














































The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

	1982 Martland Retires									
		Laskin	Martland	Ritchie	Dickson	Beetz	Estey	McIntyre	Chouinard	Lamer
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	—	0% 0/1	0% 0/1	0% 0/1	0% 0/1	0% 0/1	0% 0/1	0% 0/1	—
1	<i>Cardinal v. The Queen</i> , [1982] 1 S.C.R. 508	—	—	X	X	X	X	X	X	—
2	<i>Martin v. Chapman</i> , [1983] 1 S.C.R. 365.	Both sides were Indian interests								
	Wilson Begins (1982) Laskin & Ritchie Retire (1984)									
		Laskin	Ritchie	Dickson	Beetz	Estey	McIntyre	Chouinard	Lamer	Wilson
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	0% 0/1	40% 2/5	40% 2/5	50% 2/4	40% 2/5	40% 2/5	50% 2/4	100% 2/2	50% 1/2
3	<i>R. v. Nowegijick</i> , [1983] 1 S.C.R. 29	—	—	X	X	X	X	X	X	—
4	<i>Racine v. Woods</i> , [1983] 2 S.C.R. 173.	—	—	X	X	—	—	X	X	X
5	<i>Smith v. The Queen</i> , [1983] 1 S.C.R. 554.	—	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	—
6	<i>R. v. Guerin</i> , [1984] 2 S.C.R. 335.	—	—	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Le Dain (1984) & La Forest (1985) Begin Chouinard Retires (1987)									
		Dickson	Beetz	Estey	McIntyre	Chouinard	Lamer	Wilson	Le Dain	La Forest
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	33.3% 3/9	37.5% 3/8	33.3% 3/9	37.5% 3/8	37.5% 3/8	66.6% 2/3	50% 2/4	100% 1/1	0% 0/1
7	<i>Jack and Charlie v. The Queen</i> ,	—	X	X	X	X	—	—	—	—

The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

	[1985] 2 S.C.R. 332.																	
8	<i>R. v. Dick</i> , [1985] 2 S.C.R. 309.		X		X		X		X		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	<i>Simon v. The Queen</i> , [1985] 2 S.C.R. 387.	X		X		X		X			-	-	X		X		-	-
10	<i>Joe v. Canada</i> , [1986] 2 S.C.R. 145.		X		X		X	-	-		X		X		X	-	-	X
11	<i>Derrickson v. Derrickson</i> , [1986] 1 S.C.R. 285.	Both sides were Indian interests																
12	<i>Paul v. Paul</i> , [1986] 1 S.C.R. 306.	Both sides were Indian interests																
	Beetz, Le Dain & Estey (1988); McIntyre (1989) Retire L’Heureux Dubé Begins (1987)																	
		Dickson	Beetz	Estey	McIntyre	Lamer	Wilson	Le Dain	La Forest	L’Heureux Dubé								
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against								
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	27.2% 3/11	27.2% 3/11	30% 3/10	27.2% 3/11	33.3% 2/6	28.5% 2/7	50% 1/2	0% 0/1	0% 0/1								
13	<i>Canadian Pacific v. Paul</i> , [1988] 2 S.C.R. 654.		X		X	-	-		X		X		X	-	-	-	-	-
14	<i>R. v. Francis</i> , [1988] 1 S.C.R. 1025.		X		X	-	-		X		X		X	-	-	-	-	-
15	<i>R. v. Horse</i> , [1988] 1 S.C.R. 187.	-	-		X		X		X		X		X		X	-	-	X
16	<i>Roberts v. Canada</i> , [1989] 1 S.C.R. 322.	Both sides were Indian interests																
	Dickson (1990) and Wilson (1991) Retire Sopinka (1988); Gonthier, Cory & McLachlin (1989) Begin																	
		Dickson	Lamer	Wilson	La Forest	L’Heureux Dubé	Sopinka	Gonthier	Cory	McLachlin								
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against								
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	46.6% 7/15	44.4% 4/9	54.5% 6/11	60% 3/5	75% 3/4	100% 3/3	75% 3/4	66.6% 2/3	100% 2/2								










The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

[illegible]



















The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

[illegible]



















The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	30.7% 8/26		28.5% 6/21		52.6% 10/19		40.9% 9/22		40% 8/20		50% 9/18		35.7% 5/14		30.7% 4/13		0% 0/1	
42	<i>Chippewas of Kettle and Stony Point v. Canada (Attorney General)</i> , [1998] 1 S.C.R. 756.		X	–	–	–	–		X		X		X	–	–		X		X
	Binnie Begins (1998) Cory (1999) & Lamer (2000) Retire																		
		Lamer		L'Heureux Dubé		Gonthier		Cory		McLachlin		Iacobucci		Major		Bastarache		Binnie	
		For	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	Against	For	Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	30.3% 10/33		50% 12/24		39.2% 11/28		38.4% 10/26		41.6% 10/24		35% 7/20		29.4% 5/16		16.6% 1/6		42.8% 3/7	
43	<i>Union of New Brunswick Indians v. New Brunswick</i> , [1998] 1 S.C.R. 1161.		X	–	–	X			X		X		X		X	–	–	X	
44	<i>R. v. Williams</i> , [1998] 1 S.C.R. 1128.	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X	
45	<i>Corbiere v. Canada</i> , [1999] 2 S.C.R. 203.	Both sides were Indian interests																	
46	<i>H. (D.) v. M. (H.)</i> , [1999] 1 S.C.R. 761.		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
47	<i>R. v. Gladue</i> , [1999] 1 S.C.R. 688.		X		X		X		X	–	–		X	–	–		X		X
48	<i>R. v. Marshall</i> , [1999] 3 S.C.R. 456 (“Marshall I”).	X		X		X	X				X	X		–	–	–	–	X	
49	<i>R. v. Marshall</i> , [1999] 3 S.C.R. 533 (“Marshall II”).	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
50	<i>R. v. Sundown</i> , [1999] 1 S.C.R. 393.		X		X	–	–		X		X	–	–	–	–		X		X
51	<i>Westbank First Nation v. B.C. Hydro & Power</i> , [1999] 3 S.C.R. 134.		X	–	–		X	–	–		X		X		X		X		X
52	<i>Lovelace v. Ontario</i> , [2000] 1 S.C.R. 950.	Both sides were Indian interests																	
53	<i>Musqueam Indian Band v. Glass</i> , [2000] 2 S.C.R. 633.	Both sides were Indian interests																	

The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

	L'Heureux Dubé Retires (2002) Arbour (1999) and LeBel (2000) Begin									
		McLachlin	L'Heureux Dubé	Gonthier	Iacobucci	Major	Bastarache	Binnie	Arbour	LeBel
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	39.2% 11/28	46.1% 12/26	34.3% 11/32	33.3% 8/24	25% 5/20	12.5% 1/8	36.3% 4/11	25% 1/4	25% 1/4
54	<i>Osoyoos Indian Band v. Oliver</i> , [2001] 3 S.C.R. 746.	X			X	X			X	
55	<i>Mitchell v. M.N.R.</i> , [2001] 1 S.C.R. 911.		X	–	–		X	–	–	
56	<i>Kitkatla Band v. B.C. (Minister of Small Business, Tourism, and Culture)</i> , [2002] 2 S.C.R. 2006.		X	–	–		X	–	–	
57	<i>Ross River Dena Council Band v. Canada</i> , [2002] 2 S.C.R. 816.		X		X		X		X	
58	<i>Wewaykum Indian Band v. Canada</i> , [2002] 4 S.C.R. 245.	Both sides were Indian interests								
	Deschamps Begins (2002) Gonthier, Iacobucci & Arbour Retire (2004)									
		McLachlin	Gonthier	Iacobucci	Major	Bastarache	Binnie	Arbour	LeBel	Deschamps
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	38.7% 12/31	34.2% 12/35	29.6% 8/27	21.7% 5/23	9% 1/11	35.7% 5/14	28.5% 2/7	28.5% 2/7	33.3% 1/3
59	<i>British Columbia (Minister of Forests) v. Okanagan Indian Band</i> , [2003] 3 S.C.R. 371.	X		X		X		X		X
60	<i>Paul v. British Columbia</i> , [2003] 2 S.C.R. 585.		X		X		X		X	
61	<i>R. v. Powley</i> , [2003] 2 S.C.R. 207	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
62	<i>R. v. Blais</i> , [2003] 2 S.C.R. 236.		X		X		X		X	

The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

	Major Retires (2005) Fish, (2003) Abella, and Charron Begin (2004)									
		McLachlin	Major	Bastarache	Binnie	LeBel	Deschamps	Fish	Abella	Charron
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	35.1% 13/37	20.6% 6/29	11.7% 2/17	31.5% 6/19	23% 3/13	25% 2/8	16.6% 1/6	40% 2/5	20% 1/5
63	<i>Haida Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Forests)</i> , [2004] 3 S.C.R. 511	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
64	<i>Taku River Tlingit First Nation v. B.C. (Project Assessment Director)</i> , [2004] 3 S.C.R. 550.		X		X		X		X	–
65	<i>Gladstone v. Canada</i> , [2005] 1 S.C.R. 325.		X		X		X		X	
66	<i>Blackwater v. Plint</i> , [2005] 3 S.C.R. 3.		X		X		X		X	
67	<i>E.B. v. Order of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate</i> , [2005] 3 S.C.R. 45.		X		X		X		X	X
68	<i>Mikisew Cree First Nation v. Canada (Minister of Canadian Heritage)</i> , [2005] 3 S.C.R. 388.	X		X		X		X		X
69	<i>R. v. Marshall; R. v. Bernard</i> , [2005] 2 S.C.R. 220.		X		X	–	–		X	
	Bastarache Retires (2005) Rothstein Begins (2006)									
		McLachlin	Bastarache	Binnie	LeBel	Deschamps	Fish	Abella	Charron	Rothstein
		For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against	For Against
	Overall percentage in favor of tribal interests	35.7% 15/42	19% 4/21	41.6% 10/24	29.4% 5/17	38.4% 5/13	36.3% 4/11	60% 6/10	40% 4/10	50% 2/4
70	<i>McDiarmid Lumber Ltd. v. God's Lake First Nation</i> , [2006] 2 S.C.R. 846.		X	X		X		X		X
71	<i>R. v. Morris</i> , [2006] 2 S.C.R. 915.		X	X	–	X		X	X	–

The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

[illegible]

The Canadian Court Justice Indian Law Report Card

84	<i>Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band v. Canada, 2011 SCC 56</i>		X		X		X		X	-	-		X		X		X	-	-
85	<i>R. v. Ipeelee, 2012 SCC 13</i>	X		X		X		X		X		X		-	-		X	-	-