii) the spouse of a child, grandchild, parent, grandparent or sibling of a Survivor Class Member;~~
  - (iii) a former spouse of a Survivor Class Member;
  - (iv) a child or other lineal descendent of a grandchild of a Survivor Class Member;

- (v) a person of the same or opposite sex to a Survivor Class Member who cohabited for a period of at least one year with that Survivor Class Member immediately before his or her death;
- (vi) a person of the same or opposite sex to a Survivor Class Member who was cohabiting with that Survivor Class Member at the date of his or her death and to whom that Survivor Class Member was providing support or was under a legal obligation to provide support on the date of his or her death;
- (vii) any other person to whom a Survivor Class Member was providing support for a period of at least three years immediately prior to his or her death;
- (i) "School" means the Lockwood School, located in Cartwright, Labrador;
- (j) "Survivor Class" means:  

All persons who attended the School between March 31, 1949 and ~~December 31, 1996~~ the date of closure of the Lockwood School.

### C. THE PARTIES

#### i. Representative Plaintiffs

3. The Plaintiff, Carol Anderson ("Anderson"), resides in Goose Bay, Newfoundland and is a Metis First Nation. Anderson attended the School in Cartwright between 1958 and 1959. Anderson is a ~~proposed~~ the representative plaintiff for the Survivor Class.

4. The Plaintiff, Allen Webber ("Allen"), resides in Goose Bay, Newfoundland and is a Metis First Nation. Allen attended the School in Cartwright between 1958 and 1959. Allen is a ~~proposed~~ the representative plaintiff for the Survivor Class.

5. The Plaintiff, Joyce Webber ("Webber") resides in Goose Bay, Newfoundland and is a Metis First Nation. Joyce was born on June 2, 1954. Her husband Allen attended the School in Cartwright, Newfoundland between 1958 and 1959. Joyce is a ~~proposed~~ the representative plaintiff for the Family Class.

6. The proposed Representative Plaintiffs do not purport to advance claims on behalf of any persons who are otherwise entitled to compensation pursuant to the terms of the Agreement.

7. In particular, the proposed Representative Plaintiffs' claim and the class they propose to represent, do not overlap with the terms of the order granted by Justice Winkler of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, dated March 8, 2007, attached hereto as Schedule "A".

ii. The Defendant

8. The Defendant, the Government of Canada, is being represented in this proceeding by the Attorney General of Canada. Canada represents the interests of the Minister of the Department of Indian Affairs Canada, who was, at all material times, responsible for the maintenance, funding, oversight or management and operation of the School, either on its own or in combination with other of its agents or servants.

9. Once the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador entered Confederation in 1949, Canada assumed and possessed exclusive Legislative and executive responsibility over aboriginal persons, including the Classes. As aboriginal persons in the 'new' province in 1949 were legally "Indians" for the purposes of section 91(24) of the *British North America Act, 1867*, they were proper subjects of federal jurisdiction.

10. Canada's participation in the funding and operation of the School breached its exclusive duty of care owed to the Classes which was also in breach of its non-delegable fiduciary obligations and constitutional obligations owed to aboriginal persons.

11. Alternatively, even if Canada did not materially operate or manage the school, it nevertheless breached its fiduciary duties by failing to properly do so and protect the Class as it alone possessed singular and exclusive legal jurisdiction over aboriginal persons.

**D. RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL SYSTEM – OPERATION OF THE SCHOOL**

**i. Background - Residential School History Generally**

12. Residential Schools were established by Canada as early as 1874, for the education of Aboriginal children. These children were taken from their homes and their communities and transported to Residential Schools where they were often confined and deprived of their heritage, their support networks and their way of life, forced to adopt a foreign language and a culture alien to them.

13. Commencing in 1911, Canada entered into formal agreements with the Churches for the operation of such schools. Pursuant to these agreements, Canada controlled, regulated, supervised and directed all aspects of the operation of the Residential Schools. The Churches assumed the day-to-day operation of the Residential Schools under the control, supervision and direction of Canada, for which the Canada paid the Churches a per capita grant calculated to cover part of the cost of the Residential School operation.

14. As of 1920, the Residential School Policy included compulsory attendance at Residential Schools for all Aboriginal children aged 7 (seven) to 15 (fifteen). This approach to the control and operation of the Residential Schools system continued until April 1, 1969, at which time Canada assumed the sole operation and administration of the

Residential Schools from the Churches, excepting certain cases where Churches continued to act as agents of Canada.

15. Canada removed Aboriginal Persons, usually young children, from their homes and Aboriginal communities and transported them to Residential Schools which were often long distances away. Canada controlled all aspects of the admission of Aboriginal Persons to the Residential Schools including arrangements for the care of such persons over holiday periods and the methods of transporting children to and from Residential Schools.

16. ~~The same A-Similar Residential Schools policy was implemented and effected in~~ existed in Newfoundland and Labrador which joined Canada on March 31, 1949. Accordingly, the claim against Canada is limited temporally to the time when the Canada became legally responsible for Aboriginal Persons residing in that province, or 1949, and beyond.

17. Aboriginal Persons were often taken from their families without the consent of their parents or guardians. While the stated purpose of the Residential Schools from their inception was the education of Aboriginal children, their true purpose was the complete integration and assimilation of Aboriginal children into mainstream Canadian society and the obliteration of their traditional language, culture and religion. Many children attending Residential Schools were also subject to repeated and extreme physical, sexual and emotional abuse, all of which continued until the year 1996, when the last federally operated Residential School was closed.

18. During the Class Period, children at the school were subjected to systemic child abuse, neglect and maltreatment. They were forcibly confined in the School and were systematically deprived of the essential components of a healthy childhood. They were subjected to physical, emotional, psychological, cultural, spiritual and sexual abuse by those who were responsible for their well being.

19. The accommodation was crowded, cold and sub-standard. Aboriginal children were underfed and ill nourished, forbidden to speak their native languages or to practice the customs and traditions of their culture. They were deprived of love and affection from their families and of the support that a child would normally expect to have from those in positions of trust and authority. Aboriginal children were also subjected to corporal punishment, assaults, including physical and sexual and systematic child abuse.

**E. CANADA'S ASSUMPTION OF DUTIES WHEN NEWFOUNDLAND JOINED CONFEDERATION IN 1949**

20. Around the time of Confederation, two separate legal opinions commissioned by the Federal Department of Justice confirmed that the Federal Crown possessed exclusive legislative and executive responsibility in relation to Aboriginal persons, including the Inuit and Eskimo, living in Newfoundland and Labrador.

21. The records of the Federal departments, agencies, ministers and bureaucrats responsible for negotiating the *Terms of Union* show that from 1946 the Federal Government recognized that under the terms of the *British North America Act*, section 91(24), it would have to assume full responsibility for the native people of the new province.

22. As Canada's legal responsibility to Aboriginals was constitutional in nature, it was prohibited from attempting to cede or delegate such duties to any other entity, including the Province itself. Given the broad duties owed by Canada to Aboriginal persons, the welfare and education of Aboriginal children cannot be said to have resided with the Crown in right of the Province of Newfoundland after March 31, 1949.

23. The entry of Newfoundland and Labrador into Confederation brought its Aboriginal population fully within exclusive federal jurisdiction. At the time of Confederation, Canada was aware that any union with Newfoundland and Labrador would have had an Aboriginal component and legal responsibility associated with it.

24. In 1947, in advance of preparing for the *Terms of Union* negotiations, the Federal Government prepared a document for the Newfoundland delegation which outlined the nature of Federal involvement with and for Aboriginal peoples. Amongst other things, under classes of subjects in which the Federal Parliament exercised exclusive jurisdiction, 'Indians and lands reserved for Indians' was listed and when outlining the responsibilities that the various Federal departments would have for Newfoundland, 'Indian Affairs' was listed under the Department of Mines and Resources.

25. The function of the Indian Affairs Branch was described as administering the "affairs of the Indians of Canada [which] included the control of their education". The Federal Department of Mines and Resources stated, at that time, that the Dominion assumes full responsibility for the welfare, including education, of Indians and Eskimos, a response which went on at length to describe the day and residential school system.

26. In and around the time of Confederation, a number of Federal legal opinions on the question were prepared, most of them acknowledging sole federal responsibility for Newfoundland's Aboriginal people. Under Term 3 of the *Terms of Union*, for matters not specifically referred to, things were deemed to be as if Newfoundland had joined under the terms of the *Constitution Act, 1867*.

27. When Canada sent its official version of the proposed *Terms of Union* to the National Convention in Newfoundland in October 1947, it had already acknowledged that under the terms of the *British North America Act* it had exclusive jurisdiction in the area of Aboriginal peoples. By deleting the reference to native people in the proposed draft *Terms of Union* and writing in Federal responsibility, as outlined in the *British North America Act*, the Federal Government acknowledged *de facto* jurisdiction for the Indians, Inuit and Eskimos of Newfoundland and Labrador.

28. At the time of Confederation, the Premier, Joseph Smallwood, actually refused to sign an agreement with Canada which would have transferred federal responsibility for native persons to the Province. The Province maintained that the fiduciary obligations for Aboriginal persons remained, and belonged to the federal government.

29. Following Confederation, in December 1949, Canada established an Interdepartmental Committee on Labrador Indians and Eskimos which requested another legal opinion from the Justice Department which stated that in the matter of Newfoundland "Indians and Eskimos":

"...the federal Parliament has exclusive legislative authority in relation to Indians ... which, of course, means that the provincial legislature has no authority to enact legislation directed at or dealing with [matters] in relation to Indians.... It is the responsibility of the federal government to formulate and carry out all policies that are

directed at dealing with Indian or Indian problems. Such policy is to be formulated by Parliament and the executive. This responsibility carries with it the responsibility or providing money to be devoted to the carrying of our policies in relation to the Indians.”

30. This opinion provided by the Justice Department is consistent with the assumptions made during the pre-Confederation talks: Aboriginal persons, pursuant to the *British North America Act*, were Canada’s responsibility. Even before Newfoundland’s entry into Confederation, various federal departments had included in their departmental estimates sizeable amounts towards relief, services and expenditures for the native populations in Newfoundland and Labrador. This demonstrates that the federal government believed it had a responsibility to fulfill in regard to the Eskimo and Inuit in Labrador and that it would be called upon to provide programs and assistance, funding, oversight and implementation of certain programs, including education.

31. In fact, the *Terms of Union* indirectly provided that the then Aboriginal population in Newfoundland fell under federal jurisdiction. Section three of the *Terms of Union* affirms that: “[t]he *Constitution Acts, 1867 to 1940* apply to the Province of Newfoundland in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the provinces heretofore comprised in Canada”.

32. The *Constitution Act, 1867* itself states that “the exclusive Legislative Authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all Matters coming within the Classes of Subjects next hereinafter enumerated; that is to say ... Indians, and Lands reserved for the *Indians*”.

33. Following Confederation in 1949, and by 1951, Canada had agreed to pay the bills submitted by Newfoundland for “Indians and Eskimos” for the period 1949-1950.

At that same time, Newfoundland also provided Canada with an estimate of provincial expenditures with respect to Eskimo and Inuit in Labrador for which it expected payment. Throughout the 1950's and 1960's, programs for aboriginal education in Newfoundland and Labrador were paid for by Canada at the rate of 90% for Indian communities and 40% in Inuit communities.

34. A 1951 memorandum prepared by the Chairman of the Inter-departmental Committee on Newfoundland Indians and Eskimos formed the basis of much of Canada's position for the future:

"Section 3 of the *Terms of Union* stipulates that the provisions of the *BNA Act* shall apply to Newfoundland except insofar as varied by the Terms. Since the Terms of Union do not refer to Indians and Eskimos and since head 24 of section 91 of the *BNA Act* places 'Indians and lands reserved for Indians' exclusively under Federal jurisdiction, it seems clear that the Federal Government is responsible for the native population resident in Labrador."

35. By 1954, Newfoundland requested that Canada provide both operating and capital expenditures towards education for Eskimos and Inuit. The 1954 Agreement between Newfoundland and Canada stipulated that Canada would assume 66% of capital expenditures on behalf of Eskimos in Newfoundland and 100% of capital expenditures on behalf of Indians in the fields of health, welfare and education. This agreement reached between the Premier of Newfoundland and Canada in 1954 provided for the re-assumption of federal constitutional responsibility over aboriginal persons in the new province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

36. Just four years into this Agreement, Newfoundland requested further funds from Canada to provide education and housing for both Indians and Inuit. Shortly thereafter, in 1964, the Premier of Newfoundland asked Prime Minister Pearson, to either have Canada

assume sole and full responsibility for Indians and Inuit or to at least increase funding to the level of support being provided by Canada to other provinces in Canada.

37. At the same time, the Pearson government requested a second legal opinion from the Justice Department. On November 23, 1964, the Deputy Attorney General provided that opinion and determined that:

“...there is no provision in the *Indian Act* excluding any portion of Canada from its application. Mr. Varcoe’s opinion [the 1950 Justice Department opinion] as to the constitutional position is, in my opinion, correct. The fact that there is no mention of Eskimos or Indians in the *Terms of Union* means only that the constitutional position with respect thereto has not changed with regard to Newfoundland.”

38. As a result, by 1965, Canada had agreed to provide the same resources and programs to Indians, Inuit and Eskimos in Labrador as were provided to similar groups elsewhere in Canada. The proposed agreements were to be: (a) renegotiated and reviewed every five years; (b) a Federal-Provincial committee was to be established to monitor expenditures and propose budgets for approval by both governments; (c) Newfoundland would be reimbursed for 90% of the Provinces’ capital expenditures for Indians and Eskimos for the period 1954 – 1964; and (d) the agreement was to be administered by an inter-governmental committee comprised of representatives of both governments.

39. Amongst other things, this “Contribution Agreement” was designed to provide services to the communities of Sheshatshit and Davis Inlet, including education. The Contribution Agreement identified the amount of funding available as (a) 90% from Canada; and (b) 10% from Newfoundland. The Contribution Agreement also established a management committee composed of federal officials, provincial officials and representatives of the Davis Inlet and Sheshatshit communities.

40. At the same time, the then Prime Minister also proposed certain increases in Canadian contributions for “Indians and Eskimos” in Newfoundland and Labrador which ultimately constituted an agreement between Canada and Newfoundland, providing, amongst other things, for:

- (a) Canada to pay Newfoundland up to \$1,000,000.00 per annum for 90% of the Province’s Innu and Inuit expenditures (except where otherwise covered under other federal-provincial agreements);
- (b) establishment of a federal-provincial committee to monitor provincial expenditures;
- (c) continuation of federal funding for Inuit communities in Labrador; and
- (d) agreements to be reviewed and renegotiated every five years to “ensure that they continued to meet the changing circumstances and needs of the Eskimo and Indian residents in Labrador.

41. A Royal Commission on Labrador was convened in 1973 with a mandate to conduct a full inquiry into the economic and sociological conditions in Labrador. In addition to recommending to Newfoundland that it immediately renegotiate its funding agreements with Canada, given that amounts paid there under were inadequate and insufficient, the Commission also made the following determination:

“The Commission finds itself unable to determine a sound rationale for the practice under this Agreement of having the Province pay a percentage of cost for services to Indians and Eskimos. This is not the practice in other parts of Canada. In the view of the Commission, the Federal Government, as it does elsewhere, should be prepared to accept full fiscal responsibility unless the Province wishes to ensure its continued direct involvement in the program for Indians and Eskimos through sharing part of the cost...”

42. Many of the recommendations of the Royal Commission were implemented through the Federal-Provincial funding agreements which were ratified in the years following publication of the Commission Report. For example, an interim agreement was in place between 1976 and 1981 and funded projects which were valued at \$22 million in

Labrador. Negotiations between the Province and Federal government led to the signing of two agreements in July 1981:

- (i) Canada-Newfoundland Community Development Subsidiary Agreement, valued at \$38,996,000.00, payable by the Federal government; and
- (ii) Native People's of Labrador Agreement, valued at \$38,831,00.00 federal payments/contributions.

43. The Labrador Agreement covered the following Indian and Inuit communities: Davis Inlet, Northwest Rivet, Nain, Hopedale, Makkovik, Rigolet and Postville. Pursuant to that Agreement, between 1981 and 1986, Canada contributed 90% of the costs of the programs and services in these Indian communities and 60% of the costs of those delivered in the Inuit communities. In total, Canada contributed \$29,135,100.00 in this respect between 1981 and 1986.

44. In August 1985, Canada entered into a further contribution agreement with Newfoundland and Labrador, "for the benefit of native peoples in Labrador", recognizing Canada's "special interest in the social and economic development of Inuit and Indian People." The operation of education was the largest budget allocation item pursuant to this Agreement, for a total of \$1,530,000.00 (1985/1986 fiscal year), 71% of which was Canada's responsibility.

45. Fiduciary obligations are and were owed by Canada to Aboriginal persons, peoples who, pursuant to section 35(2) of the *Constitution Act 1982* include the Indian, Inuit and Metis. This fiduciary relationship between Canada and Aboriginal persons was and is *sui generis* in nature. Accordingly, a fiduciary duty between Canada and

Aboriginal persons in Newfoundland and Labrador arose at the moment of Confederation in 1949.

46. Canada has acknowledged its own sole singular responsibility over Indians and Inuit in Newfoundland by accepting its obligation to financially assist or contribute. In any event, Canada has always assumed some level of legal responsibility for aboriginal persons in Newfoundland and Labrador. Having undertaken discretionary control over a cognizable Indian interest, a fiduciary duty existed between Canada and the Class in these circumstances.

47. As the nature of Canada's relationship with Aboriginal persons gives rise to a non-delegable duty to preserve, protect and promote welfare and education of Aboriginal children, the responsibility for its execution rested solely with Canada.

48. In the alternative, if Canada failed to properly assume those common law and constitutional obligations, it breached its, fiduciary and common law duties owed to the class by failing to do so.

ii. Canada's Operation of the School in Labrador

49. The School was located in Cartwright, Labrador. It was first established in 1949 and ceased operation as a residential school for Aboriginal children in 1979.

50. The purpose of the School was to provide education to Aboriginal children between the ages of 6 and 16 years who attended the School from various First Nations bands and communities in Newfoundland and Labrador. The School eventually became a

vehicle for assimilating Aboriginal children through the eradication of their native languages, cultures and spiritual beliefs.

51. The School was initially founded and established by the International Grenfell Association. Once Confederation occurred in March 1949 and Newfoundland joined Canada, the International Grenfell Association began ceasing its involvement, funding and role in the School. ~~At all material times, the staff members at the School were employees, servants and/or agents of Canada.~~ The funding provided by Canada following Confederation was inadequate to meet the costs of operating and maintaining the School, and in particular, to meet the daily and educational needs of the students at the School. As a result, the care provided to the students and the conditions at the School were poor, the staff hired were unskilled and/or unsuitable for dealing with children and the conditions at the School were unsuitable and inappropriate for an educational facility for children.

~~52. In many cases, the Aboriginal children were forced to attend the School by representatives, agents or servants of Canada. The Aboriginal children who attended the School were separated from their families, uprooted and taken to the School, where they were placed within the control of Canada. For all intents and purposes, the children who attended the School, were wards of the School and/or Canada.~~

53. Canada participated in the funding, oversight ~~carried out that operation and administration of the School until 1979.~~ These operative and administrative responsibilities, carried out on behalf of Canada or by its agents included:

- (a) the operation and maintenance of the School during the Class Period;

- (b) the care and supervision of all members of the Survivor Class, and for supplying all the necessities of life to Survivor Class members *in loco parentis*;
- (c) the provision of educational and recreational services to the Survivor Class while in attendance at the School and control over all persons allowed to enter the School premises at all material times;
- (d) the selection, supply and supervision of teaching and non-teaching staff at the School and reasonable investigation into the character, background and psychological profile of all individuals employed to teach or supervise the Survivor Class;
- (e) inspection and supervision of the School and all activities taking place therein, and for full and frank reporting to Canada respecting conditions in the School and all activities taking place therein;
- (f) transportation of Survivor Class members to and from the School; and
- (g) communication with and reporting to the Family Class respecting the activities and experiences of Survivor Class members while attending the School.

54. Attempts to provide educational opportunities to children confined in the School were ill-conceived and poorly executed by inadequately trained teaching staff. The result was to effectively deprive the Aboriginal children of any useful or appropriate education. Very few survivors of the School went on to any form of higher education.

55. The conditions and abuses in the School during the Class Period were well-known to Canada.

56. Any attempt by Canada to delegate its duties, responsibilities or obligations to the Class to the Province of Newfoundland is unlawful and in breach of its exclusive and non-delegable fiduciary duties owed to the class.

**F. CANADA'S BREACHES OF DUTIES TO THE CLASS MEMBERS**

57. The Defendant Canada, as represented by the Attorney General of Canada, has a fiduciary relationship with Aboriginal People in Canada. Canada created, planned, established, set up, initiated, operated, financed, supervised, controlled and regulated the School during the Class Period, either on its own or in conjunction with the Province.

58. Canada, and its respective servants and agents compelled members of the Survivor Class to leave their homes, families and communities, and forced members of the Survivor Class to attend (and sometimes live in) the School, all without lawful authority or the permission and consent of Survivor Class members or that of their parents. Such confinement was wrongful, arbitrary and for improper purposes.

59. Survivor Class members were systematically subjected to the institutional conditions, regime and discipline of the School without the permission and consent of Survivor Class members or that of their parents, and were also subjected to wrongful acts at the hands of Canada while confined therein.

60. In particular, Anderson experienced severe physical abuse and verbal abuse during her time at the School by teachers, "caregivers" and other students. Anderson was hospitalized for a period of two weeks during her residence at the School due to her kidney ailments as a child, exacerbated by the substandard care, poor nutrition and abuse. Webber also suffered from serious physical and mental abuse during his time at the School from both teachers and students. Many of the children at the School also experienced sexual abuse, perpetrated against them by teachers, adults in positions of authority or from other students.

61. All persons, including Anderson and Webber, who attended the School ~~did so as wards of Canada, with Canada as their guardian, and~~ were persons to whom Canada owed the highest non-delegable, fiduciary, ~~moral, statutory~~ and common law duties, which included, but were not limited to, the duty to ensure that reasonable care was taken of the Survivor Class while at the School, the duty to protect the Survivor Class while at the School and the duty to protect the Survivor Class from intentional torts perpetrated on them while at the School. These non-delegable ~~and~~ fiduciary duties were performed negligently and tortiously by Canada, in breach of its special responsibility to ensure the safety of the Survivor Class while at the School.

62. Canada was responsible for:

- (a) ~~the administration of the Act and its predecessor statutes as well as any other statutes relating to Aboriginal Persons and all Regulations promulgated under these Acts and their predecessors during the Class Period;~~
- (b) the promotion of the health, safety and well being of Aboriginal Persons in Newfoundland during the Class Period;
- (c) the management, operation and administration of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and its predecessor Ministries and Departments during the Class Period;
- (d) decisions, procedures, regulations promulgated, operations and actions taken by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, its employees, servants, officers and Agents in Canada their predecessors during the Class Period;
- (e) overseeing the construction, operation, maintenance, ownership, financing, administration, supervision, inspection and auditing of the School and for the creation, design and implementation of the program of education for Aboriginal Persons confined therein during the Class Period;
- (f) the selection, control, training, supervision and regulation of the designated operators and their employees, servants, officers and agents, and for the care and education, control and well being of Aboriginal Persons confined in the Residential School during the Class Period;

- (g) the provision of all educational services and opportunities to the Survivor Class members, pursuant to the provisions of the Act and any other statutes relating to Aboriginal Persons during the Class Period;
- ~~(h) transportation of Survivor Class Members to and from the School and to and from their homes while attending the School during the Class Period;~~
- ~~(i) preserving, promoting, maintaining and not interfering with Aboriginal Rights, including the right to retain and practice their culture, spirituality, language and traditions and the right to fully learn their culture, spirituality, language and traditions from their families, extended families and communities;~~
- (j) the care and supervision of all members of the Survivor Class while they were in attendance at the School during the Class Period and for the supply of all the necessities of life to Survivor Class Members, *in loco parentis*, during the Class Period;
- (k) the provision of educational and recreational services to the Survivor Class while in attendance at the School during the Class Period;
- (l) inspection and supervision of the School and all activities that took place therein during the Class Period and for full and frank reporting to Canada and to the Family Class Members with respect to conditions in the School and all activities that took place therein during the Class Period; and
- ~~(m) communication with and reporting to the Family Class with respect to the activities and experiences of Survivor Class Members while attending the School during the Class Period.~~

63. During the Class Period, male and female Aboriginal children, including Anderson, were subjected to gender specific, as well as non-gender specific, systematic child abuse, neglect and maltreatment. They were forcibly confined in the School and were systematically deprived of the essential components of a healthy childhood. They were subjected to physical, emotional, psychological, cultural, spiritual and sexual abuse by those who were responsible for their well being.

64. At all material times, the children who attended the School were within the knowledge, contemplation, power or and control of Canada and were subject to the unilateral exercise of Canada's (or its delegates') power or discretion. By virtue of the

relationship between the children and Canada, being one of trust, reliance and dependence, by the Aboriginal children, Canada owed a fiduciary obligation to ensure that the students who attended the School were treated fairly, respectfully, safely and in all other ways, consistent with the obligations of a parent or guardian to a child under his care and control.

65. At all material times, Canada owed a fiduciary obligation to the students who attended the School to act in the best interests of those students and to protect them from any abuse, be it mental, emotional, physical, sexual or otherwise. The children at the School relied upon Canada, to their detriment, to fulfill its fiduciary obligations.

66. Through its servants, officers, employees and agents, Canada was negligent and in breach of its non-delegable fiduciary, ~~moral, statutory,~~ and common law duties of care to the Survivor Class and the Family Class during the Class Period. Particulars of the negligence and breach of duty of Canada include the following:

- (a) it systematically, negligently, unlawfully and wrongfully delegated its fiduciary and other responsibility and duties regarding the education of and care for Aboriginal children to others;
- (b) it systematically, negligently, unlawfully and wrongfully admitted and confined Aboriginal children to the School;
- ~~(c) it acted without lawful authority and not in accordance with any statutory authority pursuant to or as contemplated by the provisions of the Act or any other statutes relating to Aboriginal Persons as:~~
  - ~~(i) said provisions are and were *ultra vires* the Parliament of Canada and of no force and effect in law;~~
  - ~~(ii) the conduct of Canada in placing the Aboriginal children in the School, confining them therein, and treating or permitting them to be treated there as set forth herein was in breach of Canada's fiduciary obligations to the Survivor Class and Family Class Members, which was not authorized or permitted by any applicable~~

~~legislation and was, to the extent such legislation purported to authorize such fiduciary breach, of no force and effect and/or *ultra vires* the Parliament of Canada; and~~

- ~~(iii) Canada routinely and systematically failed to act in accordance with its own laws, regulations, policies and procedures with respect to the confinement of Aboriginal children in the School, which confinement was wrongful.~~
- (d) it delegated to and contracted with the Churches, and other Religious organizations and the Province to implement its program of forced integration, confinement and abuse;
- (e) it failed to adequately screen and select the organizations and individuals to which it delegated the implementation of its Residential School program;
- (f) it failed to adequately supervise and control the School and its agents operating same under its jurisdiction;
- (g) it deliberately and chronically deprived the Survivor Class Members of the education they were entitled to or were led to expect from the School or of any adequate education;
- (h) it designed, constructed, maintained and operated the School buildings which were sub-standard, inadequate to the purpose for which they were intended and detrimental to the emotional, psychological and physical health of the Survivor Class;
- (i) it failed to provide funding for the operation of the School that was sufficient or adequate to supply the necessities of life to Aboriginal children confined to them;
- (j) it failed to respond appropriately or at all to disclosure of abuses in the School during the Class Period;
- ~~(k) it conspired with the operators of the schools to suppress information about abuses taking place in the School during the Class Period;~~
- (l) ~~it assaulted and battered the Survivor Class Members and permitted them to be assaulted and battered during the Class Period;~~
- (m) it permitted an environment to which permitted and allowed student-upon-student abuse;
- (n) ~~it forcibly confined the Survivor Class Members and permitted them to be forcibly confined during the Class Period;~~

- (o) it was in breach of its fiduciary duty to ~~its~~ Wards the Survivor Class Members by reason of the misfeasances, malfeasances and omissions set out above;
- (p) it failed to inspect or audit the School adequately or at all;
- (q) it failed to implement an adequate system of evaluation, monitoring and control of teachers, administrators and non-teaching staff of the School during the Class Period;
- (r) it failed to periodically reassess its regulations, procedures and guidelines for the School when it knew or ought to have known of serious systemic failures in the School during the Class Period;
- (s) it failed to close the School and otherwise protect and care for those persons confined therein when it knew or ought to have known that it was appropriate and essential to do so in order to preserve the health, welfare and well being of the Survivor Class Members;
- (t) it delegated, attempted to delegate, continued to delegate and improperly delegated its non delegable duties and responsibility for the Survivor Class when it was incapable to do so and when it knew or ought to have known that these duties and responsibilities were not being met;
- (u) it failed to recognize and acknowledge harm once it occurred, to prevent additional harm from occurring and to, whenever and to the extent possible, provide appropriate treatment to those who were harmed;
- ~~(v) it undertook a systematic program of forced integration and assimilation of the Aboriginal Persons through the institution of the School when it knew or ought to have known that doing so would cause profound and permanent cultural, psychological, emotional and physical injury to the members of the Survivor Class during and following the Class Period; and~~
- ~~(w) it was in breach of its obligations to the Survivor Class Members and Family Class Members as set out in the Act and its Treaties with various First Nations providing a right to education at a school to be established and maintained by Canada and which implicitly included the right to education in a safe environment free from abuse and the right to an education which would recognize Aboriginal beliefs, traditions, culture, language and way of life in a way that would not denigrate or eliminate these beliefs, traditions, culture, language and way of life.~~

67. Canada, through its employees, agents or representatives also breached its duty of care to protect the Survivor Class Members from sexual abuse by the student perpetrators while those particular Plaintiffs and the Survivor Class Members were attending and

residing at the School with the result that the student perpetrators did in fact commit sexual abuse upon certain Plaintiffs and the Survivor Class Members.

68. Canada breached its fiduciary duties to the Plaintiffs and the Class and their families by failing to take any steps to protect the Survivor Class Members from sexual abuse.

69. In breach of its ongoing fiduciary duty to the Class, Canada failed and continues to fail, to adequately remediate the damage caused by its failures and omissions set out herein. In particular, Canada has failed to take adequate measures to ameliorate the cultural, linguistic and social damage suffered by the class, and further has failed to provide compensation for the physical, sexual and emotional abuse suffered by the Class.

70. The Plaintiffs plead that Canada was in breach of its various treaty obligations set out through the establishment and operation of the School and are liable for such breaches. In contravention of the Treaties between the Government and First Nations and in contravention of the *United Nations Genocide Convention*, particularly Article 2(e) thereof to which Canada is a signatory, the Plaintiffs and other Aboriginal children were to be systemically assimilated into white society. In pursuance of that plan, they were forced to attend the School and contact with their families was restricted. Their cultures and languages were taken from them with sadistic punishment and practices.

71. The systemic child abuse, neglect and maltreatment sustained by the children at the School during the Class Period, the effect and impact of which is still being felt by Survivor Class Members and Family Class Members, was in violation of the rights of children, specifically, but not limited to, the rights set out in the *United Nations*

~~Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted by the United Nations in 1989, and ratified by Canada in December of 1991.~~

**G. DAMAGES SUFFERED BY CLASS MEMBERS**

72. As a consequence of the negligence and breach of duty and breach of a non-delegable or fiduciary duty and intentional infliction of harm by Canada and its agents, including the Province, for whom Canada is vicariously liable, the Survivor Class Members, including Anderson, Allen and Webber, suffered injury and damages including:

- (a) isolation from family and community;
- (b) ~~prohibition of the use of Aboriginal language and the practice of Aboriginal religion and culture and the consequential loss of facility and familiarity with Aboriginal language, religion and culture;~~
- (c) forced confinement;
- (d) assault and battery;
- (e) sexual abuse;
- (f) emotional abuse;
- (g) psychological abuse;
- (h) deprivation of the fundamental elements of an education;
- (i) an impairment of mental and emotional health amounting to a severe and permanent disability;
- (j) a propensity to addiction;
- (k) an impaired ability to participate in normal family life;
- (l) alienation from family, spouses and children;
- (m) an impairment of the capacity to function in the work place and a permanent impairment in the capacity to earn income;

- (n) the need for ongoing psychological, psychiatric and medical treatment for illnesses and other disorders resulting from the School experience;
- (o) depression, anxiety and emotional dysfunction;
- (p) suicidal ideation;
- (q) pain and suffering;
- (r) deprivation of the love and guidance of parents and siblings;
- (s) loss of self-esteem and feelings of degradation;
- (t) fear, humiliation and embarrassment as a child and adult, and sexual confusion and disorientation as a child and young adult;
- (u) loss of ability fulfill cultural duties;
- (v) loss of ability to live in community; and
- (w) constant and intense emotional, psychological pain and suffering.

73. The foregoing damages resulted from Canada's breach of fiduciary duty, and/or negligence, assault, battery and/or breach of Aboriginal treaty rights.

74. As a consequence of the negligence and breach of duty and breach of a non-delegable or fiduciary duty and intentional infliction of harm by Canada and its agents, including the Province, for whom Canada is vicariously liable, the Family Class Members, including Webber, suffered injury and damages including:

- (a) they were separated and alienated from Survivor Class Members for the duration of their confinement in the School;
- (b) their relationships with Survivor Class Members were impaired, damaged and distorted as the result of the experiences of Survivor Class members in the School;
- (c) they suffered abuse from Survivor Class members as a direct consequence of their School experience;

- (d) they were unable to resume normal family life and experience with Survivor Class Members after their return from the Schools;
- ~~(e) their culture and language was undermined and in some cases eradicated by, amongst other things, as pleaded herein, the forced assimilation of Survivor Class Members into non-aboriginal culture through the School.~~

75. Canada knew, or ought to have known, that as a consequence of its mistreatment of the children at the School, these Plaintiffs and class members would suffer significant mental, emotional, psychological and spiritual harm which would adversely affect their relationships with their families and their communities. ~~In fact, one of the purposes behind the operation of the School was to eliminate and damage relationships within families and communities with a view to promoting the assimilation of Aboriginal children into non-Aboriginal society.~~

#### **H. PUNITIVE AND EXEMPLARY DAMAGES**

76. The Plaintiffs plead that Canada, including its senior officers, directors, bureaucrats, ministers and executives, had specific and complete knowledge of the widespread physical, psychological, emotional, cultural and sexual abuses of Survivor Class Members which were occurring at the School during the Class Period. Despite this knowledge, Canada continued to operate the School and permit the perpetration of grievous harm to the Survivor Class Members.

~~77. In addition, Canada deliberately planned the eradication of the language, religion and culture of Survivor Class Members and Family Class Members. Their actions were deliberate and malicious and in the circumstances, punitive, exemplary and aggravated damages are appropriate and necessary.~~

78. The Plaintiffs plead and rely upon the following:

~~Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, ss. 7, 15 and 24;~~

~~Class Actions Act, S.N.L. 2001, c. C-18.1.~~

~~Constitution Act, 1982, s. 35(1), being Schedule "B" to the  
Canada Act, 1982 (U.K.), c. 11.~~

~~Crown Liability and Proceedings Act, R.S.C. 1985, c. C 50, ss.  
3, 21, 22, and 23;~~

~~The Indian Act, S.C. 1951, c. 29, ss. 113-118;~~

~~The Indian Act, R.S.C. 1985, ss. 2(1), 3, 18(2), 114-122;~~

~~The Newfoundland Act, 1949 (U.K.), c. 22;~~

~~United Nations Genocide Convention; and~~

~~United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted  
by the United Nations in 1989, and ratified by Canada in  
December of 1991.~~

79. The Plaintiffs propose this action be tried in the City of St. John's, in the Province of Newfoundland.

**Dated** at St. John's, in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, this 19<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2012.

---

**Koskie Minsky LLP**  
900-20 Queen Street West  
Toronto, ON M5H 3R3

**Kirk Baert LSUC# 30942Q**  
Tel: 416-595-2117  
Fax: 416-204-2889

**Celeste Poltak LSUC#: 46207A**  
Tel: 416-595-2701  
Fax: 416-204-2909

**Ahlstrom Wright Oliver & Cooper LLP**  
Suite 200, 80 Chippewa Road,  
Sherwood Park, AB T8A 4W6

**Steven L. Cooper**  
Tel: 780-464-7477  
Fax: 780-467-6428

**Ches Crosbie Barristers**  
169 Water Street  
St. John's, NL A1C 1B1

**Chesley F. Crosbie**  
Tel: 709-579-4000  
Fax: 709-579-9671

Solicitors for the Plaintiffs

**TO: THE DEFENDANT**

**Attorney General of Canada**  
**Department of Justice Canada**  
Suite 1400, Duke Tower  
5251 Duke Street  
Halifax, NS B3J 1P3

**Jonathan Tarlton**  
Tel: 902-426-5959  
Fax: 902-426-8796  
**Mark S. Freeman**  
Tel: 902-426-5761  
Fax: 902-426-2329

Solicitors for the Defendant