



---

## **SECTION 1: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

**(2002)**

### **GRADES 9-12**

#### **LANGUAGE ARTS, HISTORY**

##### **MAIN IDEA**

When Europeans first arrived in northern North America they saw it as empty land, but in reality it was a complex environment containing many cultures and communities. There was a new attitude of Europeans superiority over all other peoples and policies in Canada. These policies, combined with missionary efforts to civilize and convert Aboriginal people, tore wide holes in Aboriginal cultures, autonomy, and identity. One policy was making education compulsory for all Aboriginal children.

##### **LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

- Review a brief history of North America.
- Students will learn about Colonization, the Royal Proclamation, and the Early History leading up to Residential Schools and the Effects of residential schools in the present day.

##### **ACTIVITIES**

1. Please refer to the Jigsaw Technique and explain the 10 steps to the students.
2. Once the Jigsaw Activity is complete, have a class discussion to clear up any misunderstandings.
3. Have students complete the **Historical Overview Quiz**.

##### **ASSESSMENT**

**Formative:** Jigsaw Technique #9, Group Assessment

**Diagnostic:** Historical Overview Quiz



## HANDOUT

# JIGSAW TECHNIQUE

The Jigsaw technique is a cooperative learning technique that is just like a jigsaw puzzle. Each piece of the puzzle and each student's part to the puzzle is essential for the completion and full understanding of the final product, the completed jigsaw puzzle.

The Jigsaw Technique is simple to use follow these *steps*:

1. Divide students into 5 or 6 person jigsaw groups. Make sure that the jigsaw groups are diverse in terms of gender, race, ethnicity, and ability.
2. Appoint one student from each jigsaw group to be the leader. This person should be the most mature student in the group.
3. Divide the day's lesson into 5-6 different segments. For example, if you want history students to learn about the medicine wheel, you might divide the different teachings into stand-alone segments on: (1) The Four Races, (2) The Four Seasons, (3) The Four Directions, (4) The Four Elements...
4. Assign each student to learn about one segment of the jigsaw puzzle, making sure students have direct access only to their own segment.
5. Make sure you give students enough time to read over the segment at least twice in order to become familiar with it. There is no need for them to memorize it!
6. Form temporary "master groups" by having one student from each jigsaw puzzle group join other students assigned to the same segment. Give students in these "master groups" time to discuss the main points of their segment and to rehearse the presentations they will make to their jigsaw group.
7. Bring all the students back into their original jigsaw puzzle groups.
8. Ask each student to present her or his "master group" segment to the group. Encourage others in the group to ask questions for clarification.
9. Rotate from group to group, observing the process (assessment). If any group is having trouble (e.g., a member is dominating or disruptive), make an appropriate intervention. Eventually, it's best for the group leader to handle their task of keeping the group on track and listening.
10. At the end of the session, give a quiz on the material from the day's lesson so that students quickly come to realize that these sessions are not just fun and games but really count.

Source: <http://www.jigsaw.org/steps.htm>



## SEGMENT #1

### COLONIZATION

European colonization of North America had a devastating effect on the native population. Within a short period of time their way of life was changed forever. The changes were caused by a number of factors, including loss of land, disease, enforced laws which violated their culture and much more.

When the Europeans arrived they brought with them diseases unknown to the natives. The natives, having no immunity died from diseases that the Europeans thought of as commonplace. They also brought guns, alcohol and horses. The effect of these was to change the way of life for the Native Americans. Horses and guns changed their way of hunting for food. Since the cultural groups had been based on their method of subsistence, changing this changed the groupings. Some major groups moved. Once they started to move fights over territory broke out. Groups who had had plenty of food, now didn't have enough.

Missions were introduced, and Natives were aggressively encouraged to convert to Christianity. Most of the groups had had some form of ancestral worship, and this enforced change in religion altered their culture identity. On top of all of these factors was the Europeans need for land and food. Native groups, because they were nomadic, didn't see land as belonging to one person. The idea that someone could come in, claim a piece of land and ban them from it caused many problems. Wars broke out over the fact that they could no longer hunt or forage for food in places they had always done so.

Some of the effects that colonization had were unintentional. No one thought much about immunity to diseases, or that they would kill off the entire bison population. These effects were a side effect of the Europeans greed and attitude that they could take anything they saw. Later however, things changed, and a determined effort was made to completely suppress the Native culture. This active suppression took many forms. Certain tribes were freely supplied with guns, so that they could wipe out their neighbors. Old problems between tribes were brought back into the open, causing wars. The army and many settlers treated the Natives as nothing more than pests to be got rid of. Laws were introduced that banned certain ceremonies, forced the children into the European education system, and tied whole groups to land that was useless and could not sustain them. The intention was to deny them of their cultural identity, which has the same effect as wiping them out.

*It took Europeans, disease, guns and horses less than 300 years to destroy a way of life that had been going on for at least 20,000 years. Although many Native American groups are trying to regain their cultural identity, it will never be the same.*



Nishnawbe Aski Nation

ᐱᓄᓄᓄᓄᓄ ᐱᓄᓄᓄᓄᓄᓄ

HEALING THE GENERATIONS  
RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL

2002 CURRICULUM UPDATE

### *SEGMENT #1 continued...*

When Europeans first arrived in northern North America they saw it as empty land, but in reality it was a complex environment containing many cultures and communities.

**West Coast:** The Aboriginals lived very well with a lot of resources from the seas and from the forest.

**Prairies and Northern Tundra:** The Aboriginals lived off the vast herd of buffalo and caribou.

**Central Canada:** Aboriginal peoples harvested wild rice from marshes and they grew corn, squash and beans. The many lakes and rivers supplied them with fish and they also hunted animals.

**East Coast and Far North:** The sea and land supplied their needs, and with incredibly ingenuity enable the inhabitants to survive harsh conditions.

**Encounters between Aboriginals and non-aboriginal people increased in the 1500s with:**

- Exchange of goods
- Trade deals
- Friendships
- Intermarriages
- Military and trade alliances were set up
- Introduction of diseases: many different diseases killed tens of thousands of Aboriginals
- Diseases included: typhoid fever, influenza, diphtheria, plague, measles, tuberculosis, venereal disease, scarlet fever
- Fur trade: animal populations were wiped out in certain areas (Buffalo)
- Inter-tribal wars: over hunting and land were even more bloody due to the introduction of firearms by non-aboriginals through trade
- Treaties: the Aboriginals did not accept the monarch; they had no notion of giving up their land, a concept that was not familiar to Aboriginal culture. It is a non-aboriginal concept

**In my language, there is no word for “surrender”. There is no word. I cannot describe surrender to you in my language, so how do you expect my people to (have) put their (x) signature on surrender?**

*-Chief Francois Paulette-*

Source: <http://www.funsocialstudies.learninghaven.com/articles/natives2.htm>



## SEGMENT #2

### HISTORY OF INDIAN AND NORTHERN AFFAIRS CANADA (INAC)

A few words must be said about the larger historical and policy context in which the issues of matrimonial rights on reserve is situated.

Prior to European colonization efforts, many First Nation societies were matriarchal in nature. Missionaries and other Church officials discouraged matriarchal aspects of First Nation societies and encouraged the adoption of European norms of male dominance and control of women. According to the customary law of the Mohawk nation for example, the matrimonial home and the things in it belong to the wife and women traditionally have exercised prominent roles in decision-making within the community<sup>15</sup>.

With the establishment of Canada in 1867, federal Indian Affairs policy reflected a patriarchal bias in many areas. For example, federal legislation from 1869 to 1985 imposed patriarchal rules for determining Indian status, band membership and rights to reserve residency. On marriage to a man from another band, First Nation women were automatically transferred to their husband's band. Women were involuntarily "enfranchised" and separated from their communities and lands under such rules. For a long period of time First Nation women were forbidden to vote in band council elections among other legal disabilities.

That First Nation women bore the brunt of assimilative policies, implemented through the *Indian Act* status entitlement provisions and enfranchisement provisions, is clearly evident from the statistics: "Between 1955 and 1975 (when forced enfranchisement of women stopped), 1,576 men became enfranchised (along with 1,090 wives and children), while 8,537 women (as well as 1,974 of their children) were forcibly enfranchised and lost their status. From 1965 to 1975, only five per cent of enfranchisements were voluntary; 95 per cent were involuntary, and the great majority of these involved women."<sup>16</sup>

This gender-based discrimination took place in a larger context of Indian Affairs policy that sought to suppress First Nation cultural values and to assimilate First Nation people. The protection of the collective interest in reserve lands was a temporary protective measure pending the ultimate elimination of the need for reserves at all by assimilating the First Nation population. The assimilative purpose of certain sexually discriminatory Indian status and enfranchisement provisions is clearly evident in the historical record of the day and has been documented by many authorities. As just one example, is the following correspondence between the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and the Superintendent General (the Minister of Indian Affairs) in 1920:



### **SEGMENT #2 continued...**

When an Indian woman marries outside the band, whether a non-treaty Indian or a white man, it is in the interest of the Department, and in her interest as well, to sever her connection wholly with the reserve and the Indian mode of life, and the purpose of this section was to enable us to commute her financial interests. The words "with the consent of the band" have in many cases been effectual in preventing this severance. The amendment makes in the same direction as the proposed Enfranchisement Clauses, that is it takes away the power from unprogressive bands of preventing their members from advancing to full citizenship.<sup>17</sup>

One of the aims of the first consolidated *Indian Act (Indian Act, 1876)* was to encourage individual property rights and landholding on reserves.<sup>18</sup> The location tickets that are grandfathered by s. 20(3) for example, were a means of introducing European concepts of individual property ownership and encouraging the assimilation of individuals holding them<sup>19</sup>. Location tickets granted exclusive rights of occupancy and possession (but not ownership) of particular plots of reserve land. Today's Certificate of Possession system eventually replaced location tickets. But, as Daugherty and Madill note, an essential condition of enfranchisement and of the "civilization" policies of the day was the granting of a portion of the reserve in fee simple.<sup>20</sup>

---

A few words must be said about the larger historical and policy context in which the issues of matrimonial rights on reserve is situated.

Prior to European colonization efforts, many First Nation societies were matriarchal in nature. Missionaries and other Church officials discouraged matriarchal aspects of First Nation societies and encouraged the adoption of European norms of male dominance and control of women. According to the customary law of the Mohawk nation for example, the matrimonial home and the things in it belong to the wife and women traditionally have exercised prominent roles in decision-making within the community<sup>15</sup>.

With the establishment of Canada in 1867, federal Indian Affairs policy reflected a patriarchal bias in many areas. For example, federal legislation from 1869 to 1985 imposed patriarchal rules for determining Indian status, band membership and rights to reserve residency. On marriage to a man from another band, First Nation women were automatically transferred to their husband's band. Women were involuntarily "enfranchised" and separated from their communities and lands under such rules. For a long period of time First Nation women were forbidden to vote in band council elections among other legal disabilities.

That First Nation women bore the brunt of assimilative policies, implemented through the *Indian Act* status entitlement provisions and enfranchisement provisions, is clearly evident from the statistics:



## *SEGMENT #2 continued...*

"Between 1955 and 1975 (when forced enfranchisement of women stopped), 1,576 men became enfranchised (along with 1,090 wives and children), while 8,537 women (as well as 1,974 of their children) were forcibly enfranchised and lost their status. From 1965 to 1975, only five per cent of enfranchisements were voluntary; 95 per cent were involuntary, and the great majority of these involved women."<sup>16</sup>

This gender-based discrimination took place in a larger context of Indian Affairs policy that sought to suppress First Nation cultural values and to assimilate First Nation people. The protection of the collective interest in reserve lands was a temporary protective measure pending the ultimate elimination of the need for reserves at all by assimilating the First Nation population. The assimilative purpose of certain sexually discriminatory Indian status and enfranchisement provisions is clearly evident in the historical record of the day and has been documented by many authorities. As just one example, is the following correspondence between the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and the Superintendent General (the Minister of Indian Affairs) in 1920:

When an Indian woman marries outside the band, whether a non-treaty Indian or a white man, it is in the interest of the Department, and in her interest as well, to sever her connection wholly with the reserve and the Indian mode of life, and the purpose of this section was to enable us to commute her financial interests. The words "with the consent of the band" have in many cases been effectual in preventing this severance. The amendment makes in the same direction as the proposed Enfranchisement Clauses, that is it takes away the power from unprogressive bands of preventing their members from advancing to full citizenship.<sup>17</sup>

One of the aims of the first consolidated *Indian Act* (*Indian Act*, 1876) was to encourage individual property rights and landholding on reserves.<sup>18</sup> The location tickets that are grandfathered by s. 20(3) for example, were a means of introducing European concepts of individual property ownership and encouraging the assimilation of individuals holding them<sup>19</sup>. Location tickets granted exclusive rights of occupancy and possession (but not ownership) of particular plots of reserve land. Today's Certificate of Possession system eventually replaced location tickets. But, as Daugherty and Madill note, an essential condition of enfranchisement and of the "civilization" policies of the day was the granting of a portion of the reserve in fee simple.<sup>20</sup> Thus for a period of time, "enfranchised" Indians left the reserve, forfeited their legal status as "Indians" and took a portion of the reserve with them. It appears however that the women who were forcibly enfranchised were provided a portion of annuities from band funds but not land.<sup>21</sup>

Some First Nations dealt with the threat of assimilation (including threats to the reserve base through enfranchisement and federal policies of individual allotment) by refusing to make allotments



### ***SEGMENT #2 continued...***

to individuals or to cooperate with the federal system of registering such allotments. For a period of time, the federal government responded by removing the band council's power to make individual allotments and placing it with the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs (the Minister).<sup>22</sup>

With respect to individual land allotments on reserve, there has been a bias in favour of males receiving certificates of possession for the family home. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples concluded:

There is no prohibition against women owning property through a certificate of possession. But the cumulative effect of a history of legislation that has excluded women and denied them property and inheritance rights, together with the sexist language embedded in the legislation before the 1985 amendments, has created a perception that women are not entitled to hold a CP [Certificate of Possession].<sup>23</sup>

All of these legal barriers to equality, and intrusions into fundamental questions affecting First Nation women's identities, interfered with traditional roles of women in governance, their relationship to traditional territories and their role as conveyors of cultural values and traditions.

The 1985 amendments to the *Indian Act*<sup>24</sup> were intended to remove the worst aspects of sex-based discrimination in the Act's Indian status and band membership provisions. However, on reinstatement under the 1985 amendments to the *Indian Act*, many women have reported difficulty in acquiring housing on-reserve and establishing residency on reserve in their own right.

The combined impact of colonialism on the landholding traditions of First Nations and on gender relations has been severe and negative. The *Indian Act* land regime interfered with the pre-contact gender relations and power relations between women and men as well as indigenous values in relation to land and individual and collective rights in relation to land.<sup>25</sup> This is especially the case in regard to First Nation women's rights to reside and hold individual interests in reserve land, whether single, married, separated or divorced. Contemporary matrimonial property issues on reserve thus occur against a long and fairly consistent historical pattern of disenfranchisement, by which First Nation women have been separated from reserve communities and their gender equality interests in reserve lands ignored.<sup>26</sup>

Matrimonial property rights off reserve are governed exclusively by provincial law. These have undergone considerable change and continue to evolve with contemporary notions of gender







### ***SEGMENT #2 continued...***

<sup>22</sup> John L. Tobias, "Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History of Canada's Indian Policy" in J.R. Miller, ed. Sweet Promises: A Reader on Indian-White Relations in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), page 127 at page 135.

<sup>23</sup>Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*, (1997) Vol.4, Chapter 2, RCAP CD ROM, Seven Generations, Record 26161)

<sup>24</sup>An Act to amend the *Indian Act*, S.C. 1985, c. 27.

<sup>25</sup>See for example, Kathleen Jamieson, *Indian Women and the Law: Citizens Minus* (Ottawa: Supply and Services, 1978); Martha Montour, "Iroquois Women's Rights with respect to matrimonial property on Indian Reserves" [1987] 4 Canadian Native Law Reporter 1; Mary Ellen Turpel "Home/Land" in (1991) 18 Canadian Journal of Family Law 17; Robert A. Williams, "Gendered Checks and Balances: Understanding the Legacy of White Patriarchy in an American Indian Cultural Context" (1990) 4 Georgia Law Review 1019.

<sup>26</sup>The larger pattern of historic and continuing discrimination experienced by First Nation women has been well documented. See for example, Joanne Fiske, "Political Status of Native Indian Women: Contradictory Implications of Canadian State Policy" (1995) 19 American Journal of Culture and Research 1. Kathleen Jamieson, *Indian Women and the Law in Canada: Citizens Minus* (Ottawa: Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Ministry of Supply & Service Canada, 1978); Sharon McIvor, *The Indian Act As Patriarchal Control Of Women* (1994) 1 Aboriginal Women's Law Journal 41; Mary Ellen Turpel-Lafond, "Patriarchy and Paternalism: The Legacy of the Canadian State for First Nation women" in *Women and the Canadian State* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997) at 64.; Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*, Vol. 4 Perspectives & Realities, Chapter 2, Women's Perspectives; Sally Weaver, "First Nation women and Government Policy, 1970-92: Discrimination and Conflict" in *Changing Patterns*, eds. Sandra Burt, Lorraine Code & Lindsay Dorney (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1993).

Thus for a period of time, "enfranchised" Indians left the reserve, forfeited their legal status as "Indians" and took a portion of the reserve with them. It appears however that the women who were forcibly enfranchised were provided a portion of annuities from band funds but not land.<sup>21</sup>

Some First Nations dealt with the threat of assimilation (including threats to the reserve base through enfranchisement and federal policies of individual allotment) by refusing to make allotments to individuals or to cooperate with the federal system of registering such allotments. For a period of time, the federal government responded by removing the band council's power to make individual allotments and placing it with the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs (the Minister).<sup>22</sup>

With respect to individual land allotments on reserve, there has been a bias in favour of males receiving certificates of possession for the family home. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples concluded:

There is no prohibition against women owning property through a certificate of possession. But the cumulative effect of a history of legislation that has excluded women and denied them property and inheritance rights, together with the sexist language embedded in the legislation before the 1985 amendments, has created a perception that women are not entitled to hold a CP [Certificate of Possession].<sup>23</sup>



### ***SEGMENT #2 continued...***

All of these legal barriers to equality, and intrusions into fundamental questions affecting First Nation women's identities, interfered with traditional roles of women in governance, their relationship to traditional territories and their role as conveyors of cultural values and traditions.

The 1985 amendments to the *Indian Act*<sup>24</sup> were intended to remove the worst aspects of sex-based discrimination in the Act's Indian status and band membership provisions. However, on reinstatement under the 1985 amendments to the *Indian Act*, many women have reported difficulty in acquiring housing on-reserve and establishing residency on reserve in their own right.

The combined impact of colonialism on the landholding traditions of First Nations and on gender relations has been severe and negative. The *Indian Act* land regime interfered with the pre-contact gender relations and power relations between women and men as well as indigenous values in relation to land and individual and collective rights in relation to land.<sup>25</sup> This is especially the case in regard to First Nation women's rights to reside and hold individual interests in reserve land, whether single, married, separated or divorced. Contemporary matrimonial property issues on reserve thus occur against a long and fairly consistent historical pattern of disenfranchisement, by which First Nation women have been separated from reserve communities and their gender equality interests in reserve lands ignored.<sup>26</sup>

Matrimonial property rights off reserve are governed exclusively by provincial law. These have undergone considerable change and continue to evolve with contemporary notions of gender equality and evolving notions of family in Canadian society. The notion of equal division of matrimonial property now reflected in provincial and territorial laws of general application emerged in the 1970's. The rights of common law couples and same-sex couples relative to those married under provincial law is currently undergoing considerable discussion and change, as courts and legislatures consider and deal with the impact of the Charter on these issues. Addressing issues of family violence through specific legislation is another recent development in provincial and territorial family law.

On reserve, the *Indian Act* today remains silent on the subject of matrimonial real property, the *First Nations Land Management Act* addresses it explicitly and existing self-government agreements generally do not mention the subject.

Source: Indian Northern Affairs Website [http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/2002-templates/ssi/print\\_e.asp](http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/2002-templates/ssi/print_e.asp)





Nishnawbe Aski Nation

ᐱᓄ ᓄᓇ ᖅ ᐱᓄ ᓄᓄ ᐱᓄ

**HEALING THE GENERATIONS  
RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL**

2002 CURRICULUM UPDATE

### ***SEGMENT #3 continued...***

was based on timber, mining and agriculture and it needed land from the Natives, who began to be seen as “impediments to progress”. Colonial governments in Upper and Lower Canada no longer needed military allies, the British were victors in Canada, and the USA had won its independence. There was also a new attitude of European superiority over all other peoples and policies of domination and assimilation slowly replaced those of partnership.

Ironically, the transformation from respectful coexistence to domination by non-Aboriginal laws and institutions began with the main instruments of partnership: the treaties and the Royal Proclamation of 1763. These documents offered Aboriginal people not only peace and friendship, respect and approximate equality, but also “protection”. Later it meant “assistance”, a code word implying an encouragement to stop being a part of Aboriginal society and merge into the settler society.

Protection took the form of compulsory education such as “Residential Schools”, economic adjustment programs, social and political control by federal agents, and much more. These policies, combined with missionary efforts to civilize and convert, tore wide holes in Aboriginal cultures, autonomy and identity.

Source: <http://www.mytraveguide.com/city-guide/North-America/Canada/Colonization>



## SEGMENT #4

### EARLY HISTORY

There was a new attitude of European superiority over all other peoples and policies in Canada. These policies, combined with missionary efforts to civilize and convert Aboriginal people, tore wide holes in Aboriginal cultures, autonomy and identity. One policy was making education compulsory for all Aboriginal children.

Long before Europeans came to North America, Aboriginal people had a highly developed system of education. Aboriginal Elders and parents passed on not only survival skills to their children, but their history, artistic ability, music, language, moral and religious values.

It is important to be aware of the beginnings of residential schools. Although residential schools were not officially set up until 1892, the roots of the residential school system actually reach back to the colonial governments before Confederation. The idea that Indian boarding schools be set up and run jointly by government and church was being discussed as early as the 1840s. At this time government and church were already conferring on the issue of Indian education and what form it would take.

By 1830, a successful assimilation policy was in place spearheaded by Sir John Colbourne. The idea was to replace the nomadic lifestyle of the Native people and to have them be settled in one place. This way they could be properly acculturated.

Then along came Sir Francis Bond Head whose idea was to segregate Native people by congregating them apart from the "whites". Even back then, the educational issue was the language of instruction. This idea was quickly done away with by no other than a Superintendent of Indian Affairs, who deemed this method as "time and labour lost." Records kept by the Wesleyan Methodist Church continued to refrain: "remove the (native) children from their "imperfectly civilized parents", and place them into schools where they would be "enabled to forget their Indian habits," be "well taken care of", "fed and clothed". In effect "weaned" altogether from being Indian. However, the children at Shingwauk were allowed to speak Ojibwa at tea-time between 6-7:00pm any other time they were supposed to speak English and English ONLY! (Source: *No Blanket to Be Worn in School*, article)

By 1845 a government report to the Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada recommended that Indian boarding schools be set up. Then, in 1847, the Assistant Superintendent of Indian Affairs wrote to Dr. Egerton Ryerson, Methodist head of education in Upper Canada asking for suggestions on the topic of Indian industrial schools. Ryerson suggested that the schools be a partnership between government and church and that the schooling be of religious nature.



### ***SEGMENT #4 continued...***

In 1879, under pressure from the Catholic and Methodist churches, the government of Sir John A. Macdonald gave Nicholas Flood Davin the task of studying Indian industrial schools in the United States. He was to determine whether similar schools should be set up for Aboriginal children in Canada.

Using the U.S. Schools as a model, Davin’s report called for the creation of funding of off-reserve schools to teach children the skills they would need in the modern Canadian economy. He advised the government to set up boarding schools rather than day schools. Residential schools, it was reasoned, would be more successful because they could completely remove children from “the influence of the wigwam”.

Both the church and government strongly supported the report. Not only was it commonly believed at the time that the “savage” Indian needed to be “civilized” but in the opinion of many churches and government officials, the best way to do this was bring children completely under the control and influence of church-run boarding schools. At these schools, children could be fully indoctrinated in the ways of Canadian Society. As church officials at the time said “caught young”, Aboriginal children could be “saved” from the so-called “deleterious” and “degenerating” influence of their parents and communities.

To this way of thinking, through the residential school system, Aboriginal children could be taken from their Aboriginal way of life. They could be remade into citizens who, by becoming labourers and maids or small time farmers in their communities, would cease to be a “drain” on the Canadian economy. Besides, similar institutions were being used effectively by colonizing governments on other Indigenous peoples in Australia, Hawaii, New Zealand, Tahiti and the United States for example.

Soon after the submission of Flood’s report the “Davin Report” a formal church/government partnership was put into place to jointly manage an education system for Aboriginal children. The partnership between the church/government lasted from 1892-1969. The schools were run by the Roman Catholic Church, Church of England (Anglican), United Church (Methodist), and Presbyterian Church. They were operated in every province but New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island.



## SEGMENT #5

### RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

Children as young as 3 years of age left the world of their families and were sent into the unfamiliar world of the white man.

How did those children get transported to residential school? By the Indian agent, the RCMP, and the Priests, all were symbols of authority. The children were brought by wagon in the early days, by train, by bus, then by car, and later on, by plane.

When children arrived they were issued cloths and assigned a bed number. Children were also punished for speaking their Native languages. Children were unable to express to anyone in authority what their basic needs were. Loneliness, sickness, confusion and abuse all had to be borne in lonely silence.

Experience was difficult because of many things combined:

- Suffocating heat of the buildings
- The painful need for someone to talk to
- The pain of separation from their families
- The bad tasting, indigestible food
- The size and unfamiliarity of the buildings and rooms
- The frightening crowds of people
- The concentration-camp style discipline
- Mental and physical abuse
- Continual loss of personal freedoms and individual control

Aboriginal children were expected to help with jobs such as tending the nets, feeding the dogs, cutting and hauling wood, cutting up meat and fish for drying. Residential school demanded very little in comparison. At residential school, Aboriginal children became no one's keeper, not even his/her own. Some children were able to return home for two short summer months while other stayed during the summer months.

Children were no longer interested in helping family with tasks such as carrying water and other chores and parents noted that frequent, violent arguments (very unfamiliar to most Aboriginal cultures) arose and that children seemed as unconcerned about hurting others as they were unwilling to obey Elders. Parents also were upset at the fact their children were unable to speak their own language very good any more. Children at home often spoke English when they were angry and so English became associated with bad feelings.





**Nishnawbe Aski Nation**

ᐱᓂᓃᓂᓃᓂ ᐱᓂᓃᓂᓃᓂ

**HEALING THE GENERATIONS  
RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL**

2002 CURRICULUM UPDATE

### ***SEGMENT #5 continued...***

While at residential school the children were taught that their Aboriginal culture was not worth preserving. Students then believed that traditional Aboriginal “ceremonies” and “rituals” were “heathen” and “the work of the devil”. Residential schools disrupted the smooth transmission of beliefs, skills, and knowledge from one generation to the next. This caused severe, and in many cases, unalterable damage to the child, to the family and to the community to which she would eventually return to.

Without residential schools most of the students would never have learned to read and write, or learn about other ways of life other than their own. It was not the education itself that was bad, it was the manner in which the residential schools were organized. The residential schools simply were not sensitive to the needs or lifestyles of the Aboriginal students.

In 1950, the Canadian Government began to realize the residential school policy was a failure, the last residential school was closed 46 years later in Saskatchewan in 1996. Aboriginal people want recognition of what was done to them as children and what it has done to their communities as a result of the residential school system. Aboriginal people have demanded, and received, official apologies from the Church and from the Government of Canada which operated the schools. Religious authorities who administered the schools and committed sexual and physical abuse are now being criminally charged.

Since the closure of residential schools, Provincial schools and the curriculum they follow did not change to reflect the educational needs of Aboriginal children. Today, Aboriginal children that complete grade 12 is 20% lower in northern regions. Many First Nations communities are taking over the running of their schools from the government. By designing their own curriculum and running their own schools, Aboriginal people intend to reclaim the education of their children and put the residential school experience in the past and try to heal from the legacy that has been left in their wake.





***SEGMENT #6 continued...***

Canada, including the First Nations, Inuit and Métis. Our purpose is not to rewrite history but, rather, to learn from our past and to find ways to deal with the negative impacts that certain historical decisions continue to have in our society today.

The ancestors of First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples lived on this continent long before explorers from other continents first came to North America. For thousands of years before this country was founded, they enjoyed their own forms of government. Diverse, vibrant Aboriginal nations had ways of life rooted in fundamental values concerning their relationships to the Creator, the environment, and each other, in the role of Elders as the living memory of their ancestors, and in their responsibilities as custodians of the lands, waters and resources of their homelands.

The assistance and spiritual values of the Aboriginal peoples who welcomed the newcomers to this continent too often have been forgotten. The contributions made by all Aboriginal peoples to Canada's development, and the contributions that they continue to make to our society today, have not been properly acknowledged. The Government of Canada today, on behalf of all Canadians, acknowledges those contributions.

Sadly, our history with respect to the treatment of Aboriginal people is not something in which we can take pride. Attitudes of racial and cultural superiority led to a suppression of Aboriginal culture and values. As a country, we are burdened by past actions that resulted in weakening the identity of Aboriginal peoples, suppressing their languages and cultures, and outlawing spiritual practices. We must recognize the impact of these actions on the once self-sustaining nations that were disaggregated, disrupted, limited or even destroyed by the dispossession of traditional territory, by the relocation of Aboriginal people, and by some provisions of the Indian Act. We must acknowledge that the result of these actions was the erosion of the political, economic and social systems of Aboriginal people and nations.

Against the backdrop of these historical legacies, it is a remarkable tribute to the strength and endurance of Aboriginal people that they have maintained their historic diversity and identity. The Government of Canada today formally expresses to all Aboriginal people in Canada our profound regret for past actions of the federal government which have contributed to these difficult pages in the history of our relationship together.

One aspect of our relationship with Aboriginal people over this period that requires particular attention is the Residential School system. This system separated many children from their families



### ***SEGMENT #6 continued...***

and communities and prevented them from speaking their own languages and from learning about their heritage and cultures. In the worst cases, it left legacies of personal pain and distress that continue to reverberate in Aboriginal communities to this day. Tragically, some children were the victims of physical and sexual abuse.

The Government of Canada acknowledges the role it played in the development and administration of these schools. Particularly to those individuals who experienced the tragedy of sexual and physical abuse at residential schools, and who have carried this burden believing that in some way they must be responsible, we wish to emphasize that what you experienced was not your fault and should never have happened. To those of you who suffered this tragedy at residential schools, we are deeply sorry.

In dealing with the legacies of the Residential School system, the Government of Canada proposes to work with First Nations, Inuit and Métis people, the Churches and other interested parties to resolve the longstanding issues that must be addressed. We need to work together on a healing strategy to assist individuals and communities in dealing with the consequences of this sad era of our history.

No attempt at reconciliation with Aboriginal people can be complete without reference to the sad events culminating in the death of Métis leader Louis Riel. These events cannot be undone; however, we can and will continue to look for ways of affirming the contributions of Métis people in Canada and of reflecting Louis Riel's proper place in Canada's history.

Reconciliation is an ongoing process. In renewing our partnership, we must ensure that the mistakes which marked our past relationship are not repeated. The Government of Canada recognizes that policies that sought to assimilate Aboriginal people, women and men, were not the way to build a strong country. We must instead continue to find ways in which Aboriginal people can participate fully in the economic, political, cultural and social life of Canada in a manner which preserves and enhances the collective identities of Aboriginal communities, and allows them to evolve and flourish in the future. Working together to achieve our shared goals will benefit all Canadians, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal alike.

Source: [http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/gs/rec\\_e.html](http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/gs/rec_e.html)



**Nishnawbe Aski Nation**

ᐱᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ ᐱᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ ᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅᐅ

**HEALING THE GENERATIONS  
RESIDENTIAL SCHOOL**

2002 CURRICULUM UPDATE

**QUIZ HANDOUT  
GRADES 9-12**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Marks: \_\_\_\_ / 35

**HISTORICAL OVERVIEW**

1. When \_\_\_\_\_ first arrived in northern North America they saw it as \_\_\_\_\_ land. (2)

2. Encounters with Europeans also introduced diseases. Name 5 diseases that were introduced. (5)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. The Royal Proclamation was issued by \_\_\_\_\_. (1)

4. In 1763, the Royal Proclamation was a defining document in the relationship between the \_\_\_\_\_ and the \_\_\_\_\_. (2)

5. What did the Royal Proclamation summarize? (3)

\_\_\_\_\_.

6. Long before the Europeans came to North America, Aboriginal people had a highly developed system of education. (Circle your answer) (1)

True      False

7. Using the U.S. Schools as a model, the \_\_\_\_\_ Report called for the creation of funding of off-reserve schools for Aboriginal children. (1)

8. The Government and \_\_\_\_\_ formed a partnership to jointly manage an \_\_\_\_\_ education system for Aboriginal children. (1)

9. Children as young as \_\_\_\_\_ years of age left the world of their families and were sent into the unfamiliar world of the white man. (1)

10. Without residential school most of the students would never have learned to \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_. (2)



**QUIZ HANDOUT**

**GRADES 9-12 continued...**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

11. The \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_ abuse suffered by many children at residential school spilled back into some First Nations communities. (3)

12. The Federal Government and Churches have not acknowledged the damages done to Aboriginal communities as a result of the residential school system. (1)

True      False

13. What report was release in 1996? (2) \_\_\_\_\_.

14. What did the report recommend? (3)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

15. The \_\_\_\_\_ Healing Foundation was granted \$\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ support healing initiatives that address the legacy of abuse left by the residential school system. (2)

16. Write a summary below about the **Statement of Reconciliation** or **History of Indian Affairs** (5).

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



**TEACHER MASTER COPY**  
**QUIZ HANDOUT**  
**GRADES 9-12**

## HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

1. European, Empty
2. Typhoid fever; Influenza; Diphtheria; Plague; Measles; Tuberculosis; Venereal Disease, Scarlet Fever
3. King George III
4. Natives and Newcomers
5. Summarized the rules and regulations that were to govern British dealings with the Aboriginal peoples, especially in relation to the question of land.
6. True
7. The Davin Report
8. Church
9. 3
10. Read and Write
11. Physical, Sexual, and Spiritual
12. False
13. Statement of Reconciliation
14. Recommended that the government and churches offer apologies to residential school Survivors, that people be compensated for the abuse they suffered and that a public inquiry be struck to examine the treatment of First Nations students at residential school.
15. Aboriginal Healing Foundation and \$350 million
16. Summary of **Statement of Reconciliation or History of Indian Affairs.**