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ABSTRACT

This study is written in the belief that Canada's Indigenous educational policies need to be re-examined. Taking full account of social context, institutional structure, culture, agency, and the force of ideas this thesis analyzes how historical Indigenous educational policies within Canada have and continue to create difficulties in the development of a strong Indigenous identity.

Unlike previous works, this study puts the “internal colonial way of inquiry” central in its analysis. Specifically, exploring the realities of increased migration of Indigenous people to urban centres within Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba and the issues and concerns involved in initiating policies, developing programs, and creating Urban Indigenous Controlled Schools.
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CHAPTER 1

NATURE OF THE STUDY

It is only by unveiling the truth about reality that one can come to a critical understanding of the present and learn what needs to be done for the future.

-Paulo Freire, Politics and Education

Origins of the Study

Contemporary Indigenous people in Canada face myriad difficulties in establishing themselves in today's world as a people whose lives have meaning and dignity. The issue for many revolves around reaffirming a cultural identity imbued with positive attributes. Counteracting the divisive effects of the various ethno-status distinctions that have been constructed and imposed upon them by the social, legal, and political institutions of the larger society. Historically, these various imposed constructions have served both to undermine Indigenous identity and to circumvent the development of more cohesive political efforts towards achieving goals common to Indigenous people as a whole. At the structural level, all aspects of Indigenous life have been formally reorganized through the enforcement of policies and legislation, which reflect a colonial perspective.
This study progresses from my Honour’s thesis entitled, “Can First Nations Band-Operated Secondary Schools Survive?: A Case-Study of a Band-Operated Secondary School” (University of Calgary 1999). In this thesis, I discussed the concerns of a particular Indigenous self-controlled school and how each concern was being addressed within the school administration, school committees, the Indigenous community, and by the federal and provincial governments. The purpose was to analyze the current Indigenous educational situation, determine why there remain significant obstacles in implementing Indigenous education sui generis, and raise new questions about, education, society, identity, and how the past is constructed and represented.

I see the formation of Indigenous self-controlled schools as a legitimate desire by Indigenous people to seek self-definition. To have their own ways of life respected, and to teach their children in a manner that enhances consciousness of being an Indigenous person. In Canada, the educational system has been a major source of the interrelated problems of cultural dissonance and conflicting expectations experienced by Indigenous people. Historical educational policies of segregation, assimilation, and integration have displaced Indigenous populations' and sought to separate them from their traditional roots. Education was seen as a means to replace Indigenous languages, religions, history, cultural traditions and values, and world-views with those of the dominant culture. Modifying the values of Indigenous people and destroying their identity, by immersing them in “white culture” and extracting out what was perceived as “Indianness.” This (de)construction was based in part
on liberal humanist philosophy, its avocation of a distinct colonial identity, and a belief that Indigenous people were incapable or unwilling to adjust to rapid social and cultural change.

From the outset I approached education both as a political and cultural activity within a given historical context. Paradoxically, education is at the heart of the struggle of Indigenous people to regain control over their lives (Castellano Davis and Lahache 2000). Education has been a force of destruction, and a powerful force for construction (Williams 2000). “Despite the painful experiences Indigenous people carry with them from formal education systems, they still see education as the hope for the future and they are determined to see education fulfill its promise” (RCAP 1996c:434).

Nevertheless, the promise of an education that delivers the skills to survive in a post-industrial global economy, while affirming the ethical and spiritual foundations of Indigenous cultures is far from being fulfilled. Where Indigenous people have assumed control of the education of their children, youth, and adults, the results with regard to program completion, personal satisfaction, and successful preparation for employment or continuing education are much improved. Still, these initiatives struggle at the margins of education systems that operate under municipal, and provincial and territorial jurisdiction that continue to deliver curriculum that has a strong assimilationist bent.
There is an apparent emphasis on economic, political, social, and educational needs and policies of Indigenous people on reserves in public discussion, in the volumes of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, and in the academic literature. However, while these discussions have been going on there has been a quiet and gradual re-location of Indigenous people through migration to urban areas (Thornton and Todd 2001). This increased urbanization of Indigenous people in the last twenty years, has raised significant questions about the extent to which all levels of government are responding to the economic, political, social, and educational needs and policies of Indigenous people in urban centres.

Statement of the Problem

Political constraints have not yet enabled Indigenous people to be creators of their own education systems. Concerns posed by non-Indigenous and Indigenous people about how a strong sense of identity can be maintained in a changing environment, and how an education system can be designed and controlled by Indigenous people have prevented significant progress in this area. The wish to see their culture reflected in the institutions that serve their needs, and to ensure that their children have the opportunity to know and value who they are as Indigenous persons has not been met.

Given the long-held institutionalism of internal colonialism within Canadian educational policies, and in light of recent attempts within Canada, Armitage (1995), Binda (2001), Burns (2000), Castellano, Brant, Davis, and Lahache (2000), Devrome (1991), Long and Dickason
(2000), and Perley (1993) to reveal the debilitating effects of cultural dissonance, and simultaneously working towards a reaffirmation of a cultural identity, I analyze why, under what circumstances, and to what effect, government educational policies have been established to suppress, transform, or destroy Indigenous values.

**Research Design and Methodology**

The original approach taken for this study was interpretive. Qualitative and exploratory strategies were used to further understand the reconstruction of an Indigenous identity in “urban schools from an Indigenous perspective.” The purpose of the study was to give a detailed view of the culture of an “urban school from an Indigenous perspective” in its particular context, attempting to make sense of and interpret the meanings the administration, staff, and students constructed around it. The intended outcome of the research was to increase understanding in order to improve practice and initiate policy, using an inquiry process of understanding defined by Creswell (1998) “based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem” (15).

The research design was to build a complex holistic picture through a historical case study. Merriam (1992) points out that case study’s are intended to be largely descriptive, interpretive, and are intended to build theory and present judgements about the worth of a policy or program. The importance of a historical case study in examining a contemporary
event, is that it employs many of the same techniques as a historical study, but adds two sources of evidence not usually included in the historian’s approach: direct observation, and systematic interviewing. The case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence: documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations, beyond what might be available in the conventional historical study.

Data for this historical case study was collected employing ethnographic field techniques such as participant and non-participant observation, semi-structured and structured interviews, on-site document analysis, and analysis of primary sources. In so far as ethnography is concerned with what actions and events mean to the participants we are attempting to understand, ethnographic techniques cohered with the fundamental purpose of the study. Data was collected from one school and several participants during several one-week visits over a period of a year and a half, and analyzed for common constructs, patterns, and themes.

Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, the school and its participants could not complete the research study due to time constraints, and thus withdrew from the study. As a result, any information obtained through the ethnographic field techniques: participant and non-participant observation, semi-structured and structured interviews, and on-site document analysis will not be used in this study to protect the school and its participant’s rights to anonymity.
In response to the unavailability of this information for research purposes, I have utilized an eclectic approach to generate and evaluate the reconstruction of an Indigenous identity in “urban schools from an Indigenous perspective.” In keeping with the philosophical framework of qualitative research, which is multidimensional, I have approached this study through three distinct, yet interrelated methods.

First, I incorporate a historical approach, analyzing Canadian Indigenous educational policy and how it has evolved over time, through an “internal colonial way of inquiry.” My proposal of looking to the past through an internal colonial lens begins to redress the relationship between past experiences and present circumstances involving Indigenous people in Canada. The “internal colonial way of inquiry” allows for an examination of educational issues and structures in a broader perspective rather than simply seeing it as an issue of individual or school failure, or as a problem of contemporary circumstances. It requires that Indigenous education be described in the context of institutional arrangements that have been established by a manifestly dominant group. Examining both primary and secondary sources, I contextualize the ideologies and policies currently underlying Canadian Indigenous educational practices.

Secondly, I have provided a secondary analysis of official statistics outlining the current situation in regards to the social and economic realities faced by Indigenous people, the trend of increased urbanization of Indigenous people, and the continued low-level of
educational attainment. Slater (1998) confirms the usefulness of official statistics in placing a smaller scale qualitative study in broader context, which allows generalization across social space and comparisons over time.

Finally, I have analyzed current urban Indigenous educational policies by examining “urban schools from an Indigenous perspective.” The data collected and obtained publicly through my research allowed me to examine the philosophy behind the schools, their goals, and the programs initiated to reconstruct a strong Indigenous identity.

Definitions and Terminology

In this thesis I have used various terminology to describe Indigenous people in the appropriate context, whether it be historical, political, legal, cultural, or personal. The usage of myriad names applied to Indigenous people can cause enormous confusion and misunderstanding, so some clarification of this matter is therefore needed.

**Native**

The term Native is widely used, though Aboriginal, as a general cover term has largely superseded it.
Aboriginal

The term Aboriginal is the most commonly used amongst Indigenous people, governments, and academics within Canada today. Aboriginal is defined as “indigenous, existing in a land at the dawn of history, or before the arrival of colonists.” Section 35 of the Constitution Act of 1982 states, “In this act, ‘aboriginal peoples of Canada’ include the Indian, Inuit, and Métis peoples of Canada.”

Métis

The word “Métis” is French for “mixed blood.” Historically, the term Métis refers to the children of French fur traders and Cree women in the Prairies, and of the English and Scottish traders and Dene women in the North. Today, the term is used broadly to describe people with mixed Indigenous and European ancestry who identify themselves as Métis, distinct from Indian people, Inuit, or non-Aboriginal people.

Inuit

The term Inuit refers to the Indigenous people of Arctic Canada who speak the Inuktitut language.

First Nations

In 1980-81, the Joint Council of the National Indian Brotherhood and the Assembly of First Nations used the term “First Nations” for the first time in their Declaration of the First
Nations. First Nations is the name used by Canada’s Indigenous people, which refers to Indian people and may sometimes include the Métis and Inuit. Symbolically, the term attempts to elevate Indigenous people to a status of “first among equals” in their quest for self-determination and self-government alongside the English and French founding nations in Canada. Indigenous people outside Canada do not use the term.

Indian

The term “Indian” was more widely used in the past than it is today. This is partly a result of its pejorative connotation among some people, especially those who point out that it was associated with Columbus’s case of mistaken identity (Hedican 1997). However, it does have a rather specific definition in Canadian law, such as that given in the Indian Act Section 2: (1) “Indian’ means a person who pursuant to this Act is registered as an Indian or entitled to be registered as an Indian.” In this context the term has a legal connotation because it specifies types of Indians with special legal rights. The constitutional category of “Indian,” i.e., Indigenous people, is broken down, first by so-called “race” into the two racially distinct categories of Indian and Inuit; secondly, the racial category is divided into two subcategories: registered (status) and non-registered (non-status), which includes Métis persons:

1. Registered (status): a legally defined Indian whose name (with some exceptions) is registered on a particular band list and on the “roll” in Ottawa (Kallen 1995).

2. Non-registered (non-status): persons of Indian or part-Indian ancestry (Métis) who do not have or are not entitled to acquire legal Indian status (Kallen 1995).
It should also be noted that not all registered Indians have a relationship with the federal government that is partly defined in a treaty. Hence the distinction between “treaty” and “non-treaty” Indians:

1. Treaty: Indians and their descendants, who signed land cession treaties with the crown.
2. Non-treaty: Indians and their descendants, who did not sign land cession treaties with the crown, but still may have registered their names on Indian band lists (Kallen 1995).

Indigenous

In this thesis I have chosen to use the term Indigenous to refer to Native people in the widest sense. I have chosen the usage of Indigenous, as I believe the context of this thesis could be used to describe the relations of Indigenous people with their colonizers worldwide. I prefer to capitalize the term Indigenous even though a capital letter is not used in most instances because the word often appears as an adjective. I prefer the capitalized form out of deference to the wishes of the Indigenous people themselves, as a way of showing respect to their identity as distinct peoples.

In this discussion of definitions and terminology it is important to emphasize the fact that many of the names commonly used to refer to Canada’s Indigenous populations are not the names Indigenous peoples use to describe themselves (Hedican 1997).
Delimitations and Limitations

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher I believe is as an active learner. I am always questioned as to why and how a non-Indigenous person can write on Indigenous issues, especially those dealing with identity. Being asked these questions always puts my views, my conceptions, and my identity on the line. I have to justify who I am, and why I write about ideas, conceptions, and knowledge I am not privy to first hand. When I am asked these questions, I feel exposed, and feel I have to defend who I am. Stating that, I am asking and requiring the subjects and participants of my research to do the same. I am asking them to have enough faith in me to tell me who they are, what they think, and most importantly what they are feeling. Realizing that, I am able to give them my answer. I am here to listen, discuss, and most importantly to learn.

I posit that within this study I am not speaking on behalf of Indigenous peoples, but that I am speaking alongside Indigenous peoples. I am fully aware that within Canada and elsewhere within the last decade the debate about cultural appropriation has focused largely on “voice appropriation” (Ziff and Rao 1997). That concerns “have evolved about the propriety of writers depicting ‘cultures other than their own,’ [and] when or if it is appropriate to ‘tell someone else’s story,’” (Coombe 1997:74). Harmut Lutz (1991) notes, “there are many Native writers who have asked only that those engaging in cultural
appropriation do so with ‘sensitivity and respect’” (Cited in Ziff and Rao 1997:17). I believe that it is possible to be supportive of Indigenous struggles for self-representation and be uncomfortable with the rhetorical strategies employed by many of us who are sympathetic to this end (Coombe 1997). I feel anyone who writes about culture, ethnicity, and identity does so under extremely contentious situations regardless of whether or not one deems that is appropriate for them to or not. I agree with Coombes (1997) when she emphasizes that, “ultimately the questions of ‘whose voice it is,’ who speaks on behalf of whom, and whether one can ‘steal the culture of another’ are ethical ones, ones that demand empathetic identifications rather than formal resolutions – a situational ethics to which we must always attend” (93). I believe within this study I have identified my position and have proceeded appropriately with the sensitivity and respect, which is needed.

Dialogue between non-Indigenous and Indigenous people is the key to deconstructing the internal colonial relationship that still exists. Currently, we are at a stage in the asymmetrical relationship, whereby meaningful discussion is needed to conduct meaningful research, to be able to establish effective policies to put into practice.

**Ethnographic Data**

One of the limitations of this study was the unavailability of the interviews and on-site observation data to supplement the analysis of an “urban school from an Indigenous perspective.” The information collected could have strengthened the argument and
provided possible suggestions for improving Indigenous educational policies and practices. The information also may have helped to alleviate the potential concerns of those critics of appropriation of voice.

Statistical Data

The other limitation of this study was the restricted access of the data pertaining to Indigenous people of Canada in the 2001 Census, until the spring of 2003. Statistics Canada has only released a demographic profile analysis series thus far. The statistical data analyzed from 1996 introduces the trend of increased urbanization of Indigenous people, however, with the introduction of new identification terminology in the 2001 Census, the predictions made could be slightly altered in either direction.⁶

In addition, both Statistics Canada and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development collect statistical information about Indigenous people.⁷ Unfortunately, these two sources differ widely in their terms of reference and in their method of enumeration. As a result, statistics coming from one agency are not strictly comparable with statistics from the other. This also raises a number of concerns when using either or both statistical sets. One such concern deals with the purpose behind the collection of the data, and another concern deals with why each government institutions' terminology differs. These concerns are too large to analyze here, but I think it is necessary for the researcher who uses such data
sets to be aware of such certain philosophical, political, economic, and social perspectives, which influence the collection of statistical data.

Organization of the Study

The following five chapters erect a framework for analyzing the continued underlying internal colonial ideology within current Indigenous educational policies in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba.

Chapter two outlines the theoretical orientation of the thesis, by presenting an overview of the literature used to emphasize the importance of the social and cultural functions of the past, the applicability of the "internal colonial way of inquiry" as the best means to analyze Canadian Indigenous educational policy, and the significance of the power and identity relation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. Chapter three delineates historical Canadian Indigenous educational policies into identifiable internal colonial periods, examines how these policies constructed a negative Indigenous identity, and what has been done to deconstruct the internal colonial ideology. Chapter four contextualizes the current realities of Canadian Indigenous people, in specific, increased urbanization and the lack of Indigenous educational policy needed to address this reality. Chapter five introduces the need for alternative programming and presents several examples of such alternatives. Finally, Chapter six summarizes the findings of the research, explains the continued inequality maintained
within the system, and concludes with comments on the future of Canadian Indigenous educational policy.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature I have reviewed summarizes the framework with which I approached this study: the importance of the social and cultural functions of the past in contemporary issues, the relevancy of the colonial and "internal colonial ways of inquiry," and the need to address the politics of identity in analyzing historical and contemporary Canadian Indigenous educational policy. These areas contribute to knowledge of the issues and questions under consideration. As the research and writing process evolves various literature will be examined throughout my work. I did not necessarily use the material as written reference. However, all cited material did have an effect on and contribute to my work. This type of holistic approach in the research and writing process, I believe, expresses the multidimensional aspects in conducting qualitative inquiry.

The Social and Cultural Functions of the Past

The past is both a stake in current struggles and an essential factor in the political relationship of forces (Chesneaux 1978). Understanding the past, as well as its legacy in structures and behaviour, is a requisite for fundamental change.
Representations and Interpretations

History remains inevitably a personal construct, a manifestation of the historian's perspective as a narrator (Burke 1992; Jenkins 1991). Henry Steel Commager (1965) advances, "that history is neither scientific nor mechanical, that the historian is human and therefore fallible, and that the ideal history, completely objective and dispassionate, is an illusion" (Cited in Berkhofer 1995:140). "The truth(s) of the past elude us, history is intersubjective and ideologically positioned that objectivity and being unbiased are chimeras" (Jenkins 1991:56). Human beings do not achieve a separation from the objects they study; they simply invest them with their own values (Appleby, Hunt, and Jacobs 1994; Berkhofer 1995; Burke, 1992; Jenkins 1991). There is bias in the choice of subject, bias in the selection of material, bias in its organization and presentation, and inevitably bias in its interpretation. "Consciously or unconsciously, all historians are biased: they are creatures of their time, their race, their class, their country-creatures, and even prisoners" (Henry Steel Commager cited in Berkhofer 1995:140). The solution to the deep and perplexing problems of partiality would seem to many historians to require nothing more than the self-conscious and self-announced statement of biases - all too often placed - in the preface. We might call this approach the full disclosure or the truth in historicizing doctrine. Berkhofer (1995) suggests such a recommendation assumes that a warning to the reader of the presumed biases would seem to overcome them, or at least balance them, in the reader's mind. The advice also assumes that authors would or could know all of their biases so as to expose them fully to their readers (Berkhofer 1995). Given the various kinds of perspectives and the many places they
enter a historical discourse, we must accede to the argument of F.R. Ankersmit, “that is only by taking a point of view that historians create in the first place historical narrative or interpretation as such” (Cited in Berkhofer 1995:168). Taking a perspective provides the very way of “seeing” the past as history. A perspective enables selection of facts and gives coherence to the narrative. It excludes as it includes. Kent (1999) stresses, history is always history for someone, someone in the present.

For the purpose of this thesis, the historical representations and interpretations I put forth are intended to open up new areas of Indigenous research. To explore the historical experiences of those whose existence is so often ignored or mentioned in passing in mainstream historiography, and to criticize, redefine, and strengthen the dominant mode of historical analyses (Sharpe 1992).

*Past and Identity*

“History and culture are fundamental aspects of the fabric of everyday life” (Jordan and Weedon 1995:4). According to Jenkins (1991), “history is the way people create, in part, their identities” (19). “People literally feel the need to root themselves today and tomorrow in their yesterdays” (18). “History and culture give us our sense of identity, telling us who we are, where we are from and where we are going...In any society the denial or marginalization of histories and cultures other than those of the dominant group has profound implications for subjectivity and identity” (Jordan and Weedon 1995:4). Whose culture shall be the
official one and whose shall be subordinated? What cultures shall be regarded as worthy of
display and which shall be hidden? Whose history shall be remembered and whose
forgotten? What images of social life shall be projected and which shall be marginalized?
What voices shall be heard and which shall be silenced? Who is representing whom and on
what basis? This is the realm of cultural politics (Jordan and Weedon 1995).

Jordan and Weedon (1995) insist that power is at the centre of cultural politics and is integral
to culture. “Culture, being not a separate sphere, but a dimension of all institutions -
economic, social and political...A set of material practices, which constitute meanings,
values and subjectivities” (Jordan and Weedon 1995:8). All signifying practices, which
involve relations of power (Jordan and Weedon 1995). They subject us in a sense that they
offer us a particular subject position and mode of subjectivity. But these subject positions
are not all the same. “The power relations inherent in a particular signifying practice may be
in a state of equilibrium, but more often they involve relations of domination and
subordination. We are either active subjects who take up positions from which we can
exercise power within a particular social practice, or we are subjected to the definitions of
others” (Jordan and Weedon 1995:11). Keesing (1987) advances “we need to ask who
creates and who defines cultural meanings, and to what ends” (Cited in Hunt 1989:81).

Historically, “the social and cultural functions of the past” for Indigenous people has been
defined and represented by others. Edward M. Bruner, an American anthropologist,
suggests “that we understand the world and live our lives through stories, and that these stories are capable of sudden and dramatic change” (Cited in Cairns 2000:42). According to Bruner, “we position ourselves in accordance with such stories, and we fit the events that impinge on our vision into them, until finally the discrepancy between story and reality becomes too great. Then the old story that once seemed eternal becomes an emperor with no clothes, incapable of accommodating a reality that can no longer be denied” (Cited in Cairns 2000:42). According to Bruner, that is what happened in the 1960s and 1970s to the old story that formerly provided accepted interpretations of the past of Indigenous people, their contemporary condition, and their likely future. Now, however, we have a new narrative: the present is viewed as a resistance movement, the past as exploitation, and the future as ethnic resurgence. “The assimilation story easily became a mask for oppression by justifying the leadership of change agents with power over wards who needed to be taught. The resistance, ethnic resurgence story, by contrast, generates claims for redress for past exploitation, and turns yesterday’s wards into activists for a cultural revival, a better future, and autonomy” (Cited in Cairns 2000:43).

“Long–standing Canadian policy assumed the erosion of Indigenous difference on the road to homogeneity. Indigenous cultures were transitional, not enduring. We were to be held together by citizenship after Indigenous cultures had confirmed the premise of social Darwinism, and disappeared. That is not where we are today. History changed direction on us” (Cairns 2000:45).
Indigenous People and Internal Colonialism

For generations, Indigenous people around the world have been attempting to rid themselves of the vestiges of colonialism by fostering the political, social, and economic development of their communities (Barron and Garcea 1999; Long and Dickason 2000). Relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples have not been conducted on an equal and respectful basis.

For the non-Indigenous settlers, the colonial era ended in the nineteenth century with the establishment of self-government. However, countries like Australia, Canada, and New Zealand have all continued to maintain forms of internal colonialism vis-à-vis Indigenous peoples. It is this internal colonialism and its links to colonialism that is considered in this section (Armitage 1995; Lui 1996; Welch 1988).

Colonialism

Colonialism describes an asymmetrical relationship in which one culture dominates another. Although the characteristics of colonialism vary from one context to another, the literature shows that the model is applicable to a number of groups, including Indigenous peoples of Canada (Armitage 1995; Battiste 2000; Binda and Calliou 2001; Burns 2000; Castellano, Brant, Davis, and Lahache 2000; Devrome 1991; Emberley 1993; Frideres 1993; Kulchyski 1995; Long and Dickason 2000; Nicholas 2001; Perley 1993; Ponting 1997). According to
Devrome (1991), "generally, a colonial relationship is characterized by the relative powerlessness of the colonized in comparison to the colonizers. The political structures and institutions of the colonizers regulate the relations between the two groups. They protect and enforce the interests of the dominant group by keeping the subordinate population subjugated and directing their activities toward satisfying the needs of the colonizers" (12).

Kennedy (1945), Blauner (1969), and Geshwender (1978) have identified four basic components of colonialism. These include:

1. The forced, involuntary entry of the colonized group into the dominant society.
2. The colonizing power adopting policies that suppress, transform, or destroy the values, orientations, and ways of life of the colonized.
3. The manipulation and management of the colonized by agents of the colonizing group.
4. The domination, exploitation, and oppression justified by an ideology of racism, which defines the colonized group as inferior.

Blauner (1969) for example, used the colonial way of inquiry in his research on Black poverty. He applied the colonial theory to the internal situation of Black Americans by identifying what he describes as the four principle mechanisms of colonialism:

1. Forced Entry: "a contact situation during which the colonizers enter the colony through a forced penetration of the domestic and economic and political institutions" (Cited in Devrome 1991:16).
2. Cultural Impact: during this phase a process of cultural genocide is begun, whereby "the colonizers execute policies that undermine the traditional social, economic and ideological organization and structures of the colonized culture" (Cited in Devrome 1991:16).

3. External Administration: "an action in which the colonizers acquire political power for their own institutions, enabling them to redirect the colonized society to the economic benefit of the colonizing nation" (Cited in Devrome 1991:16).

4. Racism: a mechanism, which provides the colonizers with the ideological rationale for their subordination of the colonized (Devrome 1991).

Blauner (1969) further explains, "that the dialectic between the concepts racism and inferiority are internalized within the colonizer and colonized through policies that make the colonial relationships self-sustaining" (Cited in Devrome 1991:16).

*Internal Colonialism*

Colonial theory and internal colonial theory both emphasize the political and economic asymmetry that exists when one culture systematically dominates another (Devrome 1991). Welch (1988) proposes, "the use of the word 'internal' should not be taken to indicate a wholly new or discrete form of colonialism" (206). On the contrary, colonialism has as its central feature its links to imperialism and, as Kelly and Altbach (1978) have argued, "the domination of one nation by another" (24); "perhaps the major distinguishing feature of internal colonialism, then, is its context" (Welch 1988:206). Internal colonialism has its links
to nationalism, and involves the subordination and continuing domination of a previously independent nation within the borders of another nation state (Devrome 1991; Welch 1988). In the internal colonial relationship, the dominant culture’s nationalist agenda through its social, legal, economic, and political institutions and practices dominate the subordinate culture on a day to day basis (Devrome 1991; Perley 1993; Welch 1988). According to Devrome, “the consequences of this relationship for the subordinate culture, are a loss of the power to govern themselves as they had prior to contact, and the loss of their ability to be self-sustaining...in terms of the reproduction of their culture” (Devrome 1991:1).

van den Berghe (1978) builds on the four basic components of colonialism identified by Kennedy (1945), Blauner (1969), and Geshwender (1978) and reworks them specifically for internal colonialism. These include:

1. Dominance by one group, or coalition of groups, over another, living within common boundaries; but with

2. Territorial separation, with individual land and tenure rights being different for the colonized group; with

3. An internal government for the colonized within the dominant government;

4. The maintenance of economic inequality, reinforcing relationships of “dependency” and “inferiority” in the division of labour and the relations of production; and
5. The development of a racist ideology portraying the internally colonized peoples as backward, savage, uncivilized, and childlike (Devrome 1991; Perley 1993; van den Berghe 1978; Welch 1988).

Devrome (1991) posits, that “a key feature of the [internal colonial way of inquiry] is the dominant culture’s forced application of all its national laws on the subordinate culture, and the inability, or lack of social, political and economic power, of the subordinate culture to effect any meaningful change in the relationship” (1). Another feature of the relationship is that the subordinate culture becomes dependent on the political power of the dominant culture for their existence, and for the services they receive. Their rights as a distinct culture are no longer determined internally within their culture, but externally, by the dominant power (Devrome 1991; Perley 1993; Welch 1988).

Such groups as North American Indians, Latin American Indians, and Australian Aborigines all fall readily into this category of nations who have failed to gain political or economic independence from their respective colonial powers (Armitage 1995; Perley 1993; Welch 1988).

Drawing on the work of Blauner (1969), Kennedy (1945), J. R. Ponting and Roger Gibbins (1980), and S. Frideres (1983) I believe it is appropriate to view Indigenous and non-Indigenous relations in Canada according to what is called the “internal colonial way of
The reason that Indigenous peoples' relationships with the Canadian state are dramatically different from the relationships shared by other groups, especially to the extent that the Indigenous-state relationship is characterized by such pervasive subordination and control (Frideres 1993). Indigenous people in Canada are an internal colony within the nation-state of Canada. "In fact this whole relationship has been likened to an 'institution'" (Ponting and Gibbins 1980:9).

The policies and practices of the Canadian government conform to the "internal colonial way of inquiry." Frideres (1988) conceptualizes the internal colonization process into seven parts. The first involves the incursion of the colonizing countries of France and Britain into a geographical area. Second, the appropriation of Indigenous lands combined with the destruction of the traditional Indigenous economy, social structure and ideology forced them into a subordinate relationship with the Canadian government. The third and fourth aspects of internal colonization involved the establishment of systems of external political control and Indigenous economic dependence (Frideres 1988). The federal government formalized its political ideology about Indigenous people, with the creation of the Canada Indian Act over 100 years ago. The Indian Act legalized cultural genocide by legislating who an Indian was, where land would be set aside for their use, and what social, civil, and legal rights they had (Cardinal 1969). Indigenous people were denied many basic civil and political rights that other Canadians have taken for granted (Frideres 1993). Concomitantly, the Indigenous
people became increasingly dependent upon the Canadian government, and specifically the Department of Indian Affairs.

The fifth aspect of the internal colonization process “is the provision of low quality social services for Indigenous people” (Frideres 1988:371). Wotherspoon and Satzewich (1993) advance, that “the inadequate provision of health and social services is indicated by the low health status, the extensive welfare dependency, and the low educational attainment of Indigenous people” (8).

The sixth and seventh aspects of internal colonization relate to the nature of social interactions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (Frideres 1988). Wotherspoon and Satzewich point out:

An ideology of racism and a color line emerge to regulate social interaction between the two groups. Social significance is attached to skin color, and ideologies of biological superiority and inferiority are institutionalized to justify the exploitation of Indigenous peoples and their resources, to break down their resistance to exploitation, and to deter them from becoming full members of Canadian society (1993:8).

What was done to the Indigenous people in Canada in the 19th century was accomplished by a political decision that made them wards of the federal government, without equal rights. Kallen (1995) notes it was based on a civilizing mission justified, by such ideas as “manifest destiny.” “The manifest destiny postulate included two related ideas, that of the ‘white man’s burden’ and that of ‘noblesse oblige’. The white man’s burden was the task of
civilizing the savages. Noblesse oblige referred to the idea that privilege entails responsibility, i.e., the white man, privileged with the power to rule, had the responsibility to care for and protect the non-white savages under his control” (24). The federal control of Indigenous people was placed in the hands of a bureaucracy, granted with the authority to abolish Indian culture and replace it with Euro-Canadian culture, and still has the legal and administrative power to determine the rights of Indigenous people (Devrome 1991).

The result of this oppression is that the Indigenous people in Canada have traditionally experienced low incomes, high unemployment rates, high dependency rates, lower life expectancy, and lower educational achievement levels than non-Indigenous people (Devrome 1991; Frideres 1993; Perley 1993; Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993).

Since 1972, Canada has made some progress towards the eradication of internal colonialism with the institution of sentencing circles within the judicial system, the creation of Indigenous Control of Indigenous Education, the signing of modern treaties, such as the Nisga’a, and the creation of Nunavut. However, despite increased Indigenous administrative responsibility for the delivery of services, the needs of the Indigenous people are not being met relative to the services delivered to the general Canadian population (Devrome 1991). Canada is still a long way from replacing the internal colonial principle that non-Indigenous people have the right to rule with the principle that Indigenous peoples have the right to govern themselves.
The colonial and internal colonial ways of inquiry discussed emphasize that the major consequence of the internal colonial relationship was the loss of autonomy by the colonized population. This loss of independence resulted in the Indigenous populations’ social, political, and economic organization being disrupted and being ascribed a subordinate status in their relations with the superordinate power. A major point put forth by writers on internal colonialism is that although the objective of colonial practice was economic gain, the strategies and operations were rationalized through a political process. And that it was the political decisions, and the power to enforce them by legislation and regulatory procedures, that has created a situation whereby the lives of Indigenous people in Canada are still subject to the will of the state, through a process of administrative determinism (Devrome 1991; Frideres 1988; Perley 1993; Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993).

Internal Colonialism and Education

Since the 1970s the “internal colonial way of inquiry” has become increasingly popular in the explanation of the position of Indigenous peoples in Canada. There are several proponents of the “internal colonial way of inquiry” in Canada, each with a somewhat different emphasis. Kellough (1980), Bienvienue (1985), and Frideres (1988) provide a general historical overview of the colonization process. Mel Watkins (1972) and Coates and Powell (1989) applied the “internal colonial way of inquiry” to Indigenous peoples and development in the North. In more specific studies, Brady (1984) uses the “internal colonial way of inquiry” to explain poor health status of Indigenous peoples and Boldt (1981) in his study of
Indigenous leadership. However, until recently there has been little use of it to analyze Canadian Indigenous educational policy.

In spite of notable work on colonialism and Indigenous education outside of Canada, such as Altbach and Kelly (1978), Carnoy (1974), Lui (1996), and Welch (1988) there has been a marked reluctance on part of educators in Canada to address the issue. According to Nicholas (2001), “although it has been commonplace to see the word ‘colonialism’ in Canadian studies of Indigenous education, most writers relegate the phenomenon to the past, or mention it in a cursory way only as a counterpoint to what they see as ideal forms of education for [Indigenous] people” (10).

Internal colonialism provides an important framework of analysis with which to explain policies and practices in Indigenous education within Canada (Welch 1988). The “internal colonial way of inquiry” allows for the exploration of historical and contemporary educational issues in a multidimensional approach. Perley (1993) agrees that, “it requires that Indigenous education be described in the context of institutional arrangements that have been established by a manifestly dominant group, and it demands treatment from a historical perspective” (119).

Unlike many major studies of Indigenous education in Canada, this thesis attempts to make internal colonialism central to the analysis. It aims to demonstrate that colonialism is not
something that existed only at the time Canada was a colony of either France or England, but rather that it has continued into the present. “Not only as a political ideology ordering relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, but also as the primary ideology underlying the education of Indigenous people in Canada today” (Nicholas 2001:10).

Internal Colonial Educational Way of Inquiry

Altbach and Kelly (1978), provide the framework with which I will analyze Canada’s Indigenous educational policies. In reviewing writing about education under classical, internal, and neo-colonial situations Altbach and Kelly (1978) identified ten key features of colonial education. These included:

1. Geographic separation of schools and communities from which students came.
2. The colonized were not consulted in the planning process regarding their education.
3. Parents performed no role in the determination of educational content.
4. Content had little to do with the culture or society of the colonized.
5. Usually only primary education was provided.
6. Missionary schools emphasized moral training.
7. The language utilized in the schools was that of the colonizer.
8. Language of the colonized was devalued and discouraged.
9. Practical skills like agriculture and manual trade were emphasized.
10. Culture of the colonized was negatively evaluated.
According to Perley (1993), Altbach and Kelly found:

That in all cases education for the colonized was planned and controlled by the colonizers, a reflection of the exercise of power held by the colonizer. The political and economic dominant group of the internal colonial situation made the educational decisions for the colonized: they determined who would go to school, how long the children of the colonized group would attend school, what would be learned in school, and in what language it should be learned. Under this system the goals of schooling for the colonized population are designed to serve the needs of the colonizer, not the colonized (121).

In conjunction with Altbach and Kelly's (1978) colonial education way of inquiry, I will also use the "internal colonial way of inquiry" outlined by Frideres (1988) as it contributes to an understanding of the causes of the present day political and economic dependency of Indigenous people within their asymmetrical relationship with Canada.

Nicholas (2001) has aptly pointed out, "unfortunately, it is not enough to define traditional pedagogies and ways of inquiry of education. What has to happen is that the colonial element in [Indigenous] education needs to be deconstructed and rooted out. Unless we do so there can be no fertile ground on which Indigenous education can take root" (10).
Indigenous People and Identity

Identity

The notion of identity is closely linked to "self-concept." Basically, it is the way in which one identifies oneself, in response to questions such as "who are you?" or "how would you describe yourself?" A part of an individual's self-concept is one's "cultural identity." Cultural identity derives from one's knowledge of one's membership in a cultural group or groups, together with the value, and emotional significance attached to that membership (Berry 1994). That is, "there are both knowledge (perceptual) and evaluation (affective) aspects of [cultural] identity" (Berry 1999:3). Cultural identity, thus, reflects the cultural standards of a society to which one subscribes. Michael Green describes cultural identity as an identity that gives the individual a sense of a common past and a shared destiny (Cited in Mihesuah 1998). Green also asserts that culture unifies and integrates the individuals, gives them a sense of belonging, and a sense of their own uniqueness as a people (Cited in Mihesuah 1998).

I will use the term cultural identity throughout this work "to refer to the complex set of features that together indicate how one thinks of oneself in relation to Indigenous peoples" (Berry 1994:18). Those who address questions of identity should keep in mind its kaleidoscopic nature. They should examine the multiple contributions given to any definition of identity. They ought to examine the pattern of power relationships within
which an identity is forged. And, “they need to explore the pattern of power relationships within which each question of identity is framed...who picks an identity and who is consigned to it” (Coombe 1997:86). One has to realize that Indigenous people have differences. After all, there are more than a hundred nations and histories. “There is no need for Indigenous people to have a fully coherent position that expresses an authentic identity forged from an uncomplicated past that bespeaks of a pristine cultural tradition before they are recognized as Indigenous people” (Coombe 1997:89). Identities are comprised of numerous factors, which form collective and individual identities, which need not be static.

Identity and Power Relations

Minh-ha (1997) maintains that, “to raise the question of identity is to reopen the discussion on the self/other relationship in its enactment of power relations” (415). Taylor (1994) adds, “our identity is partly shaped by recognition of self or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or a group can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining, demeaning or contemptible representation of themselves” (25).

The social construction of cultural identity reflects the ideological, political, economic, and cultural biases of the ruling authorities of society. Those with the power to rule inevitably
have the power to define (Kallen 1995). Frantz Fanon (1969) argued that, “the major weapon of the colonizers was their ability to define the image of the colonized people” (Cited in Taylor 1994:65). Dominant groups tend to entrench their hegemony by inculcating an image of inferiority in the subjugated through stereotypes (Taylor 1994). Glaser and Possony (1979) define stereotypes as broadly fixed images or beliefs about experiences and people that exceed logic or empirical evidence. Homi Bhabha (1994) offers a useful way of inquiry for understanding colonial or racist stereotypes. Bhabha argues:

That a primary strategy of colonialist discourse is the circulation of the stereotype, which, through its repetitive fixity, renders the colonized knowable and visible. Anti-colonial discourses have thus focused on exposing the effectivity of the stereotype, on destabilizing its apparent fixity, and on unmasking the imperialist anxieties, which underlie its still efficacious repetitions. But to judge the stereotyped image on the basis of a prior political normativity is to dismiss it, not to displace it, which is only possible by engaging with its effectivity; with the repertoire of positions of power and resistance, domination and dependence that constructs the colonial subject (both colonizers and colonized)(1994:67).

The struggle for freedom and equality must therefore pass through a revision of these images (Taylor 1994).

*Indigenous Identity*

Lives of contemporary Indigenous people have been massively influenced by the nature of the contact between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. This contact has initiated a process of acculturation involving both cultural and psychological changes. Acculturation is defined as a culture change resulting from contact between two autonomous cultural groups
Berry (1994). Berry (1999) contends that, "the most important change is the disruption of cultural identity, leading to identity loss and confusion, and to an associated decline in social and psychological wellbeing" (28).

Indigenous cultural identity according to Berry (1994) "can best be understood when the impact of both societies is examined: the current situation can be seen as a result of the interaction (both historically, and at the present time) between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples" (17). In other words, since the present situation has resulted from a particular set of relationships, future improvements are likely to be possible only when the character of these relationships are examined and changed. And, since these relationships are largely characterized by domination (on the part of the non-Indigenous society) and resistance (on the part of the Indigenous peoples), there is a joint responsibility for changing both of these features. Berry (1994) adds that, "non-Indigenous society needs to recognize that it must draw back from this pervasive domination, and provide a context (political, economic, social and cultural) in which Indigenous people can begin to recover" (18).

Indigenous peoples saw non-Indigenous experiences as having severely deprived or diminished the attainment and expression of a positive Indigenous cultural identity. Non-Indigenous experiences have had a substantial negative impact on the development of an Indigenous cultural identity (Berry 1994). Historically, the cultural identity of Indigenous people was defined by nation-states for the purpose of restricting Indigenous participation in
the wider society. Government definitions of cultural identity were shaped in part by purveying ideologies of the period such as humanitarianism, liberalism, nationalism, paternalism, and by institutional ideologies of departments and agencies, and by the values and goals of key actors in the policy-making process. Absorbing Indigenous people into Canadian society and erasing Indigenous identity were openly stated objectives of government policy for many generations. As a result, systemic discrimination has become rooted in the system-wide operation of society as a long-term consequence of past forms of cultural discrimination (Kallen 1995).

Education has been a principle instrument of this policy. For Indigenous people in Canada the educational system has been a major source of the interrelated problems of cultural dissonance and conflicting expectations (Hedican 1997). Jordan (1986) brings this process into sharper focus. Jordan explains that “in the past, the identities offered to Indigenous people by the dominant society have been negative; assimilationist policies carried out through education made the people dependent economically and culturally and that was reflected in their identity...[Indigenous] claims today are not focused toward new rights; they re-claim prior rights to a positive identity” (1986:260). For many Indigenous people the real problem in countering the divisive effects of cultural discontinuities is one of reconstructing a positive identity. Historically, “the schools have been seen to destroy identity; in contemporary society, Indigenous people see educational institutions as the sites for constructing or reconstructing their identity” (Jordan 1986:261). In this sense, Hedican
(1997) proposes "when Indigenous people put forward claims to exert more control over educational institutions it is a sociopolitical act, since these are also claims to control the construction and reaffirmation of their own identity" (217).
CHAPTER 3

HISTORICAL CANADIAN INDIGENOUS EDUCATION POLICIES

The past is more than something to be recalled and debated intellectually. It has important contemporary and practical implications, because many of the attitudes, institutions and practices that took shape in the past significantly influence and constrain the present.

-Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples 1996a

Indigenous education in Canada has undergone many transitions, however, the problems and issues that characterized it in the past remain. They have only become more complex as Indigenous people attempt to implement their own vision of education in a contemporary world. To understand the current issues facing Indigenous people, we must begin with an overview of the history of Indigenous educational policy within Canada (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986; Hare and Barman 2000).

In Canada the history of Indigenous education can be divided into three identifiable internal colonial periods: assimilation, integration, and Indian Control of Indian Education.
Assimilation

The first period of internal colonialism, began to take shape after the fall of New France in 1760 and with the creation of British North America (Nicholas 2001). Under this period of internal colonialism educational goals were characterized by efforts to assimilate Indigenous people (Hare and Barman 2000). Wilson (1983) describes that, “in 1830, the imperial government decided to alter its ‘Indian policy’. From a policy based upon using Indians as military allies...to a state of civilization through education” (70). This new emphasis in internal colonial education was based on a racist belief in social evolutionism, which held that Indigenous people could eventually be educated out of their “savage” and “wandering ways” to become like Europeans (Nicholas 2001). “The European conviction was, that in order for Natives to survive, they would have to be assimilated into the European social order” (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill, 1986:2). Education was seen as a means to achieve this, by replacing Indigenous languages, religions, history, cultural traditions and values, and world-views with those of the dominant culture, and modifying the values of the Indigenous people. “The Indian problem exists owing to the fact that the Indian is untrained to take his place in the world. Once teach him to do this, and the solution is had” (Canada, 1895; xxi).

With the coming confederation under the 1867 British North America Act, “Indians” and their lands became the responsibility of the new government in Ottawa. Under this mandated paternalism the federal government became increasingly aggressive and coercive in
carrying out its responsibilities (Nicholas 2001). Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill (1989) contend, that for the dominant society in Canada, this need for paternalism toward Indigenous people was confirmed in the years immediately following Confederation, where the most effective means by which to educate them became the issue. The Indigenous education policy initiated by the federal government after Confederation, according to Petrone (1983) was fundamentally different from earlier efforts where many young Indigenous children became educated in “the white schools” without losing contact with their own culture (Cited in Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986).

In 1879, the federal government commissioned Nicholas Flood Davin, to evaluate the American policy favouring separate Indian residential schools. “The Americans believed that Indigenous children were best prepared for assimilation into the dominant society if they were removed from the influences of home, family, and community” (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986:6). Davin in his report entitled, “Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-breeds to the Right Honorable the Minister of the Interior,” recommended the American practice of removing Indigenous children with the stipulation that schools be operated so far as possible by missionaries, who had already demonstrated their commitment to “civilizing” Canada’s Indigenous people. The federal government initiated Davin’s recommendations and in effect became a three-step process towards assimilation. First, boarding schools were established for the young, as it would remove traditional Indigenous cultural attributes from the child and provide habilitation into the dominant culture. Second,
industrial schools were to be created to provide further character formation and controlled work-training skills for the older children who were to be integrated into agricultural work and labour force positions. Finally, day schools were to be established to signify the complete assimilation of Indigenous people into Euro-Canadian cultural and employment patterns (Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993). It was believed that Indigenous people could only be assimilated if they were removed from the influences of their family and community (Hare and Barman 2000).

Industrial, Residential, and Day Schooling

Residential schooling of Canada’s Indigenous people was pursued with implacable determination and consistency from the 1880’s until the 1960’s, when it came under a series of policy reviews. By 1900 there were 61 residential schools being operated by the government and the churches and out of a total Indigenous population of about 20,000 aged between six and fifteen, 3,285 Indigenous children were enrolled in 22 industrial and 39 boarding schools and another 6,349 in 226 day schools (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986; Brooks 1990).

From the onset Indigenous educational policy within Canada was used to remove one’s identity. The policy was based on the belief that Indigenous people must be remade to conform to the values and culture of the new race. To achieve this goal, the Department of Indian Affairs acknowledged its responsibilities to emancipate the Indigenous children from
the condition of ignorance and superstitious blindness and to convert them into useful members of society and contributors to, instead of merely consumers of the wealth of the country (Brooks 1990). In 1919 the Indian Act was amended to make schooling compulsory for Indigenous children between seven and fifteen years of age (Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993). It was during this time period, under this educational policy, and at these schools that the attack on Indigenous culture began (Hare and Barman).

Diane Persson (1986) describes the residential school as a “total institution” (152). She identifies three mechanisms of social control used: isolation, sanction, and persuasion, to regulate the children like inmates. When children entered residential school, they underwent admission procedures designed to dispossess them of their previous roles and isolate them from the reserve world. They were isolated from their parents and siblings. Children were either brought to the school by their family or, more often, were rounded up by a priest or truant officer and transported to the school. Once at school, children were separated by age and gender, and rarely having any contact with brothers and sisters. Upon entering the residence, the child’s clothes were removed. After being bathed and deloused, he or she was issued a set of clothing. After requiring a uniform, which was the same as that worn by others of the same sex and size, the child was given a number (Persson 1986).

The use of rewards and punishment were the sanctions most evident in school life. Children were forbidden to speak their language and received harsh punishment if caught doing so.
If, the children complied with the privilege system they were rewarded with preferred jobs (Persson 1986).

Persuasion, as a form of social control centred on attempts to alter individual attitudes. Persson (1986) uses the example of a religious pictorial catechism used at Blue Quills Residential School to exemplify this: “They had two roads going up, the one going up to heaven had all white people and the one going to hell had all Indian people” (154). See Appendix A. Persson proposes that the catechism left the message that “if you stay Indian you’ll end up in hell” (154).12

The learning opportunities that did take place at residential schools focused on domestic skills and religious indoctrination. Though basic education was provided, it was to prepare students for participation in the lower fringes of the dominant society (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986). Hare and Barman (2000) claim federal policy initiated by the government and carried out by the church, legitimized and even compelled children to be schooled not for assimilation purposes but for inequality. Their education ensured that students could not participate socially or economically in the dominant society, but also prevented them from returning to their traditional ways of life (Hare and Barman 2000).13

Hare and Barman (2000) declare that, the most glaring conditions of residential school that contributed to Indigenous children’s inequitable treatment was the brief time spent in the
classroom, the curriculum to which they were exposed, and the quality of instruction that they received from teachers. Indigenous children were expected to succeed in a system that was clearly paternalistic and represented the self-interest of the church and government (Hare and Barman 2000).

The Legacy of Residential Schooling

The loss of language and the erosion of family values, traditions, and parenting skills are two of the paramount effects of residential schooling. One of the major concerns was that those individuals, who received schooling, were being displaced (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986; Bull 1991; Grant 1996; Miller 1996). They were not fitting into mainstream Canadian society nor into traditional culture. John Tootoosis, a Cree from Saskatchewan, whose views were cited by Miller (1996), compared the adjustment problem to painful suspension:

When an Indian comes out of these places it is like being put between two walls in a room and left hanging in the middle. On one side are all the things he learned from his people and their way of life that was being wiped out, and on the other side are the white man's ways which he could never fully understand since he never had the right amount of education and could not be part of it. There he is, hanging, in the middle of two cultures and he is not a white man and he is not an Indian (385).

For the students of residential schools, and in many cases for the staff as well, what mattered about the residential school experience was its impact on the children and their communities, and whether it achieved its objectives (Miller 1989). Miller points out, in the
areas of academic instruction and vocational training, and in the treatment of Indigenous culture, the schools performed inadequately, and in all too many cases, wrought profoundly destructive effects on many of their students (1996). Inappropriate curriculum, inadequate school supplies, and ill-trained teachers completed the factors that conspired to doom residential schooling academically. Residential schools thus, were a failure as far as its pedagogical role was concerned.

Linda Bull (1991) claims, “[that] the impact of residential schooling can be seen in the success or failure of many band-operated schools movement towards educational control of First Nations education” (42). Bull points out some of the problems that have arisen in running their schools are a product of the particularly difficult times that Indigenous students experienced in residential schools (Bull 1991). One of the major problems associated with current trends in Indigenous schooling often lies in the communities’ attitudes about the very nature of school and what can be expected of it.

When there is a break in cultural transmission as was the case in residential schools, the children are deprived of their roots (Bull 1991). Every culture has ways of transmitting knowledge from one generation to another so that the next generation is prepared and able to meet life’s challenges. If children have insight into their past and strong connections with their language and spirituality, they have the basis from which to cope with life (Bull 1991). In the process of learning their culture they are learning how to learn (Bull 1991). When this
process of cultural transmission is interrupted, children do not develop this ability to learn. As a result, the survivors of residential schooling, who are the parents and members of the community administering the school, often lack the knowledge and tools necessary to maintain their culture (Grant 1996).

The volume and intensity of Indigenous testimony today about the cultural oppression that characterized residential schools, makes it clear that attempted assimilation was a cause of severe pain and lasting damage. According to Miller in Shingwauk's Vision:

To be treated as “dirty savages”, to be warned that your parents were doomed to damnation because of their religious beliefs, to be told you were too “dumb” to understand what incompetent teachers were teaching, and to be treated constantly as though your race made you susceptible to dishonest and sexually licentious behaviour took a toll on the psychological and emotional behaviour of many residential school children (1996:120).

The aftermath of the residential school era has been so severe that the term “Residential School Syndrome” has been coined to describe it. Alice Carroll whose views were cited in Agnes Grant’s No End of Grief: Indian Residential Schools in Canada, argues:

There are two main reasons why those who attended residential schools try to shut off their feelings. One may be that they have undergone experiences so painful that the only way they could deal with them was to block them out. Another factor is the cultural suppression. Students learned to be silent, to not express their language, culture or identity, because if they did, they were disciplined (1996:247).

With so many obstacles created by residential schooling, it is not surprising that it has taken many years and continues to take time for Indigenous community members to become
involved in the education system for their children. Hodgson (1989) maintains deep-seated attitudes towards education are hard to change.

Residential schools were only one instrument in a complex set of educational policies, whose purpose was cultural assimilation. Education provided to Indigenous people by the Government of Canada and its predecessor governments until the late 1960s, was an important element in an overall policy of assimilation.

Integration

The second period of internal colonial educational policy “integration” emerged, post World War II. Across the world, segregation based on “race” was being called into question and Canadian society’s ignorance of and disinterest in Canada’s Indigenous people began to transform (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986; Brooks 1990; Nicholas 2001; Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993). It was now appropriate to acknowledge as a failure previous policies and recommend a change to the present Indigenous educational system by abolishing separate Indigenous schools such as Industrial, Residential, and Day Schools and place Indigenous children into regular provincial schools, subject to all provincial regulations (Ponting 1997).
A Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons was appointed in 1946 to assess Canada’s current Indigenous educational policy. J. R. Miller (1996) notes, “that 126 briefs of 137 submitted by Native Bands, associations, and other bodies to the Special Joint Committee in 1946, dealt with education in one fashion or another, and 121 called for changes in the school system in general and at residential schools in particular” (97). The 1946 Special Joint Committee concluded that Industrial, Residential, and Day Schools should be closed as soon as possible (Nicholas 2001). Nicholas (2001) points out however, “not because of the abuses so prevalent in the schools, but rather, because the schools had failed to assimilate Native Children” (13)! The committee laid blame for the educational failure of the schools squarely on the segregated nature of Industrial, Residential, and Day schooling, which left only one solution, integration (Nicholas 2001).

The 1946 Special Joint Committee recommended to revise the Indian Act to accommodate the changes suggested for Indigenous education, and by 1951 the federal government began to shift the burden of Indigenous schooling to the provinces. Entering into agreements with the provinces and local school boards the federal government under Section 113 of the revised Indian Act established “joint schools,” which were the foundation of the integration policy (Barman, Hébert, and McCaskill 1986; Brooks 1990; Frideres 1993; Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993). Although integration was being promoted, the act continued the established system of Indigenous Day Schools operated on reserves, and Residential Schools conducted under joint departmental and religious auspices (Brooks 1990).
In 1963-64, approximately 55,000 Indigenous students were enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. Of these, 59 percent were in federal day schools, 13 percent were in residential schools, and the remaining 28 percent were attending joint schools (Canada DIAND 1975).

The concept of integrated education while strongly promoted was difficult to define. Government officials were adamant that integration should not be confused, either in the minds of the Indigenous people or the public at large, with assimilation. Daniels (1967) explains:

It should not be the aim to make the Canadian Indian into a “white man,” since this is neither, in the eyes of the Indian people, desirable nor, even for the purpose of economic self-sufficiency, necessary. On the contrary, the heritage of the Indian people is a proud one. They are capable of bringing many admirable qualities to the fore in the present-day fabric of Canadian life. Our aim, through education, should be to help them develop these qualities to the fullest and to assist them to take advantage of all the opportunities that should be available to all Canadians (Cited in Brooks 1990:53).

Despite such statements however, during this period of integration the rationale behind the policy remained the same, to prepare Indigenous children to take their place in Canadian society as socially and economically competent citizens (Brooks 1990). Completely unexamined in the process was the educational goal of assimilation. Only the strategies of assimilation had changed (Miller 1996).
In reality, integrated education encountered numerous barriers, which included language and cultural differences, teachers who were insensitive to or lacked training related to Indigenous concerns, and Eurocentric curricula and materials (Brooks 1990; Nicholas 2001; Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993). Resulting in high failure rates and low attainment compared with non-Indigenous students.

The policy of integration continued into the 1960s when calls for action to rectify these educational shortcomings of Indigenous education was once again examined and the findings published in the Survey of Contemporary Indians in Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies.

Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies

In 1964, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration asked the University of British Columbia to undertake in conjunction with scholars at other universities, a study of the social, educational, and economic situation of the Indigenous people of Canada, and to offer recommendations where it appeared that benefits could be gained. Volume I of the Survey of Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies (Hawthorn Report) dealt with the role of the Indian Affairs Branch and spelled out the philosophy of special status for Indigenous people, which Hawthorn called “Citizen Plus” (Weaver 1981). The thrust of the report was on the concept of choice; Indigenous people should have a greater choice in education. Volume II of the Hawthorn Report, dealt with the adequacy
and responsibility of schooling for Indigenous children and adults. Sally Weaver, (1981) stated, "the Hawthorn Report...argued that the answer for the 'Indian Problem' lay in broad-scale social development programs, and in changing public attitudes, not simplistic legal solutions and rapid legislative action" (6).

The Hawthorn Report, however, never directly questioned the emerging government policy of integration, nor recommended transferring control of education to Indigenous communities. In its analysis, the report focused on the success of Indigenous education, the educational goals of Indigenous people themselves, the role of education in the future of Indigenous people, and on schooling as a need; the ideology behind the integrated school policy. In fact, the Hawthorn Report supported integrated education:

Educational programs should take into account the obvious differences in background of the Indian student...[however,]...the integration of Indian children into public school system should proceed with due concern for all involved and after the full cooperation of local Indians and non-Indians has been secured (Canada 1967:27).

The Hawthorn Report's view of integration differed from previous government policy. Integration was to occur with Indigenous peoples involvement in helping to retain some of their cultural characteristics such as pride of origin, knowledge of their history, passing on of their traditions, and preservation of their languages (Canada 1967). Rather than, as Ahenakew (1974) stated, "driving the Indian out of the Indian" (5).
Despite the failure of integrated education so far in achieving success, the report supported integrated education and claimed that it appeared to be the most feasible of educational alternatives for Indigenous students. Shortcomings were recognized and recommendations for change in Indigenous education were made, but the federal government continued its integration policy with renewed vigour (Nicholas 2001).

The Indigenous educational policy of integration by the federal government of Canada really meant assimilation, with Indigenous people expected to accept the values of the dominant culture. At best, the policy of integration offered an alien and irrelevant program, at worst, one that was downright hostile (Nicholas 2001).

Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy

The integration policy continued and was extended by the federal government in the proposal of the 1969 Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy (The White Paper). The Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, which was published under the authority of Hon. Jean Chretien, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, envisioned the transferring of jurisdiction over Indigenous education and other responsibilities to provincial governments as the final step in the policy of integration. The Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy argued:

That equality, or non-discrimination was the key ingredient in a solution to the problems of Natives, and that special rights had been the major cause of their problems. Equality was to be achieved only by terminating the special
legislation and bureaucracy that had developed over the past century in dealing with Native concerns (1969:6).

The prior report conducted by Hawthorn had focused primarily on striking down barriers to Indigenous people in economic and educational areas. While, the White Paper called for the "political integration" of all Indigenous people as full and equal citizens of Canada, through the termination of all treaties and the transference of responsibility for "Indians" from the federal to provincial governments. According to Nicholas, "it was not until the infamous White Paper of 1969 that Native People fully realized the genocidal intentions of [the federal] government's integration policy" (2001:15).

The White Paper, which proposed the end of special status for Indigenous people as individuals, communities, and as distinct political entities, re-awakened the political consciousness of Indigenous people across Canada. Sally Weaver described, "[that Indigenous people] responded to the policy with a resounding nationalism unparalleled in Canadian history" (1981:5). Weaver contends that Indigenous organizations criticized and rejected the *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian policy* for three main reasons.

First, the policy had not been developed in good faith in terms of the participation during the consultation meetings that had been assured Indigenous peoples, and because of the secrecy that shrouded its formulation. A second concern was the unpredictable treatment Indigenous people might receive at the hands of the provinces and territories. Third and
most important, the policy was seen as a denial of what Indigenous people saw as their special rights (Weaver 1981). Special provisions for health care and education, had been recognized and recommended by the government sponsored 1967 *Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies* (Weaver 1981). According to Weaver:

*The Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* was an abrupt departure from the traditional practice of dealing with [Indigenous] people, even though the implicit long range goal of terminating the special treatment of [Indigenous] people had been a part of government policies since the 1870's (1981:4).

The 1969 *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy*, served as a catalyst for the emergence of Indigenous political activism, while the 1967 *Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*, formed the foundation for the 1972 National Indian Brotherhood (NIB) paper, *Indian Control of Indian Education* (Hare and Barman 2000; Yuzdepski 1993). This led to the third period of internal colonial Indigenous education in Canada: “Indian Control of Indian Education.” The objective was for Indigenous people to take an active role in the schooling of Indigenous children, as board members, teachers, administrators, and resource people.
Indian Control of Indian Education

The National Indian Brotherhood in framing its response to the *Statement of Government of Canada on Indian Policy* based their arguments on a series of reports such as that conducted by Brophé and Aberle in the United States. The most important, however, was the two volumes of the 1967 *Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*, as it argued strongly against the termination of special status for Indigenous people. So, when the Indigenous people responded with *Indian Control of Indian Education*, they had a strong basis in the literature for arguing for a direct and meaningful participation in the making of policies, which affected their future.

Framing of Indian Control of Indian Education

The Hawthorn Report’s recommendations contradicted previous policy, which was seen as paternalistic and which denied Indigenous people the freedom to develop as they wanted and had discouraged any educational initiatives they undertook (RCAP 1996a). One could argue then, that the prime assumption of the Hawthorn Report in framing the Indigenous response, had been that it was imperative that Indigenous people be able to make meaningful choices between desirable alternatives (Canada 1996a). The Hawthorn Report stated, “the reserve is the place of birth, family, of friendship, of one’s language, and of most of the values one shares with others. To the extent that is allowed by its setting within a modern nation, those who own the reserve [should] direct its affairs” (1967:5).
The NIB used the Hawthorn Report to further its primary aim of “Indigenous control” one, which centred on jurisdiction and authority for Indigenous education in relation to political activity and governance rather than mere participation in decision making. Jean Barman, Yvonne Hébert, and Don McCaskill argued:

This means the responsibility to establish financial priorities, to determine programme needs, to deploy personnel, to set curriculum guidelines, to decide on the utilitarian of physical resources, and to negotiate with provincial/territorial and federal school jurisdictions for necessary local education services (1987:9).

In arguing for “control,” the NIB incorporated several key recommendations of the Hawthorn Report into four main policy criteria. The first recommendation focused on the control of curriculum. The Hawthorn Report recommended, “[that] educational programs should take into account the obvious differences in background of the Native student and the differences in values and motivations” (Canada 1967:10). Although the report did not overtly recommend ways of preserving language and cultural traditions, it did recognize the need for remedial programs for Indigenous students. The Hawthorn Report maintained:

The schools serving the majority cannot readily accommodate the children of minority groups but some provisions can be made through special classes, skilled teaching, and sensitive teachers which should enable every child to experience some success and maintain his sense of worth (Canada 1967:15).

The Hawthorn Report argued that the Indian Affairs Branch, through its curriculum division and by arrangements with outside specialists, should develop materials on Indigenous languages and traditions, which could be used as guides for classroom teachers (Canada 1967).
The Hawthorn Report on educational content also recommended that Indigenous parents along with teachers of Indigenous ancestry should develop a curriculum suitable for the Indigenous way of life (Canada 1967). The Hawthorn Report, however, in recommending this policy on the preservation of Indigenous languages and cultural traditions, was unclear about the extent to which these initiatives had to coincide with provincial curricula. *Indian Control of Indian Education* concluded, "[that] to develop an Indian orientated curriculum for schools which enroll Native children, there must be full scale cooperation between federal, provincial and Indian Education people" (Cited in Mallea and Young 1984:75). The NIB tried to clarify and extend the Hawthorn Report recommendations, by proposing changes to curricula as a means of reducing the cultural alienation that Indigenous children had been experiencing. The NIB argued that this could be achieved by establishing a more relevant system, which recognized Indigenous culture, values, customs, languages, and Indigenous contribution to Canadian development (Mallea and Young 1984).

The NIB recommended five specific measures as to how this could be achieved. The first was to appoint Indigenous people to curriculum staff for the purpose of supervising the production and distribution of Indigenous - oriented materials (Mallea and Young 1984). The second was to remove texts or other teaching materials, which were negative, biased or inaccurate in their depictions of what concerned Indigenous history and culture (Mallea and Young 1984). The third was to augment the description of Indigenous contributions to Canadian life in the regular provincial curricula (Mallea and Young 1984). The fourth was to
cooperate with Indigenous people in developing Indigenous studies programs at all levels (Mallea and Young 1984). The fifth and final measure was to eliminate the use of IQ and standardized tests for Indigenous children (Mallea and Young 1984). Margaret Ward (1986) notes, “[that] the NIB established these recommendations on the premise that curriculum content should be the responsibility of the Native communities, based on the principles of ‘Parental Responsibility’ and ‘Local Control’” (11). Indigenous parents must have full responsibility and control of Indigenous education. The NIB argued that the federal government had to adjust its policy and practices to make possible the full participation of Indigenous people in all decisions and activities connected with curriculum (Ward 1986).

The second recommendation by the Hawthorn Report accepted by the NIB was the recommendation that the Indian Affairs Branch encourage the establishment of Indigenous education committees, which would play much the same role as school boards in the non-Indigenous community (Canada 1967). The report made it clear that these recommendations were to be implemented in consultation with Indigenous communities.

It was believed that the role of school committees should be enlarged in the interest of enlisting the special knowledge possessed by the adults of the reserve. In Indigenous communities, elders are known to safeguard the knowledge of tradition, culture, and Indigenous values that constitute the unique inheritance of the community (Coutre 1991). The NIB went beyond the Hawthorn Report’s recommendations. It also used the Standing
Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development’s Fifth Report (The 1971 Watson Report), to emphasize participation by Indigenous parents and communication with Indigenous communities. The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development’s Fifth Report, was written in response to concerns about high dropout-out and unemployment rates, and was preceded by intense pressure by Indigenous organizations to bring these problems to the federal government’s attention (Canada Public Policy 1996). The report noted many deficiencies, like the Hawthorn Report, in the response of federal and provincial governments to the needs of Indigenous people. However, unlike the Hawthorn Report, it recommended a variety of actions aimed at involving parents and communities through education committees and school board participation; making school curriculum and operations more reflective of the Indigenous experience (Canada Public Policy 1996).

One could argue that the main objective then, with regard to school committees, was to prepare Indigenous communities to take control of education. The Department of Indian and Eskimo Affairs in its Annual Report of 1970-1971 and 1971-1972 reported:

The Education Branch continued to assist and encourage Indian communities in their move toward increased participation in school administration. There was continuing consultation with representatives of Indian organizations and bands and with provincial authorities to plan for the future education of Indian children...Indian bands and education committees were increasingly involved in planning and decisions related to school construction, staff selection, negotiating of joint school agreements, boarding homes and student residence operations, and the development of
special education programs reflecting their values and cultural heritage (Canada 1971: 17; 1972:29).

In spite of this recommendation, the Education Branch of Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development obviously intended at the beginning to limit the responsibilities of these committees and the budgets they would use. For example, as mentioned in the Hawthorn Report, “the committee would assume responsibility in areas such as; school attendance and truancy, care of school property and school grounds, use of school buildings for community activities, and band fund appropriation for school activities” (Canada 1967:12). The intention was never to go as far as the NIB recommendation, in which the federal government was to adjust its policy and practices to make possible the full participation of Indigenous people in all decisions and activities connected with education of Indigenous people, not just the care-taking duties of the school (Ward 1986).

The third recommendation of the Hawthorn Report dealt with financing. Ward points out, “provisions of funds for Native education is a federal responsibility arising from its obligations under Treaty and Aboriginal Rights” (1986:11). The Hawthorn Report recommended that band councils be given more responsibility and authority over the control and administration of band funds, which had previously been under the direct control of Indian Affairs. (Canada 1967). The purpose being that to achieve the other goals of giving more control in administrative and curriculum matters, it was necessary to be given a more responsible role in handling financial concerns. The Hawthorn Report recommended giving
the bands authority over operational costs, but did not recommend control over capital cost spending. According to Dianne Longboat:

Canada would be liable to the Indian people for [sic] maladministration of Indian monies, or for the quality of the education provided, the government insists that it can only delegate control over aspects of education when it is satisfied that its standards of financial accountability are met and its policies are followed (1987:35).

The proposed local controlled schools would in effect be merely carrying out Indian Affairs’ programs to a large extent and not originating their own (Friesen 1996).

The fourth recommendation of the Hawthorn Report dealt with political control. The NIB in *Indian Control of Indian Education* declared, “the federal government has legal responsibility for Indian education as defined by the treaties and the *Indian Act*. Any transfer of jurisdiction for Indian education can be only from the federal government to Indian Bands” (Mallea and Young 1984:50). The Hawthorn Report never directly recommended the transfer of political control to Indigenous communities. It argued, “[that] the federal government [should] increasingly...share...responsibility on the part of the Indians, Indian bands, and band councils in the administration of their own affairs” (Canada 1967:12). The report suggested that under certain circumstances greater autonomy should be extended to “management of welfare assistance, community planning, economic development, and school administration, depending on their willingness to accept responsibility” (Canada 1967:25). The NIB in *Indian Control of Indian Education*, however, used the Hawthorn Report in supporting its claim to local control. Longboat maintains:
It argued the Hawthorn Report’s analysis on past practices of using the school committee as an advisory body with limited influence, in restricted areas of the school program, must give way to an education authority with the control of funds and consequent authority which are necessary for an effective decision making body (1987:25).

The NIB furthered the Hawthorn Report’s recommendation, stating that the band itself should determine these conditions, and that the federal government must take the required steps to transfer to local bands the authority and the funds needed for Indigenous education.

In its final analysis, the Hawthorn Report supported integrated education but it also contained a major shortcoming: a neglect for Indigenous students. The Hawthorn Report demonstrated how integration must be radically altered if further education programs are to benefit Indigenous children. The report demonstrated the difficulties of bringing educational reform in the general context of the economic, social, and political deprivation suffered by Indigenous peoples. The Hawthorn Report argued, “developments have dragged the home and the reserve in their wake. Commerce, government, industry, and settlement have affected every reserve without the Indian being able to feel that he has had much part in what is happening” (Canada 1967:7).

The report recommended that better employment, better health and livelihood, more capital for enterprise, and a greater voice in government and decisions could be obtained by better educational programs that respond to Indigenous needs. As schooling is a community
vehicle for socialization, consultation with Indigenous peoples on matters of great concern, such as education, should be a primary goal. Sonia Brooks (1991) concludes:

The NIB in *Indian Control of Indian Education*, took the recommendations of the Hawthorn Report to the next level by presenting the argument that to ensure education as a vehicle for socialization, First Nations education should fully come under First Nations control. This means curriculum and programs, administration and teachers, facilities and services, as well as financial control. (177).

By recommending these changes, the NIB intended to reverse the trend toward assimilation, outlined in the *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy*. Weaver states, “the NIB declared [that such an implementation] would lead to the destruction of a nation of people by legislation and cultural genocide” (1981:45). Without the Hawthorn Report, *Indian Control of Indian Education* would not have had a strong basis for argument.

The NIB’s use of a thoroughly researched government document, which supported their claims, enabled them to propose a clear and precise mandate for greater self-determination. J. R. Miller (1996) points out the NIB emerged at the most tumultuous point in the evolution of Canada’s “Indian Educational Policy.”

**Realities of Indian Control of Indian Education**

In the meantime, the federal government was pressing forward with its integration program, moving to close residential schools, and about to terminate Indigenous responsibilities, with the implementation of the *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* (Miller 1997).
But this process was soon reversed. In 1974, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) responded quickly by accepting the policy proposed by the NIB, but redefined "control" to mean "a degree of participation" (Longboat 1987). This definition allowed the department to move slowly, as it was not in any way prepared financially, administratively, or philosophically to implement Indigenous control. It created a varying interpretation of the objectives, delivery methods, and financial expectations of the NIB Indian Control of Indian Education policy (Longboat 1987).

Unfortunately, the policy's intentions have never been completely recognized. True Indian Controlled schools in Canada are almost non-existent (Pauls 1984; Nicholas 2001). Nicholas explains, that "most band-operated schools, rather than tailoring their own program to suit their particular communities and culture [adopted] the cultural inclusion model (an add on) – rather than the cultural base model" (2001:16). Where communities have managed to gain some measure of control, it is soon discovered that administration and control are two different things. While the communities do get to administer some educational monies, hire their own teachers, and develop some policies and procedures, in reality, the funds are woefully insufficient, and local decisions are heavily circumscribed by federal and provincial governments. Most schools for Indigenous children fall under provincial curriculum mandates, lack Indigenous language instruction, relevant curriculum, and continue to have high failure rates. Even with some elements of Indigenous control, most of the structures,

After nearly thirty years of Indian Control of Indian Education, Nicholas (2001) insists, "it is patently clear that assimilation is still the driving force in Native education policy, even on reserves" (17). Eber Hampton (1995) suggests, a century or more of cultural conflict, non-Indigenous - oriented schools, and non-Indigenous trained Indigenous educators has left major obstacles in the way of Indigenous controlled schools. Hampton argues, "[that] First Nations languages have declined, non-First Nations standards are usually used to evaluate First Nations schools and teachers, the development of First Nations curricula and First Nations educational methods are underdeveloped, and funding is uncertain and usually controlled by non-First Nations people" (1995:7).

The NIB policy Indian Control of Indian Education brought forth a new era of Indigenous political awareness in dealing with the government and Canada. It raised public awareness of the situation of Indigenous peoples. It portrayed a dismal image of Indigenous education and made extensive recommendations for improvement. It has been a focus of policy discourse since its publication; however, it has never fully been implemented under the spirit it was drafted.
While the most recent studies of Indigenous education credit the Indian Control of Indian Education policy almost entirely for the improvements that have been made in Indigenous education over the past three decades, it is impossible to forget that, overall, Indigenous education is still in an atrocious state from almost any perspective (Nicholas 2001). Many reasons have been identified for the lack of full autonomy in education, which were outlined in the 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (Nicholas 2001).

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

The 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples can be regarded as instrumental for contextualizing Indigenous relations historically and currently within Canada. Hare and Barman contend, “if a key character of postcolonial critique and analysis is that all vestiges of colonization ought to be scrutinized in the light of the experiences and perspectives of marginalized people, then the RCAP foreshadows an age that will follow our postcolonial times” (2000:351). The RCAP allowed a forum for Indigenous people to really begin a process of decolonization. Indigenous people since the post World War II years have become aware of their iniquitous, disadvantaged position in Canadian society and have taken considerable measure to resist Canadian domination and control. However, nowhere have the issues been addressed most forcefully by all participants, than in the RCAP.
The initiatives presented in the RCAP, reflect a continuing process characterized by intensive political activity on the part of Indigenous people, their leaders, and supporters. The final commission report published in 1996 made the following recommendations:

- Indigenous control of education.
- Courses in Indigenous studies, including history, language, and culture in provincial curricula.
- Training and hiring of more Indigenous teachers.
- Inclusion of Indigenous parents, elders, and educators in the education of Indigenous children.
- Special support programs for Indigenous students, for example: counselling, substance abuse education, and remedial education and retention programs.
- Indigenous language instruction from pre-school to post-secondary education.
- The resolution of federal, provincial and territorial conflict over responsibilities and recognition by the federal government of its funding responsibility for education.
- Training Indigenous adults for teaching, para-professional, and administrative positions in education. (Canada 1996c)

The Commission throughout its hearings heard the call for Indigenous control of education. There was a clear consensus from Indigenous organizations that control over policy, curriculum, and support services is necessary to create an educational experience that
reinforces the positive identity of Indigenous students and enables them to succeed academically. Presenters told the Commission that education must develop children and youth as Indigenous citizens, linguistically and culturally competent to assume responsibilities for their communities. The youth that emerge from school must be grounded in a strong, positive Indigenous identity. Consistent with Indigenous traditions, education must develop the whole child, intellectually, spiritually, emotionally, and physically. (Canada Discussion Paper 2: Focusing the Dialogue 1993). Presenter's argued:

[Currently] educational practices fail to recognize these goals. The majority of First Nations youth do not complete high school. They leave the school system without the requisite skills for employment, and without the language and cultural knowledge of their people. Rather than nurturing the individual, the school experience typically erodes identity and self-worth (Canada Discussion Paper 2: Focusing the Dialogue 1993).

Indigenous people rightly expected education to serve as a vehicle for cultural change and economic renewal. They recognized that this would not happen without critical changes in education processes and systems. Indigenous educational objectives despite some successes in gaining control of education are far from being realized. Issues of authority, jurisdiction, control, and implementation remain.

While Indigenous control of Indigenous education is well underway, it remains incomplete both in substance and degree.
CHAPTER 4

INDIGENOUS URBAN EXPERIENCE

Realities

Relative Neglect of the Urban Dimension

Public Policy discussions about Indigenous people tend to focus on the reserve-based population. This oversight is problematic as it ignores the urban realities of Canada's Indigenous population (Hanselmann 2001). This is evident with the 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples relative neglect of the urban dimension. The Commission's preference for the landed Indigenous nation over the urban Indigenous community, manifested in a relative absence of the latter (Cairns 2000). Cairns (2000) advances, that "the lesser importance to the Commission of 'Indigenous groups without any form of land base' was systematic, not accidental" (124). It was indicated in its early 1993 publication, *Partners in Confederation: Aboriginal Peoples, Self-Government and the Constitution*, which stated that, "their situation 'poses a range of complex problems that cannot be dealt with here'" (44).

The relative inattention paid to the urban Indigenous population flows directly from the Commission's decision to focus not on the several positive indicators of the urban
experience, but "on the survival and maintenance of Aboriginal cultural identities in urban society" (Cairns 2000:125). From this perspective, the urban setting has little to offer:

- Intermarriage rates are high, projected at 62 percent for off-reserve status Indians.
- Knowledge of Indigenous languages erodes, especially among the young.
- The link to the Indigenous nation of origin is attenuated, or identification with a particular nation is replaced by a diffuse Indigenous identity (Cairns 2000).

Cairns argues that, "the survival of cultural Indigeneity in the urban setting is problematic from the Commission's perspective compared to the more favourable situation of territorially bounded communities" (2000:125).

Despite the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples neglect or unwillingness to broach the urban situation, the urban Indigenous population is growing rapidly; indeed it has doubled in the past decade (Richards 2001; Wherrett and Brown 1994). According to the 1951 census, only 7 percent lived in urban areas; according to the 2001 census, nearly 50 percent did (Canada DIAND 2001). That year, the Department of Indian Affairs registered 690,101 Indians under the Indian Act, of whom 396,688 — less than 60 percent — lived — on-reserve (Canada DIAND 2001). See Table 3.1. That is just registered Indians, there are additional hundreds of thousands of people (no one is sure of how many) of partly Indian ancestry who call themselves Métis, non-status Indians, or just Canadians (Flanagan 2000). The 2001 Census conducted by Statistics Canada reported, just over 1.3 million people as having at least some Aboriginal ancestry, representing 4.4% of the total population (Statistics
Canada 2003). In 2001, a total of 976,305 persons identified themselves with one (or more) of these groups. The count was 22% higher than the 1996 figure of 799,010 (Statistics Canada 2003). In contrast, the non-Aboriginal population grew only 3.4% between 1996 and 2001 (Statistics Canada 2003).²⁰ See Table 3.2.

Table 3.1 National Registered Indian Population by Type of Residence, December 31, 1981 - 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On Reserve</th>
<th>Off Reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>203,517</td>
<td>96,290</td>
<td>299,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>210,779</td>
<td>96,538</td>
<td>307,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>218,117</td>
<td>98,412</td>
<td>316,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>223,169</td>
<td>100,101</td>
<td>323,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>228,517</td>
<td>104,545</td>
<td>333,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>235,642</td>
<td>123,642</td>
<td>359,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>242,837</td>
<td>147,424</td>
<td>390,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>254,074</td>
<td>170,118</td>
<td>424,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>260,760</td>
<td>186,666</td>
<td>447,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>273,992</td>
<td>196,974</td>
<td>470,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>284,649</td>
<td>207,032</td>
<td>491,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>295,032</td>
<td>217,798</td>
<td>512,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>305,247</td>
<td>226,872</td>
<td>532,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>314,843</td>
<td>237,014</td>
<td>551,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>325,453</td>
<td>245,131</td>
<td>570,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>331,289</td>
<td>256,505</td>
<td>587,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>341,825</td>
<td>261,629</td>
<td>603,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>351,671</td>
<td>266,687</td>
<td>618,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>360,707</td>
<td>275,112</td>
<td>635,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>368,556</td>
<td>283,506</td>
<td>652,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>396,688</td>
<td>293,413</td>
<td>690,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: On Reserve includes on reserve and on Crown land (Canada DIAND 2001)
Table 3.2 Population Reporting Aboriginal Ancestry and Aboriginal Identity, Canada, 1996-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Aboriginal Ancestry¹</td>
<td>1,319,890</td>
<td>1,101,960</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aboriginal Identity</td>
<td>976,305</td>
<td>799,010</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Indian²</td>
<td>608,850</td>
<td>529,040</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Métis²</td>
<td>292,310</td>
<td>204,115</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inuit²</td>
<td>45,070</td>
<td>40,220</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple and Other Aboriginal Responses³</td>
<td>30,080</td>
<td>25,640</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Also known as Aboriginal origin.
2. Includes persons who reported a North American Indian, Métis or Inuit identity only.
3. Includes persons who reported more than one Aboriginal identity group (North American Indian, Métis or Inuit) and those who reported being a Registered Indian and/or Band member without reporting an Aboriginal identity.

(Statistics Canada 2003)

Census data shows a slow, but steady growth among Indigenous people living in urban centres across Canada. In 2001, almost one-half (49%) of the population who identified themselves as Aboriginal lived in urban centres, up from 47% in 1996 (Statistics Canada 2003). At the same time, the proportion of Aboriginal people who lived on Indian reserves and settlements declined from 33% to 31% (Statistics Canada 2003). Through a combination of social, economic, and political factors, migration to cities has increased and can be expected to increase.²¹ See Table 3.3 and 3.4.
Table 3.3 Summary Results of Canada and DIAND Regions, Average Growth, 1998 - 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>16,828</td>
<td>8,716</td>
<td>25,544</td>
<td>20,882</td>
<td>8,834</td>
<td>29,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>43,955</td>
<td>18,020</td>
<td>61,975</td>
<td>54,834</td>
<td>17,174</td>
<td>72,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>78,416</td>
<td>72,390</td>
<td>150,806</td>
<td>98,030</td>
<td>75,750</td>
<td>173,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man.</td>
<td>67,80</td>
<td>34,874</td>
<td>102,674</td>
<td>93,668</td>
<td>38,834</td>
<td>132,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>53,402</td>
<td>49,904</td>
<td>103,306</td>
<td>73,306</td>
<td>56,355</td>
<td>129,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>55,025</td>
<td>27,476</td>
<td>82,501</td>
<td>75,361</td>
<td>30,086</td>
<td>105,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>82,501</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>8,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.</td>
<td>57,725</td>
<td>51,788</td>
<td>109,513</td>
<td>75,275</td>
<td>54,114</td>
<td>129,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>10,874</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>14,945</td>
<td>13,058</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>17,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>387,878</td>
<td>270,946</td>
<td>658,824</td>
<td>508,876</td>
<td>289,334</td>
<td>798,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Canada DIAND 2000)

For additional statistics, see Appendix B; C; D; E; F; G; H and I.

Table 3.4 Aboriginal Identity Population for Canada by Area of Residence, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Area of Residence</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population1</th>
<th>North American Indian Population</th>
<th>Métis Population</th>
<th>Inuit Population</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - Area of Residence</td>
<td>29,639,035</td>
<td>976,305</td>
<td>608,850</td>
<td>292,305</td>
<td>45,075</td>
<td>28,662,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Reserve</td>
<td>321,855</td>
<td>286,080</td>
<td>272,410</td>
<td>7,315</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>35,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Off Reserve</td>
<td>29,317,175</td>
<td>690,225</td>
<td>336,435</td>
<td>284,995</td>
<td>43,260</td>
<td>28,626,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes the Aboriginal groups (North American Indian, Métis and Inuit), multiple Aboriginal responses and Aboriginal responses not included elsewhere.

(Statistics Canada 2003)

For additional statistics, see Appendix J and K.

The urbanization of Indigenous people is especially apparent in Western Canada, particularly the Prairie Region. Two-thirds of Canada's urban Indigenous population lives in Western
Canada, and six of the seven cities with the highest proportions of Indigenous people are in the West (Canada DIAND 2002). Winnipeg had the greatest number, followed by Edmonton, Vancouver, Calgary, Saskatoon, and Regina. For example, the 55,755 Aboriginal people who lived in Winnipeg represented 8% of its total population. Five years earlier, Winnipeg had 45,750 Aboriginal people who account for 7% of its population (Statistics Canada 2003). The highest concentration in 2001 was in Saskatoon, whose 20,275 Aboriginal people accounted for 9% of its population (Statistics Canada 2003). See Table 3.5, Table 3.6, Table 3.7, Table 3.8 and Figure 3.1 and Figure 3.2.

Table 3.5 Prairie Region Registered Indian Population by Type of Residence, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>On Reserve</th>
<th>Off Reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>58,046</td>
<td>29,657</td>
<td>87,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>55,340</td>
<td>53,461</td>
<td>108,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>69,689</td>
<td>40,099</td>
<td>109,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Region</td>
<td>189,075</td>
<td>123,217</td>
<td>306,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: On reserve includes on reserve and Crown land (Canada DIAND 2001).

Table 3.6 Aboriginal Identity Population for Alberta Census Metropolitan Areas, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>114.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Includes the Aboriginal groups (North American Indian, Métis and Inuit), multiple Aboriginal responses and Aboriginal responses not included elsewhere.

(Statistics Canada 2003)

Table 3.7 Aboriginal Identity Population for Saskatchewan Census Metropolitan Areas, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes the Aboriginal groups (North American Indian, Métis and Inuit), multiple Aboriginal responses and Aboriginal responses not included elsewhere.

(Statistics Canada 2003)

Table 3.7 Aboriginal Identity Population for Manitoba Census Metropolitan Areas, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes the Aboriginal groups (North American Indian, Métis and Inuit), multiple Aboriginal responses and Aboriginal responses not included elsewhere.

(Statistics Canada 2003)

For additional statistics, see Appendix L and M.
The urban Indigenous population on a whole is younger, more female, more transient, and more dependent on transfer income, than the urban population in general. Indeed an overall picture of poverty, unemployment, low-level housing standards, poor health, and low-levels of educational attainment prevail.\textsuperscript{23} For additional statistics, see Appendix N; O and P.
What happens to the Indigenous migrants when they get to the city?

For the most part, Indigenous urban people are consistently concentrated in core areas of Canadian cities (Richards 2000). Particularly in the Prairie Region, they live disproportionately in the "poorest of urban neighborhoods," neighborhoods that Richards (2001) describes as "displaying characteristics associated with the 'ghettos' of the US cities" (4).

Michael Hatfield (1997), a researcher at the Department of Human Resources Development, defines "very poor neighborhoods" as those census tracts in which family poverty rates are more than twice the Canadian national average" (Cited in Richards 2001:4).

Driedger (1996) offers an explanation for the high levels of clustering of Indigenous people. He argues, "Aboriginals in Canadian cities are forced to live in the inner cities because of unemployment, low incomes, and often discrimination" (Cited in Todd 2001:101).

If policy makers fail to address these conditions, then Indigenous - non-Indigenous disparities will continue and may lead to serious inequities within Canadian cities, including the possibility of ghettoization, leading to increased isolation, increased social tensions, and reduced opportunities (Barron and Garcea 1999; Fixico 2000; Hanselmann 2001; Lobo and Peters 2001; Richards 2000).

Racism/Discrimination

The stark reality is that the majority of Indigenous people face discrimination, ethnocentrism, blatant racism, marginalization, and poverty (Binda 2001; Fixico 2000; Lobo
and Peters 2001). Binda (2001) argues, "ethnocentrism on the part of mainstream Canada is perhaps the crux of the problem, for it breeds racism, discrimination, marginalization and poverty" (181).

Racism and discrimination can come in many forms, individual, systemic or ideological. Racism is a form of discrimination. It is prejudice, backed up by institutional power, used to the advantage of one group and to the disadvantage of another (Calgary 2000). The Report of National Roundtable on Aboriginal Urban Issues (1994) entitled, *Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres* concluded, racism and discrimination against Indigenous people in urban centres is pervasive. Indigenous people face racial discrimination daily across the country, in every urban centre, on the streets, at work, and sometimes at home (Canada RCAP Aboriginal Urban Issues 1994). “Racism is so prevalent that many Indigenous people simply accept violent racism and racial discrimination as a ‘normal’ fact of life” (Canada RCAP Aboriginal Urban Issues 1994:7). Participants within the roundtable “blamed attitudes and negative stereotypes for racist behaviour and policy. They said these attitudes and negative stereotypes are widespread and ingrained” (1994:7). They also blamed “negative stereotypes conveyed through books, taught in schools, and reported on the evening news” (7). Participants proposed that “there should be better textbooks in Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal schools” (7). They argued, “some books should be banned, because they depict Natives as ‘greasy boozing people’ or ‘as nomads who live in tents,’ [and that] this image permeates the Aboriginal self-image, particularly Aboriginal urban people who lack contact
with their own culture” (10). As a result, constant reinforcement of negative perceptions and expectations of them affects their sense of self-esteem, self worth, and cultural identity (Canada RCAP Aboriginal Urban Issues 1994). Under constant threat of personal, cultural, and societal reinforcement of negative attitudes, it becomes difficult for young people to construct a positive image (Canada RCAP Aboriginal Urban Issues 1994). Much of the discrimination Indigenous people face is institutional and systemic. Children learn to hate themselves in school, especially in the city, because nobody is teaching according to Indigenous culture and values, and when Indigenous issues are addressed, outdated culturally inappropriate teaching models are used (Smith 1999).

Participants within the roundtable, connected many of these problems with “cultural degradation and erosion: colonialism, assimilation, loss of language, loss of tradition, lack of traditional or cultural institutions and structures, loss of identity and low self-esteem” (Canada RCAP Aboriginal Urban Issues 1994). Participants explained “they have tried to combine the social services they provide to Indigenous urban people with cultural components to deal with the effects of cultural erosion and loss of identity” (7). They emphasized that, “solutions to social problems in Indigenous urban communities that fail to address the cultural, emotional and spiritual needs of Indigenous people are merely band-aid solutions” (7).
The structural problems are obvious. There is a general lack of funding and support attributed in large measure to a disturbing ignorance on the part of all levels of government of the depth and the nature of the problems in Indigenous urban communities (Binda 2001; Burns 2000; Canada RCAP Aboriginal Urban Issues 1994; Caulfield and Peake 1996; Dosman 1972; Graham 1995; Richards 2001; Todd 2001). There is a duplication of some services, insufficient co-ordination, and a total lack of other services. Participants' argued, “the problems can be addressed only by creating central [Indigenous] urban organizations that could streamline and create coherence where there is now underfunding, artificial divisions and confusion” (Canada RCAP Aboriginal Urban Issues 1994). Mostly, though, there is a jurisdictional void: all levels of government offload their responsibilities to Indigenous urban people upon other levels of government. As a result, participants at the roundtable felt that “all' governments, including Indigenous governments, deny their obligations to Indigenous urban people” (11).

Policies and Programmes

Introduction

This section of the study attempts to provide an overview of the complex array of policies and principal features of programs established within Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba over the years focusing in on the particular field of education. In preparing this section, I have paid particular attention to a variety of issues encountered in the formation of policies
and/or in the development of programs for urban Indigenous people. These issues are not primarily conceptual or theoretical, although those aspects may be quite significant. Rather, they are political in the sense that they involve controversy and power struggles between and within Canada’s Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities. Because of this reality, this section of the study does not offer solutions to the problems. It’s aim is to shed light on what the issues entail, on the implications of various possibilities for the future, and on the factors that will need to be dealt with in finding a resolution. In analyzing the development of educational policies and programs for urban Indigenous people, a number of facets of the policies and programs addressed by various authors, Breton and Grant (1984), Cairns (2000), Caulfield and Peake (1996), Graham (1995), Hanselmann (2001; 2002), Richards (2001), Todd (2001), and Wherrett and Brown (1994) must be considered:

1. The cultural and ideological assumptions that underlie the definition of the problems faced by Indigenous people in urban centres.

2. The social theories that are implicitly or explicitly used to identify the causes of those problems and the kind of action required to deal with them.

3. The organizational theories that define or justify the structures established for implementing the policies and programs, and the standards that have established the criteria of eligibility for each policy and program.

4. The organizational structures and processes through which the various policies and programs are implemented.
5. The legal/administrative apparatus to which the specification of policies and programs and their implementation are subject.

6. The network of agencies and groups involved in the definition and operation of the policies and programs; and

7. The level of resources channelled into the various policies and programs, the problems encountered in mobilizing those resources, and the system of rules, procedures and agencies through which the programs are administered.

Policy Vacuum

Despite, the growing number of urban Indigenous people and the increasing realization that they constitute a permanent presence in urban centres across Canada, little attention has been paid to them and their needs by either land-based Indigenous governments, Indigenous organizations, or non-Indigenous governments (Breton and Grant 1984; Caulfield and Peake 1996; Hanselmann 2001; Richards 2001; Todd 2001; Wherrett and Brown 1994). Since the early 1970s, governments and other departments and agencies have reacted in a variety of ways to the increasing urbanization of Indigenous people. Sometimes they have shown indifference, but often they have developed new policies and corresponding programs or have extended or adapted existing programs to serve urban Indigenous people (Breton and Grant 1984). “Canadian governments have historically been hesitant to create policies specific to urban Indigenous people” (Hanselmann 2001:9). Richards (2001) argues, Canadian policymakers have failed to adjust to this reality, and have concentrated too much
on rural reserve-based Indigenous concerns. Conflicting views about governmental responsibilities have long complicated policy for Indigenous peoples. Hanselmann (2001) proposes “much of this hesitancy is related to disagreements over the unclear and controversial question of legislative authority, and therefore responsibility, for urban [Indigenous] peoples” (9). The issue of responsibility affects matters of jurisdiction, access to services and programs, and financing. Section 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867 confers jurisdiction over “Indians, and Lands reserved for the Indians” on the federal government. This has given the federal government exclusive legislative jurisdiction over treaties and reserves, and wide authority over the lives of Indigenous peoples. However, the federal government has chosen to limit its responsibility (Richards 2001). The application of special federal laws and programs are limited to those defined as status Indians in the Indian Act (Wherrett and Brown 1994).

Since the 1960s, the federal government has also generally restricted its responsibility for the provision of services and funding to status Indian off-reserve population. According to Hanselmann, “as a result, the federal government has traditionally focused its attention towards on-reserve status Indians, and in a policy sense, has largely ignored Indigenous people living off reserves, including urban Indigenous people” (2001:10). While the situation varies from province to province, the federal government pays all or some of the costs for on-reserve services, while the provinces or the bands act as delivery agents. Otherwise, expenditures and responsibility for off-reserve status Indians are the
responsibility of the provinces (Breton and Grant 1984; Frideres 1988; Todd 2001; Wherrett and Brown 1994; Wotherspoon and Satzewich 1993).

Hanselmann (2001) points out, “the provinces, have historically responded, that all Indigenous people are the primary responsibility of the federal government and that provincial duties are limited to serving Indigenous people as part of the larger provincial population” (10). Provinces have argued that they have no special responsibility for Indigenous people. According to Wherrett and Brown, “aside from some special programs aimed at all Indigenous peoples, provincial governments have generally treated status Indians and non-status Indians as part of the general provincial population for the funding and provision of services” (1994:6). Provincial governments have therefore been hesitant to take any policy actions targeted towards Indigenous people.

Hanselmann (2001) notes that, “in absence of federal and provincial action, municipalities have often been left to create policies to provide for the needs of urban Indigenous people – and frequently lacked capacity to do so” (10). According to Hanselmann, “the outcome of this policy void has been that urban Indigenous people have largely fallen through the cracks” (2001:10). The lack of agreement over responsibility has been identified as leading to “inconclusive activity” (Breton and Grant 1984:XXX) and a “policy vacuum” (Canada RCAP 1996b:542). Where policies do exist, they “have evolved ad hoc” and are often seen as inadequate (Canada RCAP 1996b:544). The “policy vacuum,” which is not being filled
effectively by any level of government, results inevitably in serious deficiencies in public services for Indigenous people in urban centres. The first problem with services relates to the fundamental nature of needs; the second relates to the structure and financing of services to respond to the needs (Canada RCAP 1992). As a result, there are three issues pertaining to the type of action to be pursued:

1. Should, programs be created to accelerate the adaptation of Indigenous people to mainstream institutions?
2. Should, programs be created to adapt non-Indigenous institutions to the culture of Indigenous people?
3. Should, much emphasis be given to remedial, preventive, and developmental programs (Canada RCAP 1992; Hanselmann 2002)?

The first two categories include programs that attempt to deal with immediate problems or with the symptoms of problems, while the third category, preventive programs aims to alleviate the causes of problems (Hanselmann 2002). Such developmental programs attempt to create opportunities for socio-economic activities and to rebuild Indigenous communities (Breton and Grant 1984). The question is how far should the process go in each institutional area (Hanselmann 2001)?

*Defining Urban Indigenous Policy, Programs, and Services*

Hanselmann (2001) advances that, a public policy signals first, “that a government recognizes both the importance of an issue and the government’s responsibility to address
the situation. Second, [that] public policies help maintain lines of responsibility as elected officials make policy decisions, and are responsible to the public for these decisions” (12). Public policies are therefore fundamental to the connection between government and the public (Hanselmann 2001). For the purpose of this study, “an urban Indigenous policy is an explicit public expression of a governmental or departmental approach to addressing issues confronting urban Indigenous people” (Hanselmann 2001:12). According to Hanselmann, the document must:

1. Specifically mention Indigenous people in an urban setting; or
2. Be Indigenous-specific and include an urban component; or

The federal, provincial, municipal, and Indigenous governments usually choose one of three strategies in responding to the socio-economic conditions of urban Indigenous people:

1. No response (do nothing).
2. General Application Policies and Programs: Policies and programs that provide services to urban Indigenous people as members of the general population. This type of response does not identify any designated sub-population (Hanselmann 2002).
3. Enhanced Policies and Programs: These policies and programs provide designated populations, such as Indigenous people with special consideration beyond, which is available to the general population. For example, “programs that are designed and/or intended to serve urban Indigenous people as the specific designated population;
programs designed for Indigenous people, but with explicit content related to urban areas; and programs designed for urban areas, but with explicit content related to Indigenous people” (2002:2).

**Federal Urban Indigenous Policies and Programs**

Historically, the federal government has been hesitant to provide programs and services for Indigenous people living off-reserve (Barron and Garcea 1999; Hanselmann 2002). “However, as more and more Indigenous people migrated to – or were born within – cities, the federal government responded (albeit tentatively) with some urban Indigenous programming” (6).

For example, in 1996, the federal government responded to the needs of urban Indigenous people through *Gathering Strength – Canada’s Aboriginal Action Plan*. Within this policy statement, the federal government specifically mentioned the issues and concerns of urban Indigenous people. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples identified three important concerns:

1. First, urban Indigenous people do not receive the same level of services and benefits that Indigenous people living on reserve obtain from the federal government.
2. Second, urban Indigenous people often have difficulty gaining access to provincial programs available to other residents.
3. Third, urban Indigenous people have limited access to culturally appropriate programs in urban centres (Canada RCAP 1996c).

The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples stated that “[m]any called this the most critical issue facing urban Indigenous people” (Canada RCAP 1996c:538). Although the RCAP identified the issues and concerns of urban Indigenous people and included recommendations meant to close the policy gaps with respect to urban Indigenous people, according to Cairns (2000) and Hanselmann (2002) no implementation of the specifics of the policy framework by the government has occurred.

Provincial Urban Indigenous Policies and Programs

“A consistent historical theme among provincial governments has been that provinces believe they have no special, constitutional mandated responsibility for [Indigenous] people, and that the federal government is not fulfilling its responsibilities in this respect” (Hanselmann 2001:13). Consequently, the provinces have tended to avoid urban Indigenous policies and programs. However, within the last twenty years several key reports, assessments, and studies have been conducted on urban Indigenous people, identifying problems, needs, and services. For example, in 1981 the Ontario Minister of Culture and Recreation established a task force to improve the quality of life of Indigenous people migrating to and residing in urban areas. The report entitled Native People in Urban Settings: Problems, Needs and Services, sought through co-operative efforts, to develop the opportunities and resources whereby Indigenous people may determine their own future, while adjusting
to an urban environment and retaining their cultural heritage. The report’s objectives were
to:

1. Identify needs of Indigenous people migrating to and residing in urban areas.
2. Identify and evaluate resources available to urban Indigenous people.
3. Determine resource requirements based on Indigenous people’s needs and the services
currently available.
4. Identify and clarify areas of jurisdictional responsibility and limitations; and
5. Develop a plan that would meet the identified needs and achieve stated goals (Ontario

Prairie Region Urban Indigenous Policies and Programs

The Prairie provinces have traditionally provided programming and services for off-reserve
Indigenous people through programs and services for the general population. However,
recent initiatives in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba have designed policies and
programs to specifically address the challenges confronting urban Indigenous people.

Alberta

In Alberta, the provincial government currently does not have a specific urban Indigenous
policy. The provincial government, however, has created an overall Indigenous policy
framework entitled, Strengthening Relationships. This framework created in 2000, sets out the
basic structure for existing and new Government of Alberta policies to address First
Nations, Métis, and other Indigenous issues in Alberta. The framework's initiative is to address improving socio-economic opportunities for Indigenous people and communities and to clarify roles and responsibilities of federal, provincial, municipal, and Indigenous governments and communities (Alberta 2000). According to the framework, “responsibility to First Nation[s], Métis, and other Indigenous people has long been an area of disagreement between federal and provincial governments” (2000:16). As a result, “confusion over whether the federal or provincial government is, or ought to be responsible for which programs and services, has resulted in inconsistency, duplication and unnecessary costs” (Alberta 2000:16).

Saskatchewan

The province of Saskatchewan currently has a government-wide policy statement that covers urban Indigenous people. *A Framework for Cooperation* initiated in 1999 as a discussion paper, resulted in a policy statement by 2001. It set out the government’s vision, principles, and key goals with respect to urban Indigenous people in the province. The framework’s intent is to guide future initiatives in four policy fields: education and training, workforce development, employment and economic development, and individual and community well-being (Saskatchewan 2001). In addition, to the policy statement Saskatchewan Education currently has a departmental policy statement encouraging the “Community Schools Model” for Indigenous communities, which includes urban Indigenous communities (Hanselmann 2001).
Manitoba

The Province of Manitoba currently does not have an urban Indigenous policy (Hanselmann 2001). According to Hanselmann, the previous government had drafted a comprehensive policy statement entitled, the *Urban Aboriginal Strategy*, and was working on implementation when control of the legislature changed hands. Hanselmann notes, ‘this document is no longer considered government policy and nothing has replaced it’ (2001:14).

Prairie Region Municipal Urban Indigenous Policies

Historically, municipalities in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba have provided programs and services to urban Indigenous people in the normal course of serving their residents. More recently, some municipalities have also started to establish and deliver programs for urban Indigenous people (Hanselmann 2002).

Municipal governments in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba have jurisdiction only in those areas delegated to them by their respective provincial governments, although the delegation can be very broad in scope (Hanselmann 2001). In Calgary, Edmonton, and Regina the current municipal governments do not have a government wide urban Indigenous policy. However, each respective centre has varying department-specific policy directives. Saskatoon and Winnipeg, unlike the other prairie municipal centres have developed a comprehensive framework to guide city decision, policies and programs. For example, Winnipeg’s *Plan Winnipeg...Toward 2010* has developed specific policy statements
for Indigenous people in the fields of education, training, employment, economic development, housing, and cultural support (Winnipeg 1993).

Indigenous Initiated Urban Policies

The resulting uncertainty over responsibility has created problems for all Indigenous peoples, and particularly those living off reserve. Wherrett and Brown (1994) argue, "disputes over jurisdiction have led to the inadequate provision of services and funding. As well, federal-provincial differences have interfered with [Indigenous] peoples' efforts to assume responsibility for the provision of their own programs and services" (7). As a result, Wherrett and Brown note, the problems: economic, social, and cultural, faced by Indigenous peoples in Canadian urban centres has led them to develop services and institutions to suit their particular needs, and to redress their severe problems. Wherrett and Brown insist, "these institutions however, have been limited by a lack of autonomy and inadequate and inconsistent funding" (1994:8). These Indigenous organizations also have to comply with municipal, provincial, and federal directives and program standards that are not directed to the needs of Indigenous communities (Wherrett and Brown 1994).

Given the variety of urban situations, Indigenous peoples have an obvious interest in ensuring that their fundamental rights are not tied to residence in a particular territory. While some Indigenous communities in urban areas are located within traditional lands and have rights tied to that territory, for example the Muskeg Lake First Nation in Saskatoon,
Saskatchewan, many urban residents live outside their original territories or move between communities (Barron and Garcea 1999; Wherrett and Brown 1994). Thus, as Wherrett and brown point out, “it may be necessary to provide for the mobility of Indigenous rights, to ensure that Indigenous peoples living in mixed communities outside traditional lands will be able to protect their cultures, languages and traditions” (1994:13). Wherrett and Brown argue the institution of certain “legal measures to provide for mobility [could] ensure that rights would not necessarily be attached to [a] land base, thus allowing for a variety of forms of urban self-government (1994:13).

Forms of Urban Self-Government

Models for Aboriginal Government in Urban Areas (1994) presented three models: a community of interest model, a neighborhood model, and an extra-territorial model all based on the distribution of urban populations.

A Community of Interest Model

The community of interest model is best adapted to an Indigenous population, which is dispersed throughout the city. In this model the concept of “territory” “would be cultural rather than geographic, and the jurisdiction would be defined accordingly, resulting in different institutions for various segments of the population” (Wherrett and Brown 1994:13). For example, Indigenous school boards within the province and its cities (Richards 2001). This would work like other school boards where municipal taxpayers,
Indigenous and non-Indigenous contribute to part of the cost of one or another of these school boards, choosing which board their taxes will support, while the remaining cost is funded by the federal and provincial governments (Wherrett and Brown 1994). The individual school boards would have enough authority under these agreements to design and implement educational programs that meet their community needs, while maintaining the provincial curricula standards set by their respective provincial governments. Richards (2001) suggests, such institutions as Indigenous school boards, could provide levels of community autonomy without adversely affecting the public provision of services to the community as a whole.

A Neighborhood Model

The neighborhood model is best adapted to an Indigenous population concentrated in a particular area, such as a neighborhood (Wherrett and Brown 1994). Wherrett and Brown point out that these communities might be able to take on a larger governing role than the community of interest model. For example, in 1972 E. Dosman in Indians: The Urban Dilemma recommended the creation of an Indigenous enclave in the urban environment. He suggested “that a carefully designed self-governing native residential community could provide support for urban Indians in adapting to the urban setting, and help to meet their economic, political, and psychological needs” (183). The community could assist with economic development and opportunities, and could provide child-care, education, and other services (Fixico 2000). Krotz (1980) discusses, a federally funded feasibility study,
which looked into the creation of an urban Indigenous village in downtown Winnipeg during the 1970s. Krotz notes that this study looked at creating schools, art and cultural facilities, health and social services, shopping facilities, and facilities for political and cultural organizations (1980). Krotz adds, while the plan received some attention it never went beyond the proposal stage (1980). Wherrett and Brown (1994) argue, “these neighborhoods could provide cultural havens and allow for a greater scope of self-government in the urban setting” (1994:14). However, as Richards (2001) has pointed out, there are potentially negative consequences, including the creation of a ghetto-like atmosphere.

A Extra-Territorial Model

The third model the extra-territorial model deals with citizens of Indigenous nations not based in an urban centre. In this model laws, which apply to land based Indigenous nations would extend to the citizens of those nations in urban centres. The jurisdictional powers usually associated with this model are in the areas such as justice, family law, child and family services, welfare, and education (Wherrett and Brown 1994). For example, the creation of sentencing circles, which would allow the citizens of a particular Indigenous nation living in an urban centre, to be judicially administered by their land-based government. However, a number of problems with this model can be identified:

1. The creation of different services and regulations both between non-Indigenous and Indigenous communities, and within the urban Indigenous community.

2. The creation of different standards and services.
3. The interests of urban residents represented in the land based governments whose laws applied to them (Richards 2001; Wherrett and Brown 1994).

These three models are only the beginning of numerous possibilities and arrangements that could be made by all the respective governments involved. The development of self-governing arrangements for Indigenous peoples living in urban centres, however, will not be easy. The myriad distinctions between Indigenous peoples in terms of cultural identity based upon definitions of legal status, and differences in terms of political, social, historical, and economical traditions are contentious. As Wherrett and Brown point out, “if self-government is to succeed, there will clearly be a need to develop the resources, skills, and coherence of urban Indigenous communities” (1994:25).

Indigenous people living in urban centres historically and presently have challenged the roles and powers of all governments. While it is unrealistic to think that the creation of new policies, programs, and arrangements will be developed easily and without conflict. It is important to begin now to develop solutions, such as workable models for Indigenous urban self-government (Barron and Garcea 1999; Hanselmann 2001; 2002; Richards 2001; Wherrett and Brown 1994).
What Challenges and Questions Continue to Confront Governments

The differentiated policy landscape with respect to urban Indigenous people is neither comprehensive nor coherent. The fact that no one level of government has taken primary responsibility for urban Indigenous people has resulted in gaps in the policy landscape. At the same time, and perhaps as a result of unclear responsibilities, a lack of coordination and cooperation among governments has led to policy overlaps in some fields and further gaps in others (Hanselmann 2001:19).

As a result of these policy overlaps and policy gaps, questions and challenges continue to confront governments. Here is a list of several questions and challenges:

Questions:

1. Who should be responsible for creating policies and programs, that are specific to urban Indigenous people, and should exclusive responsibility for urban Indigenous people be assumed by one level of government?

2. Should the needs, rights, entitlements, and aspirations of urban Indigenous people be addressed through general application policies and programs or enhanced policies and programs?

3. Is there a constituency to be served by Indigenous governments, and if so, through which urban Indigenous government model?
Challenges:

1. Lack of Indigenous involvement in creating policies and programs for urban Indigenous people.

2. Creating dialogue among all levels of governments and urban Indigenous people (Barron and Garcea 1999; Hanselmann 2001; Richards 2001; Wherrett and Brown 1994).

Over the past generation, the outlines of Canadian Indigenous policy have been sketched, for the most part, by the federal Department of Indian Affairs and by the courts. Indigenous policy is too important to continue to leave to these arenas; rather the provinces, particularly the three Prairie provinces where Indigenous people compose a large proportion of many urban centres, must undertake major interdepartmental initiatives. Given the nature of the problems incurred, I believe the lead agency within the provinces should be the ministry of education.
CHAPTER 5

INDIGENOUS URBAN EDUCATIONAL PROFILES

Realities

Despite improvements and considerable progress in Indigenous run schools on reserves, there has been little understanding of similar problems and disadvantages facing Indigenous students in urban areas. Urion (1992) states, "75 to 80 percent of Indigenous children in Canada attend urban schools run by non-Indigenous administrators" (Cited in Smith 1999:155). Many of these children face not only the educational cross-cultural differences of language, culture, values, and learning styles, but must also overcome the realities of moving to an urban centre.

Urban Indigenous students experience high dropout rates before high school graduation. "They are heavily represented as special education cases, are low in gifted or talented classes, and many are tracked with low exit qualifications" (Binda 2001:181). A study conducted by the Department of Saskatchewan Education of urban schools in Saskatchewan in 1988 found that 90 percent of Indigenous students did not graduate from high school (Regnier 1995). As in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba dropout rates are similar. Despite efforts to make the curriculum more relevant to Indigenous students, the dropout-out figures have
not improved (See Appendix Q). “Many of the young people, both in and out of school spoke about the frustration they felt in mainstream education. [Indigenous] youth spoke of the racism, poverty, bullying, and overall violence they or their friends suffered as students and how this impacted their ability to remain in school” (Calgary 2000:12). Indigenous youth unanimously stated racism was one of the largest factors influencing their lives (Calgary 2000). Indigenous youth pointed out, “that it is difficult to concentrate on school when you are afraid to be there or are consistently on guard for fear of threats of violence” (Calgary 2000:14). They felt “that many of the issues they faced in the school system were directly related to the fact that many of their colleagues and teachers did not have an understanding of their culture, and negative school environments that did not punish negative or racist behaviour contributed to the feelings of low self-esteem, increased violence and the potential for Indigenous youth to dropout out” (Calgary 2000:15). Labelling of Indigenous youth as, “a problem” and having a tendency to fail, were also factors that have led to high dropout rates (RCAP 1994; Calgary 2000). Binda (2001) explains “parental participation in schools is low, as the schools are often viewed as hostile places: The curriculum lacks relevant cultural and language content, and there is low representation of Indigenous faculty in schools and higher education. As a result, the Indigenous students keep falling behind the mainstream students in performance and employment prospects” (181).
Richards (2001) suggests, much of the explanation for Indigenous education outcomes probably lies in social dynamics beyond the reach of any feasible education policy. He argues, “to the extent that policy can improve matters, however, schools in communities with significant Indigenous populations could better reflect that cultural reality and thereby augment parental interest in monitoring school performance” (Richards 2001:45). Educational reforms reflective of Indigenous needs in urban areas by the federal, provincial, and local governments, historically have been slow in initiating policies. Recently however, certain inner-city schools within the Prairie provinces, are doing just that in an effort to help Indigenous students complete their studies.

**Urban Indigenous Educational Profiles in Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba**

By virtue of the Canada Act 1867, education was assigned to the provinces. However, by historic implication, if not by actual treaty commitment, the federal government has continued to be involved in Indigenous education provided, both primary and secondary, through subparagraph 91 (24) of the Canada Act, 1867.

Beginning in the 1970s Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba were prepared, under certain conditions, to assume more responsibility for urban Indigenous education. Breton and Grant (1984) point out that Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba would have liked to have seen additional educational services for Indigenous people provided in its urban areas. As
each province considered such services would be most helpful to its Indigenous citizens, however, conflict arose about the most effective strategy to adopt. As a result, each of the provinces initiated policies, developed programs, and created schools incorporating different strategies.

Since the creation of “Indian Control for Indian Education” in 1972 the Prairie provinces slowly began to move away from an integrative approach to that of an isolationist approach. The idea behind this approach was to initiate policy, develop programs, and create schools that were more reflective of an Indigenous perspective. McCaskill (1987) argues that an important component in Alberta’s, Saskatchewan’s, and Manitoba’s attempts in the 1970s and early 1980s to better serve its urban Indigenous population was the creation of several “Indian Cultural Survival Schools” throughout the three provinces. Indigenous students now had the opportunity to opt out from regular public schools, out of the dominant community and culture, and attend a school with a cultural setting that was to be more reflective of an Indigenous perspective. The establishment of the schools can be traced to concerns felt by all members of the Indigenous communities involved, particularly parents, that the schooling their children were receiving in the public school system was seriously deficient. The reasons listed were:

- An intolerably high dropout rate.
- Discrimination, and
- Labelling of Indigenous students as slow learners, under-achievers, and troublemakers.
The creation of "Indian Cultural Survival Schools" was a means to eliminate these concerns by trying to promote and preserve Indigenous languages, values, and histories in order to survive as a distinct people within the larger Canadian society (McCaskill 1987).

**Alberta**

The Alberta government since the 1970's have initiated several task forces, developed several programs, and have created several schools to address the needs of urban Indigenous people.

First, a group called "Indian Rights for Indian Women" established an Indigenous preschool, "Awasis" in 1976 in Edmonton (Frideres 1984; Douglas 1987). The kindergarten program was to provide Indigenous children entering Grade 1 with a head start and at the same time to keep them in touch with their Indigenous heritage. The program assumed that Indigenous children starting school have low self-esteem and no proper adult role models in the field of education, and lack a basic understanding of their Indigenous heritage. "The school [was to attempt] to make up all of these deficiencies and to place the Indigenous child on par with non-Indigenous children in academic achievement, self-esteem and knowledge of his or her heritage" (Frideres 1984:390).

Second, the government tried to implement a cultural curriculum component in several schools within Edmonton and Calgary that focused on an Indigenous component within
their social studies units. These components however, had no official status with the school or school boards (Frideres 1984).

Third, in the spring of 1981, the Urban Native Education Council and the Edmonton Public School District personnel held intensive discussions that led to the Sacred Circle Project (Douglas 1987). The project was co-operatively designed to develop initiatives and to provide support to all of the district’s activities related to the education of or about Indigenous people. “The original project proposal to Alberta Education stressed the goal of developing a systematic approach to address the academic, social, and cultural needs of Indigenous children while at the same time emphasizing an awareness of Indigenous culture for all students in the district’s schools” (Douglas 1987:186). This was to be achieved by supporting the Indigenous child in a regular school setting, and to provide all district students with an understanding of Indigenous culture. It was hoped that this cultural awareness would contribute to an improved level of self-esteem among Indigenous students, resulting in improved attendance and academic achievement. The goals were to:

- Promote a positive self-concept among Indigenous students and their families.
- Increase the understanding and knowledge among all district students and staff of the Indigenous perspective, history, and traditional cultural values in order to diminish negative stereotyping and to promote cross-cultural communication.
- Assist in creating an educational environment, which will encourage continued participation of Indigenous students to graduation.
• Identify and introduce culturally appropriate learning resources into district schools (Douglas 1987:187).

Finally, in Calgary and Edmonton two alternative schools with an “isolationist perspective” were developed. In Calgary, the Calgary Public School Board in association with the Plains Indian Cultural Survival Society (PICSS) established in 1979 the Plains Indian Cultural Survival School, and in Edmonton the Ben Calf Robe Society in conjunction with the Edmonton Catholic School board established in 1981 the Ben Calf Robe School for Indigenous students for grades 4 to 9.

Plains Indian Cultural Survival School

The Plains Indian Cultural Survival School was the first Indigenous initiated and controlled educational program for Indigenous students within an urban centre in Western Canada. It originally opened its doors “to 53 students from the ages fourteen to twenty-one from grades eight to twelve” (Regnier 1987:46).26

The Plains Indian Cultural Survival School initially contended with a lack of funds, a lack of administrative structures and procedures, social difficulties associated with being an Indigenous school in an urban centre, and imposing differences (historical, political, and social) among students from various Indian bands surrounding the Calgary area (McCaskill 1986; Regnier 1987). However, despite the Plains Indian Cultural Survival School’s initial
operating difficulties the school was able to provide an environment for students where they could develop a sense of self-worth and self-confidence in their Indigenous identity. Cultural programs known as "survival camps" were established, where students lived in teepees, learnt about natural foods and medicines, hunted and fished, and learnt about their various histories. This cultural program and others established over the years encouraged students to live in harmony with themselves, the community, the environment, and encouraged self-reliance through personal decision-making and life skills (McCaskill 1986).

The initial years of struggle to build programs and autonomy, and trying to overcome the 85% dropout rate of Indigenous students within the public school system, the Calgary Board of Education and the Plains Indian Cultural Survival Society were able to create a viable alternative for Indigenous students who wanted a quality academic education from an Indigenous perspective.

Ben Calf Robe School

In 1980, a group of concerned citizens began to look at Indigenous education in the City of Edmonton and discovered that some 80% of Indigenous children did not complete high school (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002). They decided that the answer might lie in funding a school for the children where they felt accepted and culturally comfortable. Thus, encouraging them to remain in school and complete their grade twelve. With the collaboration of the Catholic School Board, the Ben Calf Robe School was created. It was a
school that took children who were not functioning well in the regular school system, many of whom came with a myriad of problems too time consuming for the teacher to handle and far beyond what the average school counsellor was equipped to handle (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002).

The administration of the Ben Calf Robe School outlines the vision and mission of the school as “a place where children are safe, people are treated with dignity; the child is the focus, and that we work toward the well being of all. This is to be achieved by providing Indigenous children and their families with holistic education, supportive social services and programs of high quality and cultural relevance” (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002).

Since its inception, Ben Calf Robe School has provided its students with a program of studies that follows the requirements dictated by Alberta Education. Ben Calf Robe School provides a full range of academic courses, an Integrated Occupational Program, Indigenous Spirituality and Awareness Enhancement components, plus extra-curricular programs (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002). In addition to meeting the objectives in the Alberta Education Program of Studies, Ben Calf Robe School provides Indigenous students with the ability to reaffirm their Indigenous cultural heritage through a wide range of cultural topics including:

- Traditional arts and crafts, such as drum making, pow wow songs, and dance regalia.
• Elder teachings, the importance of storytelling in the oral tradition of Indigenous peoples through the telling of myths, legends and contemporary tales.

• Spiritual ceremonies such as sweat grass smudges and sweats, and

• The introduction to a variety of games and sports that are considered popular with Indigenous groups of N. America such as lacrosse, canoeing, snow-shoeing, and archery training (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002).

The Ben Calf Robe School in association with the Ben Calf Robe Society has developed a number of programs over the years to assist the Indigenous community in Edmonton to cope with the effects of Canada’s internal colonial policies, and to assist in the transition from the reserve to an urban setting. For example, a breakfast/lunch program was established in 1982 to provide all students at Ben Calf Robe School with two nutritious meals and to enhance their concentration and learning potential on a daily basis (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002).

Current and Future Prospects

Since the Alberta government’s initial attempts to create policies, develop programs and establish schools with an Indigenous perspective, changes have occurred economically, socially, and politically that have influenced each policy, program, and school, however, it is difficult to assess such influences.
The Plains Cultural Survival School in Calgary has since closed down in 2001. However, the Calgary Public Board of Education with the start of this past school year has opened up a new elementary school from an Indigenous perspective, the Piitoayis Family School. The Piitoayis Family School objectives like its predecessor the Plains Indian Cultural Survival School is to create a respectful learning environment based on the balance of traditional cultural values and academic excellence. The schools mandate is to “integrate an [Indigenous] perspective to the Alberta Learning curriculum and practice cultural ceremonies where appropriate,...[which] enhances pride and self-esteem [amongst] its students to become successful, responsible lifelong learners” (Calgary Board of Education 2002).

The Ben Calf School in Edmonton continues to maintain close ties with the Ben Calf Robe Society through a collaboration of activities and services. In addition the Edmonton Public School Board and the Alberta Government in the fall of 2000 opened Amiskwaci Academy, an “urban school from an Indigenous perspective,” which is currently located in a section of the newly renovated former Edmonton Municipal Air Terminal.

Amiskwaci Academy

Amiskwaci Academy like the Ben Calf Robe School tries to embody the idea of honouring the Indigenous community and to reflect its cultures, values, ancestral knowledge and traditions in achieving excellence in education. The main difference between the two schools is its school board affiliation and focus of grade level. However, like all schools each
has a unique school culture. Amiskwaciy Academy thus, provides another meaningful example of an “urban school from an Indigenous perspective.”

Amiskwaciy Academy first and foremost tries to offer its students a “safe environment” in order to create a supportive learning community to assist its students in achieving their full academic potential. Provision of a safe and secure environment, in both the physical and social fabric of the school is an important proponent of the school's culture (Edmonton Public School Board “Honouring the Past Embracing the Future” 2001). Many of the students who attend Amiskwaciy Academy, previously have had academic or personal challenges in the past, which are reflective of the outcomes of the internal colonial policies discussed in earlier chapters. Dr. Phyliss Cardinal the principal of Amiskwaciy Academy in the University of Alberta Alumni Newsletter Building Bridges describes, “all of the students who come to Amiskwaciy were interviewed during the admission process, and probably 95 percent of them reported experiences of discrimination and racism...They have not felt comfortable. They have not felt safe. They have not felt wanted” (2000:1). Tim Margetts the former vice-principal adds, “a lot of these students have had really nasty experiences in school in the past...Some of these kids have gone through hell. They’ve had difficulties in their home life and their school life” (University of Alberta Building Bridges 2000:4-5). Thus, individual respect is taught within the school by emphasizing the acceptance of individuals as persons of worth, possessing talents that are encouraged and nurtured. This is accomplished for example, by encouraging involvement of all students to participate in extra-curricular
activities, in order to promote leadership, school spirit, character development, respect, and a caring sense of community (Edmonton Public School Board “Information and Registration Guide” 2001). Cardinal stresses, “that schools don’t help Native children understand who they are as individuals...All students go through a searching and wondering stage. They wonder who they are and they don’t find answers in school, they come to think that there is no meaning to what they are learning...At this Academy we hope we can change that. Belief in yourself – belief that you can – is a really powerful spiritual force” (University of Alberta Building Bridges 2000:2). Amiskwaci Academy “offers a place where students, teachers, parents, community leaders, business professionals and elders can come together to share wisdom, ideas and opinions,” and explore what it means to be Indigenous, in a safe educational environment that may not otherwise be possible in a mainstream Canadian educational society (Edmonton Public School Board “Honouring the Past and Embracing the Future” 2001:5).

“Amiskwaci Academy embraces many aspects of the Indigenous way of life. It promotes the Indigenous belief that a healthy lifestyle is in balance with the development of the physical, mental, spiritual and social life” (Edmonton Public School Board “Information and Registration Guide” 2001:7). This is reflected in how the school year is divided into four terms, based on the four seasons, each with a different theme. The school terms and associated themes are:

- September to November: Preparation, for example: sweetgrass.
November to January: Hunting, Gathering, and Singing.

February to April: Storytelling, Dancing, and Feasts.

April to June: Renewal (Edmonton Public School Board “Information and Registration Guide 2001).

The four terms and their themes are celebrated throughout the year and supplemented with unique options, extracurricular activities and special events, which reflect Indigenous traditions. For example, “a part of each day is set aside to include a sweetgrass purification ceremony, a morning prayer, and meditation. During this part of each day, students are provided assistance in using guided imagery to help them focus on achieving positive outcomes for themselves, both in their education and their lives” (Edmonton Public School Board “Information and Registration Guide” 2001:6).

Amiskwaciy Academy is a unique place with special values, beliefs and behaviour expectations reflective of an Indigenous way of life within the confines of the Edmonton Public School Board and the Alberta Curriculum standards. Margetts notes, “basically, we have an Alberta Learning curriculum. We follow the same objectives, the same evaluation – but we add more” (University of Alberta Building Bridges 2000:4). Cardinal adds, “we don’t want to be an isolated institution. We are not saying that the Aboriginal way is the only way. We acknowledge and respect the Alberta Learning curriculum. But we need to go beyond the prescribed curriculum so that young people feel complete and whole as Aboriginal people” (University of Alberta Building Bridges 2000:2).
The Saskatchewan government since the 1970's have initiated several task forces to address the concerns of Indigenous people of Saskatchewan, developed several programs, and have created an Indigenous survival school to address the needs of urban Indigenous people.

First, in the mid-1970s, the Regina Public School board with the assistance of the Saskatchewan Department of Education, Regina Native Women, and the Regina Native Race Relations Association introduced several pilot projects in two inner-city elementary schools. These projects included: Community Aide, Indigenous Class Room Assistants, and Indigenous Pre-Kindergarten programs (Anderson 1984). These programs along with the Saskatchewan government’s Social Planning Secretariat 1979 policy paper entitled, “The Dimensions of Indian and Native Urban Poverty in Saskatchewan,” and the Saskatchewan Department of Education’s 1980 discussion paper entitled, “Community Schools Programs,” provided a starting point for remedial action. The 1979 policy paper identified the lack of educational attainment as one of the primary factors in the current disadvantaged state of Saskatchewan's urban Indigenous people. While the 1980 discussion paper identified the need for “community schools” and the need for the development of a number of specialized programs for each such school. A “community school” was defined as a school, which drew its children from a community that fell into two or more of the following categories:
1. The unemployment rate is 25% above the city average.

2. The proportion of the single parent families is 25% above the city average.

3. The proportion of those whose first language is not English is 25% above the city average.

4. The proportion of those with less than Grade 1 education is 25% above the city average.

5. The proportion of social assistance recipients is 25% above the city average (Saskatchewan 1980).

In addition to these criteria, all schools chosen must satisfy a final criterion: at least 15% of the students’ enrolment is of Indigenous ancestry (Saskatchewan 1980).

The discussion paper identified five areas in which they would establish programs:

1. Saskatchewan Urban Native Teachers Education Program (SUNTEP): to train Indigenous teachers through a four year off-campus program, with a major emphasis on the attainment of practical experience that is to be gained through sojourns in the designated community schools.

2. Native Teaching Associates: to hire people to actively assist the classroom teacher in various ways.

3. Community School Co-ordinators: to hire people to attempt to foster community interest and understanding of the educational process, and to work with Indigenous families whose child/children are experiencing difficulties at school.

4. School Nutrition Project
5. Native Curriculum Resources: to provide grants to assist the “community schools” to undertake various projects (Saskatchewan 1980).

Besides the various departments within the Saskatchewan government to initiate policy and develop specific programs to address the needs of the urban Indigenous population, the Saskatoon Catholic School Board in conjunction with the Department of Education and the “school parent” council established in 1980 an Indigenous survival school.

Joe Duquette High School

Located in Saskatoon and originally entitled the Saskatoon Native Survival School, the school was created under a three-party agreement to provide: an alternative experience that responded directly to the educational needs of urban Indigenous youth ages 14-21, and to address the unbelievably high dropout out rate of Indigenous students in inner city schools, 90.5 percent (Regnier 1995).

The Joe Duquette High School as other Indigenous survival schools was initially created as “a healing place, which nurtures the mind, the body, and soul of its students. To provide a program of studies which affirmed the contemporary worldview of Indigenous people, to support the uniqueness and creativity of the individual, and foster self-actualization in a cooperative environment” (Regnier 1995:314).
To try to achieve its mission and goals, the Joe Duquette faculty and parent council over the past two decades has experimented with various programs and initiatives. The faculty finally adopted a healing approach based on the Sacred Circle to direct their work. According to Robert Regnier, the Sacred Circle in “Cree Cosmology sees human beings and nature as connected and unified, [and] views time as cyclical rather than linear, and allows for a sense of ultimate meaning and purpose within a heritage open to cross-cultural possibilities” (1995:314). Joe Duquette High School uses the Sacred Circle as a broad perspective for understanding and developing its educational offerings, and as a means to address the crisis of meaning for Indigenous youth” (Regnier 1995:316). The Sacred Circle attempts to transcend internal colonial teaching, which assumes inherited educational goals, curricula, and frameworks without addressing the immediate reality of students. Its symbolism is enacted in meetings, ceremonies and rituals, classroom approaches, and healing educational programs. One example is to assist students to develop mutual support. The staff instituted a weekly support circle after school. The weekly support circle is to help students suffering from negative lifestyles assist one another with a culturally and spiritually based approach. Another example is the incorporation of the Sacred Circle into the classroom teaching through Indigenous literature in its English courses, and through Indigenous related events, culture, and society within its Social Studies courses (Regnier 1995).

The practice of the Sacred Circle approach within the Joe Duquette High School is to move beyond looking at only the individual, to that of the individual, the family, the community,
and the nation as a whole. To restore learning or schooling to those who have been marginalized, denied, or rejected through a non-Eurocentric framework in an urban context (Regnier 1995).

Current and Future Prospects

Currently within Saskatchewan the provincial government continues to implement new educational policies, initiatives, and programs to support the growing needs of its urban Indigenous population. Many of the programs created in the early 1970s and 1980s still remain, for example, SUNTEP and Joe Duquette High School in Saskatoon. However, there is an immediate need for further implementation of such policies, initiatives, and programs as Saskatoon and Regina have the highest Indigenous population per capita than any other urban centres in Canada, and have the highest growth rate (migration and birth rate). Just recently, the Regina Public School Board announced that two schools “Albert School and Scott Collegiate are adopting a holistic curriculum using the First Nations – Métis Education model” (Leader Post 2002).

Manitoba

In 1976 it was estimated that a minimum of 10,000 status and non-status Indian and Métis students were attending Winnipeg schools. And it was expected that this number would double every five years (Bostrom 1984). Bostrom notes, “the educational programs provided by federal, provincial, and local education authorities did not respond adequately to
the special needs of this group. The federal government’s response historically had been to withdraw financial support from status Indians after they have lived one year in an urban centre, while the provincial government provided the regular per capita grant assistance to the school boards, in accordance with all school divisions in Manitoba” (1984:98).

The Winnipeg School Division No. 1 serves the inner city, particularly the core area, where surveys show that the majority of Manitoba’s urban Indigenous population lives (Manitoba 2000). With limited resources, the schools in this area had introduced remedial measures designed to meet the special educational needs of inner-city children. For example, in 1980 the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 employed Indigenous teacher’s aides, Indigenous teachers, and Indigenous community-liaison officers. The ratio per Indigenous aide, teacher, and liaison officer per student, however, was low. A total of twenty-two Indigenous staff members for approximately 10,000 (status and non-status) Indian students represented a ratio of one Indigenous staff member to approximately five hundred Indigenous students (Bostrom 1984). In addition the Winnipeg School Division had provided support generally by instituting nurseries and creating a School Nutrition Program (Bostrom 1984).

Historically, little has been done to recognize and provide for the cultural and language needs of the Division’s Indigenous students. The whole urban educational program up until the early 1990s was far from adequate, given the number of Indigenous students it served and the special problems they faced in an urban environment.
In 1988, a Race Relations Task Force was established in Winnipeg School Division #1 to elicit community concerns regarding the high dropout rate of their children. As a result, the Urban Aboriginal Advisory Committee was formed. In 1990, the committee submitted a formal proposal to Winnipeg School Division #1 to form an Indigenous high school. The community elected the Thunder Eagle Society to work on their behalf in the negotiations. The work of the Society was successful, and in September 1991, the Indigenous High School, Children of the Earth was opened as part of Winnipeg School Division #1 (Winnipeg School Division #1 2002).

Children of the Earth High School

The Children of the Earth High School as other Indigenous survival schools and “urban schools from an Indigenous perspective” was established to value the worth of each individual Indigenous student. To recognize that their students have abilities that differ widely, and that changing times present new challenges and demands. The purpose behind the school “is to provide a pathway through which each individual may realize self-respect, self-fulfillment, and his/her relevance in a dynamic society” (Winnipeg School Division #1 2002). The Children of the Earth High School lists as their goals and objectives:

1. To prepare students for the future by providing cultural programming, demanding high academic achievement, developing positive self-esteem, and developing skills in communication.
2. To adapt the curriculum to reflect Indigenous cultures and values by implementing programs that meets the needs of our students.

3. To seek and involve parents and community in the life of the school through volunteerism and support for the implementation of the cultural and academic programs.

4. To ensure preservation of Indigenous languages by offering Cree and Ojibway language instruction.

5. To promote a healthy lifestyle (2002).

The Children of the Earth High School bases its educational approach on the concept of the Medicine Wheel. According to the school administration, "the Medicine Wheel is based on a holistic healing approach designed to assist students in developing their personal, educational, and career goals in a culturally appropriate nurturing environment. The aspects that are recognized in the Medicine Wheel teachings are Emotional, Mental, Physical, and Spiritual. This approach, views the student as a capable, worthy, gifted individual who has the potential to develop into a caring, committed, responsible human being" (Winnipeg School Division #1 2002).34

The Children of the Earth High School emphasizes the importance of language as an essential part of cultural development. The Indigenous Languages Program at Children of Earth has evolved progressively since its inception in September 1991. Presently it offers both Cree and Ojibway to all of its students. The school believes in and recognizes the
importance of preserving and promoting language learning for both fluent and non-fluent speakers (Winnipeg School Division #1 2002).

Current and Future Prospects

In addition to the continued development of the Children of the Earth High School in Winnipeg's School Division #1, two other urban schools from an Indigenous perspective have emerged. First, community and families wanting a school where Indigenous languages, culture and traditions would be taught established Niji Mahkwa, an Indigenous elementary school located in the inner city of Winnipeg in the fall of 1993. Second, Southeast College in 1996 was established as a private Indigenous high school, owned by the SouthEast Development Council and organized and operated by the Indigenous community.

Challenges and Recommendations

The federal, provincial, and local governments in consultation with urban Indigenous people through the establishment of such policies, programs, and schools are beginning to have a voice in the education of their children. Perhaps with the continued consultation in the development of such policies, programs, and schools the urban Indigenous community can reverse the high dropout rate, underachievement, and underdevelopment which historically has plagued the urban Indigenous community (Binda 2001).
It is difficult to assess the success or failure of such polices, programs, and schools in such a short time period and under such diverse conditions and circumstances. However, there is always room to improve the chances for success. Educators, administrators, academics, students, and members of various urban Indigenous communities have outlined numerous recommendations to improve the chances for success (Absolon and Winchester 1994; Alberta 2000; Battiste and Barman 1995; Calgary 2000; Canada 1994). Here is a list of the nine most frequent recommendations made:

1. Measures must be put in place to help ensure that the educational environment is safe and free of dangers and violence.

2. Indigenous youth must be taught to feel comfortable with their Indigenous identity.

3. The use of stereotypical images of Indigenous people be banned from textbook material and media presentations.

4. Decolonialization, anti-racism, and cultural awareness be taught as a mandatory part of the curriculum.

5. Indigenous educators design, develop, and implement culturally relevant curriculum and programs for use in all education systems in urban Canadian centres.

6. That more Indigenous educators be recruited, trained, and hired in all educational institutions.

7. Elders and Indigenous role models be encouraged to participate in both “urban schools from an Indigenous perspective” and other urban educational systems.

8. Operate support programs in all urban schools with a high Indigenous population.

Urban Indigenous Controlled Schools

The most significant recommendation made that could arguably make the most significant difference is the creation of Urban Indigenous Controlled Schools. Such a recommendation is certain to have critics. Although multiple publicly funded school systems, based on religious and language distinctions have existed in Canada throughout its history. Richards (2001) explains their existence, however, has frequently been controversial, on the grounds that they perpetuate particular cultures intergenerationally and subtract from a shared sense of citizenship.

Participants of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples 1994 National Roundtable on Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres suggested that Indigenous urban people operate their own schools and where population warrants, perhaps even set up their own school boards. Participants within the roundtable argued, “that aboriginal parents need to control their children’s education in urban areas. They argued there needs to be a much greater degree of control of education by and accountability to aboriginal urban parents” (RCAP Report on National Roundtable 1994:4). Absolon and Winchester (1994) argue that Indigenous controlled schools be created in urban centres for indigenous children and youth. They state that these schools would reflect an Indigenous context and would incorporate authentic
culture, language, curriculum, activities, arts, music, and spirituality. And, that students have
the choice of attending an Indigenous separate school system, without the stigma of deviant,
special needs, or dropout. Such a reform would be controversial, and its implementation
would require careful attention to administrative details. It would, however, open the
possibility for greater engagement by Indigenous families in the education of their children
(Richards 2001).

Were an Indigenous school system to exist, one over which Indigenous people exercised
meaningful control (sui genris), it might as critics fear, exacerbate racial segregation. On the
other hand, it would probably increase parental involvement and lead to better educational
outcomes than at present (Richards 2001).

Challenges and Concerns

Robert Nault, the federal Indian Affairs Minister, recently has proposed creating a new
system of Indigenous school boards. Nault said, “the existing patchwork of native education
across Canada has failed to prepare native children for the world, often resulting in feelings
of despair and entanglements with the law” (Edmonton Journal 2003:1). However, as
progressive as this proposed idea may be for the federal, provincial, and local government’s,
there are imposing challenges and concerns for operating such school boards.
First, the diversity of origins and cultures of Indigenous people living in a particular city often poses difficulties in establishing a sense of community, even for those whose ties with their homelands and original communities have weakened over time. Differences in Indigenous status and entitlements may also interfere with collective efforts to address shared concerns (RCAP Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres 1994).

Second, not only do urban Indigenous people lacking a land base not meet the conditions necessary for inclusion under the nation self-government rubric on which the federal government has pined its hopes for the cultural reinvigoration of Indigenous peoples, but also the very relevance of nation declines in the urban setting. The federal government departs from its nation focus with its recommendation that “services to Aboriginal people in urban areas generally be delivered without regard to legal or treaty status” (RCAP Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres 1994). Although the Commission’s hopes for flourishing Indigenous cultures are invested in the self-governing landed communities, it nevertheless recommends various arrangements to enhance the sensitivity of urban policies to Aboriginal peoples. The suggestions include:

- Guaranteed Indigenous representation on various urban commissions.
- The establishment by municipal governments of Indigenous Affairs committees, and what are called “community of interest arrangements.” These would involve a voluntary association of urban Indigenous peoples who would take responsibility for the provision
of one or more functions, such as education (RCAP Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres 1994).

None of these service-providing community of interest arrangements qualify as nation-governments, and their powers would be delegated. As far as the federal government is concerned, these interest arrangements would not be a part of a third order of Indigenous government. "Urban Aboriginal residents are not the hope of the future. That status is reserved for their kinfolk on a land base" (Caron 2000).
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Learning from the Past, Building for the Future

*Historical Legacy*

The past cannot be undone, but it can be better understood and acknowledged as a part of our current educational contexts. It is important to analyze contemporary Canadian educational issues in broader historical contexts, such as internal colonial ways of inquiry, and realize an understanding of the historical relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the context of educational policies as essential to the (de)construction of an Indigenous identity (Maina 1997).

The legacies of internal colonialism in Canada’s educational policies have been all too clear. They are deeply rooted in institutional structures, and must be dealt with. Burns (2000) insists “they cannot, however, be meaningful addressed in the absence of analyzing practices underpinning internal colonialism: [nationalism, manifest destiny and noblesse oblige], attitudes of racial and cultural superiority, denial of difference and suppression of difference in relationship to Indigenous peoples” (152).
Institutionalized educational policies of internal colonization, such as assimilation and integration, which extolled the virtues of the national socio-economic and political order, nearly destroyed the cultural systems of Indigenous people, leaving a legacy of ongoing oppression, suffering, and missed opportunities (Binda 2001; Burns 2000).

Responsibility
The federal, provincial, and local governments of Canada have taken substantial responsibility for what it now accepts as a range of misguided educational policies initiated and constructed by non-Indigenous people for Indigenous people of Canada, and have moved forward in an effort to rectify the entrenched ideologies of previous policies (Long and Dickason 2000). Canadian educational policies have begun to move from ways of internal colonial ideologies to those that are culturally, linguistically, and philosophically relevant and empowering for Indigenous peoples (Smith 1999). Indigenous people in Canada are re-affirming the validity of their own cultures and re-constructing a positive identity through the initiation of policies, development of programs, and the creation of Indigenous Controlled Schools. Indigenous Control of Indigenous Education has sought to reverse the experience of cultural denial that has been lived by generations of Indigenous people in assimilative educational institutions, however, there remains numerous and complex issues and concerns.
Issues and Concerns

There have been innovations in Canadian Indigenous educational policies in the past twenty-five years, both at the Indigenous and non-Indigenous levels, and on-reserve and off-reserve in urban centres, but these reforms have not gone far enough. The lack of clear, comprehensive, and consistent policies by the federal, provincial, and local governments have resulted in modern mono-cultural educational acts that continue to suppress Indigenous cultures and identities. Policies, which reinforce the cultural capital of the dominant group, while continually ignoring Indigenous worldviews and cultures perpetuating ideological hegemony. The Canadian education system continues to serve as an element to prevent Indigenous people from gaining political, social, and economic independence. “Indigenous control and Indigenous inclusiveness in both the public and Indigenous education system are essential prerequisites to any attempt at self-determination. Culture is power and internal colonial cultures of domination continue to dominate institutions, organizations, and agencies throughout Canadian society, [particularly educational institutions]” (Burns 2000:151).

I believe the state of Indigenous education in Canada remains bleak. Indigenous Control of Indigenous Education is a myth within the context of current social policies, education fiscal policies, and practices which fail to empower Indigenous people. It simply is not happening. As a result, Indigenous people in Canada pose a serious question to the Canadian
educational system: How should schools be structured and content developed and delivered to offer equitable outcomes for Indigenous peoples in Canada (Battiste 2000)?

Implications for Further Research

This study only provides a snapshot of Canada’s educational policies and the historical (de)construction of an Indigenous identity. A number of issues related to the focus of this study became apparent during the course of this research. Since these issues potentially affect the education of Indigenous people, they warrant further attention. However, while realizing there are a number of issues that need to be addressed and examined further, writing an exhaustive conclusion here is not warranted. Ultimately, a great majority of Indigenous people will make the transition from reserves to urban centres, and how an equitable education will be delivered will be a priority. This however will have to be addressed by all Canadians, Indigenous and non-Indigenous, and each must be obliged to think very hard, much harder than we have done before, about what can be done to make that successful.

Concluding Note

Informed change begins with an understanding of historic, present, and future conditions and practices. Informed change requires that we know more than we now do about
Indigenous educational policies. We need to know the assumptions that underlie the way people, programs, and resources have been put together to make schools as they are. If we want to create better schools that serve the needs of Indigenous students, we need to understand what is going on in existing Indigenous schools. Only then can we begin making the transition between what we are doing now in schools enrolling Indigenous students and what we need to begin doing.
ENDNOTES

1 Section 91 of the British North America Act gave the government of Canada legal authority over Indigenous people and matters, which concern them. As a result Indigenous affairs have always been considered the responsibility of the federal government. However, provincial laws also apply to Indigenous people in areas not affected by a particular federal legislation. This exclusive right of the federal government to legislate in Indigenous affairs creates difficulties when it comes to drawing up joint federal-provincial agreements on education or the economic and social welfare of Indigenous people (Canada 1967). When talking about Canadian Indigenous educational policies, one has to remember this includes federal, provincial, and territorial governments.

2 The usage of the phrase “internal colonial way of inquiry,” was suggested by my supervisor Dr. Lisa Panayotidis, as its terminology best reflects the theoretical and methodological ways of inquiry I have utilized in researching and in writing this study.

3 The National Indian Brotherhood, later to be renamed the Assembly of First Nations is a political organization representing First Nations, those identified as bands under the Indian Act and whose members have historically been referred to as Indian. The AFN’s assemblies, held at least once a year, and includes seats for a chief from each First Nation. There are approximately 630 First Nations in Canada.

4 The Indian Act was passed originally in 1876 under Parliament’s constitutional responsibility for Indians and Indian lands. It is based on Indian policies developed in the nineteenth century and has come down through the years in roughly the same form in which it was first passed. Until the 1982 amendments to the constitution, it was the single most prominent reflection of the distinctive place of Indian peoples within the Canadian federation (Canada 1996b).

5 As I am writing in general terms and not writing about or on-behalf of a specific Indigenous community such as the Anishenabe, the A-Piikani, etc., I do not use the terminology in which they refer to their particular people and their community. It should be noted, “…that all this terminology is a means of grouping people together for various purposes – social, political, or whatever – and that these various linguistic contexts have important legal and social ramifications” (Hedican 1997: 8).
In the Canadian Census of 2001 the section on Aboriginal Peoples of Canada has incorporated new questions and terminology different from previous censuses. In 1996 and previous censuses, Aboriginal persons were determined using the ethnic origin question, based primarily on the ancestry dimension. Rather than determining Aboriginal status based on the cultural group of one's ancestors, respondents in 2001 and the choice to define themselves as Aboriginal if they personally identified with at least one Aboriginal group [North American Indian, Métis, or Inuit]. This is also the first time that the census's Aboriginal population includes members of an Indian Band/First Nations who are not Treaty Indians or Registered Indians (Statistics Canada 2003).

The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was created by an Act of Parliament in 1966. Previously, the Indian Affairs Administration in Canada was under the governance of several different departments. In 1755, the British Crown established the Indian Department, a branch of the military, to foster good relations and cultivate military alliances with Indigenous people. From 1867 until 1966, Indian Affairs was handled by various departments throughout the years, including the Office of the Secretary of State, Citizenship and Immigration, Mines and Resources, and Northern Affairs and National Resources (DIAND 2001).

“Internal colonialism” the term itself, is said by van de Berghe in his 1978 article, “Education, Class and Ethnicity in Southern Peru: Revolutionary Colonialism” to have been used originally by Leo Marquard, South Africa's Colonial Policy, written in 1957, but Hechter (1975), Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development 1536-1966, credits Lenin with the term and with the first social analysis using the concept.

“When the Dominion of Canada was created in 1867, [Indigenous people] were declared a federal responsibility in the section of the British North America Act, 91(24). The only reference in the Act to Canada’s [Indigenous peoples]. This separated their administration from that of Crown Lands. Indigenous people continued in a distinct legal category, that of wardship, from which they could, if they chose, step out to become as other Canadians, but the price was high” (Dickason 1997:231).

Petrone (1983) in First People, First Voices points out, while some Indigenous people in the early 1800's looked upon formal education with suspicion, other Indigenous people felt that there were practical advantages to be acquired, in particular where formal schooling could be acquired alongside a traditional education. Thus, it should be noted there are instances where Indigenous communities sought out educational agreements with the federal, provincial, and territorial governments, however, the result was not what most Indigenous communities had intended upon.
Two types of residential schools were established in the late nineteenth century: boarding schools for younger children and industrial schools for their older siblings. Over time, the distinction between the two types of schools broke down, and they all became known as residential schools.

Blue Quills Residential School was located on the Saddle Lake Reserve in northeastern Alberta from 1931-1970.

It should be noted acts of “agency” amongst Indigenous people and communities occurred throughout the assimilationist policy period and throughout Canadian history in general. Grant (1996) stresses, “that a common misconception is that [Indigenous] people simply accepted the Residential school regime [and are viewed purely as ‘victims’]. Though resistance to it was difficult and largely futile, [Indigenous] parents and students did resist, and they never stopped trying to change the system” (209).

The impact on Indigenous society of the residential schools’ systematic assault on Indigenous identity cannot be measured fully or precisely. Miller (1996) recognizes, “while there are many former students who testify to the damage that the suppression of their language and other things did to them and to people they knew, there are also former students who firmly deny that their school experience scarred them or their fellow students” (205). It is also important to remember that there were exceptional individuals who respected Indigenous ways and made no efforts to suppress language and identity.

“Joint Schools” are not controlled by the federal government. Essentially they are provincial schools that allow Indigenous students to attend. Although education is a provincial responsibility, the federal government pays each local board a per diem fee for each Indigenous student enrolled there.

This 1967 report, *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies* (The Hawthorn Report), was based on data from a national sampling of 35 reserves and from 70 in-depth studies, as well as considerable literature on reserve communities prepared by social scientists (Weaver 1981).

Brophy and Aberle (1966) *The Indian: America's Unfinished Business: Report of the Commission on the Rights, Liberties, and Responsibilities of the American Indian*, evaluated the results of the United States Indian Termination Policy. The study showed how the United States’ termination policy (1953-1961) had been hastily conceived and poorly planned, the effects, which subverted the intent of the policy. Weaver (1981) notes that Brophy and Aberle “provided detailed recommendations on how a termination policy should be developed, stressing two fundamental principles: Indians must be fully involved right from the initial stages of policy.
development and be fully aware of the consequences of termination; and termination should be applied only after careful and extensive planning among Indians, the local and state governments, and the federal government" (121).

18 In 1988 the Assembly of First Nations revised and updated the 1972 Indian Control of Indian Education policy paper with the introduction of the study Tradition and Education: Towards a Vision of our Future.

19 The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and Statistics Canada provide statistics on Indigenous peoples within Canada. Incomplete enumeration and under-coverage account for most of the difference between the 2001 Census count of persons registered under the Indian Act (about 558,000) and that produced by the Indian Register maintained by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern development (about 681,000) (Statistics Canada 2003).

By design, the Indian Register (IR) is meant to record individual names in accordance with specific sub-sections of the Indian Act. The Indian Register does not include all persons who are entitled to be registered according to the Indian Act. It covers only those who have applied to be registered and whose entitlement has been verified. Individuals are considered Registered Indians if their names appear on the Indian Register. Names are added or deleted form the Indian Register based on legal sources of information such as provincial birth or death certificates (DIAND 2001). Therefore, data from the IR may not fully meet the requirements of some statistical activities (e.g. demographic projections, migration patterns). In addition methodological differences, as well as differences in concepts and definitions between the two sources account for a smaller part of the difference. The two sources have very different purposes, and given the coverage and other differences, are not directly comparable.

20 For the purposes of this study, both sets of statistics will be used to give an overall picture of Canada's Indigenous peoples. The statistics used by the Department of Indian affairs and Northern Development will relate to registered Indians (RI), while the statistics used by Statistics Canada will concentrate on people who have identified themselves as a member of one or more of these Aboriginal groups, that is, as a North American Indian, Métis or Inuit.

21 The current projections are based on the 1998 Indian Register, adjusted for late and under reporting of life events (births and deaths). The IR is based on registration of individuals who: i) are entitled to be registered according to the Indian Act, ii) who have applied to be registered, and iii) whose entitlement has been verified.
Although these projections are not predictions, they represent future trends that the registered Indian population will follow if the underlying assumptions (with respect to fertility, mortality, miscellaneous additions, migration, reinstatement, and status inheritance) prove to be correct. They help determine population trends of registered Indians and allow for a better understanding of the future population structure. DIAND produces RI population projections to help anticipate future demands for programs and services and to better understand the makeup of the RI population.

The projections were developed using a cohort component method, which involves the separate analysis and projection of each component of population change at the regional and place of residence (on/off reserve) levels (DIAND 2001).

22 The regional distribution of registered Indians is changing. Population growth is uneven across Canada. The Prairies are experiencing the largest growth, particularly in Manitoba, followed by Alberta and Saskatchewan. It is estimated that by 2008, Manitoba may have the second largest registered Indian population in Canada, after Ontario (DIAND 2001).

23 Indigenous people in urban centres tend to be economically and socially marginalized, however, not all Indigenous people living in cities fit this profile.

24 I would recommend looking at Donald L. Fixicos' The Urban Indian Experience in America and Susan Lobo and Kurt Peters' American Indians and the Urban Experience to compare the situation of urban Indigenous peoples in Canada and the United States.

25 For further insight into Indigenous image representation, I would recommend looking at Fergus M. Bordewichs' Killing the White Man's Indian: Reinventing Native Americans at the End of the Twentieth Century.

26 Canada's first Indigenous survival school was established in 1976 in Toronto. The Wandering Spirit School began with nine students as a private school under the Ontario Ministry Guidelines. In 1977 to ensure a funding base and to obtain infrastructural support, the school moved under the Toronto Board of Education as an alternative school (Regnier 1987).

27 In June of 1981 the Ben Calf Robe Society was established to act as a support system for the school, providing counselling programs and general assistance. The Ben Calf Robe Society is an Indigenous not-for-profit social service agency providing services for children and families (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002).
Over the years, the Ben Calf Robe Society has gradually assumed a broader role in the Indigenous community, helping children and families not only through the school but from the larger Edmonton areas as well. The Ben Calf Robe Society has responded to the needs of the Indigenous community taking on providing, a wide range of programs funded by all three levels of government. Today the Society continues to support the School and to provide services through its Family Support, In Home Family Support, Going Home, Receiving and Assessment Home (all provincially funded), Health for Two, Head Start (both federally funded) and Youth Intervention Program (municipally funded). These services have primarily focused on the needs of the Indigenous children and families whose lives have been affected by dysfunction, abuse, addictions, poverty, isolation from their culture and unemployment. The Society has bridged the gap, which has been greatly needed in the Indigenous community, offering a holistic approach with a rich cultural environment. The Society's primary goals are to:

- Provide Indigenous children and their families with culturally appropriate educational and social service programs to improve their stability, sense of belonging and community, potential for growth and development, fostering independence, and resilience.
- To provide advocacy for children and families.
- To be accountable to the community by offering effective programs while evaluating outcomes on a regular basis.

The Society’s objectives are achieved by:

- Providing community based in-home, residential and educational services, and resources to Indigenous children and their families.
- Providing preventative, intervention and follow-up services such as counselling, parenting skill development, child and youth focused educational and holistic activities, family mediation and health care knowledge, and skill development within an Indigenous cultural framework.
- Maintaining and facilitating a partnership with the families we serve, the Indigenous community and the community at large (Edmonton Catholic School District 2002).

"Piitoayis" is a Blackfoot name given to the school from the elders in the community. The name translates into “Eagle Lodge.” The reason behind this particular name is due first to the significance of the “eagle” to most Indigenous people in Canada, and it recognizes the school's purpose to serve a wide range of Indigenous peoples. Second, “lodge” recognizes the school as a gathering place for families, ceremonies, and prayers (Calgary Board of Education 2002).

"Amiskwaci" is the Cree word for Beaver Hills. The Cree used to call the Edmonton area Beaver Hills House. The school name was chosen in consultation with Elders from the Indigenous community (Edmonton Public School District Information and Registration Guide 2001).

For further information regarding the philosophy behind the Sacred Circle and its uses within educational practice, I would recommend reading Eber Hampton’s article “Towards a Redefinition of Indian Education” in Battiste and Barman’s book The Circle Unfolds: First Nations Education in Canada.

The Niigiigoog Parent Council was established in 1995 and has since replaced the Thunder Eagle Society (Winnipeg School District #1).

For further information regarding the philosophy behind the Medicine Wheel and its uses within educational practice, I would recommend reading Vicki English’s Ph.D Thesis entitled, “Toward a Rebirth of the Medicine Wheel as a Pedagogy for Native Education.”

"Niji Mahkwa” literally translated means “Friend Bear” in Ojibway. The name derives its deeper meaning from the legends of the bear, which symbolically represents a great protector of the natural ways of the people and a keeper of the wisdom and knowledge of the healing medicines of Mother Earth (Winnipeg School District #1).
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APPENDIX A

Illustration: Lacombe’s Ladder

(Archives Deschâteles cited in Miller 1996:192)

Note: The pictorial catechism was used to teach in Oblate missions and Residential Schools run by the missions.
APPENDIX B

Canada

Registered Indian Population, Total On and Off Reserve by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>On Reserve Male</th>
<th>On Reserve Female</th>
<th>Off Reserve Male</th>
<th>Off Reserve Female</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Total Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>19,440</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>18,255</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>37,695</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>25,444</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>24,033</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>49,477</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>23,859</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>22,689</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>46,548</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>20,517</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19,447</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>39,964</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>17,053</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16,591</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>33,644</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>15,855</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15,187</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>31,042</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>15,694</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14,776</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>30,470</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>14,846</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14,260</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>29,106</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>12,869</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12,506</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>25,375</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>9,816</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9,519</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>19,335</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7,455</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7,209</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14,664</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5,441</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11,193</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8,658</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>8,756</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10,116</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>18,872</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202,241</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>194,447</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>396,688</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total-both sexes</td>
<td>396,688</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>293,413</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>690,101</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: on reserve indicates on reserve and on Crown land.

Total Registered Indian Population (690,101) by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

Note: The age-sex graphs show the male-female proportion of the population in age groups. The chart on the left shows that 4.2% of the total population is male and between the ages of 0 and 4 (Canada DIAND 2001).
APPENDIX C

Canada

Registered Indian Population, On and Off Reserve, by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

(Canada DIAND 2001)
### APPENDIX D

**Alberta Region**

Registered Indian Population, Total On and Off Reserve by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>On Reserve Male</th>
<th>On Reserve Female</th>
<th>Off Reserve Male</th>
<th>Off Reserve Female</th>
<th>Male Total</th>
<th>Female Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>3,850</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3,317</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3,194</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1,316</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2,148</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29,441</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>28,605</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>13,719</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Registered Indian Population (87,703) by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total Male</th>
<th>Total Female</th>
<th>Total Both Sexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>29,441</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>28,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>6,539</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3,469</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: on reserve indicates on reserve and on Crown land.

**Note:** The age-sex graphs show the male-female proportion of the population in age groups. The chart on the left shows that 5.0% of the total population is male and between the ages of 0 and 4 (Canada DIAND 2001).
APPENDIX E

Alberta Region

Registered Indian Population, On and Off Reserve, by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Reserve
- 29,057
- 33%

Off Reserve
- 58,046
- 66.2%

(Canada DIAND 2001)
## APPENDIX F

### Saskatchewan Region

Registered Indian Population, Total On and Off Reserve by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>On Reserve</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Off Reserve</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>5,445</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4,096</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7,305</td>
<td>7,048</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>3,799</td>
<td>3,627</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7,099</td>
<td>6,745</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3,048</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5,801</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5,962</td>
<td>5,780</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2,329</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td>4,608</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3,110</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>1,869</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,432</td>
<td>26,908</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>25,255</td>
<td>28,205</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>53,688</td>
<td>55,113</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: on reserve indicates on reserve and on Crown land.

Total Registered Indian Population (108,801) by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

Note: The age-sex graphs show the male-female proportion of the population in age groups. The chart on the left shows that 5.1% of the total population is male and between the ages of 0 and 4 (Canada DIAND 2001).
APPENDIX G

Saskatchewan Region

Registered Indian Population, On and Off Reserve, by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

(Canada DIAND 2001)
**APPENDIX H**

Manitoba Region

Registered Indian Population, Total On and Off Reserve by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>On Reserve</th>
<th>Off Reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>3,936</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>4,045</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>4,370</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>3,635</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,774</td>
<td>33,615</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Registered Indian Population (109,788) by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

Note: on reserve indicates on reserve and on Crown land.

Note: The age-sex graphs show the male-female proportion of the population in age groups. The chart on the left shows that 5.3% of the total population is male and between the ages of 0 and 4 (Canada DIAND 2001).
## APPENDIX I

**Manitoba Region**

Registered Indian Population, On and Off Reserve, by Age and Sex, December 31, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On Reserve 63,609 On Reserve 63.5%*  
*Off Reserve 40,099 On Reserve 36.5%*

(Canada DIAND 2001)
APPENDIX J

Aboriginal Identity Population, for Canada by Provinces and Territories, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>29,639,030</td>
<td>976,305</td>
<td>608,850</td>
<td>292,305</td>
<td>45,070</td>
<td>28,662,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador</td>
<td>508,080</td>
<td>18,775</td>
<td>7,040</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>489,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>133,385</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>132,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>897,565</td>
<td>17,010</td>
<td>12,920</td>
<td>3,135</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>880,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>719,710</td>
<td>16,990</td>
<td>11,495</td>
<td>4,290</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>702,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>7,125,580</td>
<td>79,400</td>
<td>51,125</td>
<td>15,855</td>
<td>9,530</td>
<td>7,046,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>11,285,545</td>
<td>188,315</td>
<td>131,560</td>
<td>48,340</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>11,097,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>1,103,700</td>
<td>150,045</td>
<td>90,340</td>
<td>56,800</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>953,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>963,155</td>
<td>130,185</td>
<td>83,745</td>
<td>43,695</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>832,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>2,941,150</td>
<td>156,225</td>
<td>84,995</td>
<td>66,060</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>2,784,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>3,868,875</td>
<td>170,025</td>
<td>118,295</td>
<td>44,265</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,698,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon Territory</td>
<td>28,520</td>
<td>6,540</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>21,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Territories</td>
<td>37,100</td>
<td>18,730</td>
<td>10,615</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>18,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>26,665</td>
<td>22,720</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22,560</td>
<td>3,945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics Canada 2003)
## APPENDIX K

Aboriginal Identity Population, for Prairie Region Provinces by Area of Residence, 2001

### Alberta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population¹</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - Area of Residence</td>
<td>2,941,150</td>
<td>156,220</td>
<td>84,990</td>
<td>66,060</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>2,784,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Reserve</td>
<td>39,170</td>
<td>37,490</td>
<td>36,245</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Off Reserve</td>
<td>2,901,980</td>
<td>118,730</td>
<td>48,750</td>
<td>65,460</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>2,782,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saskatchewan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population¹</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - Area of Residence</td>
<td>963,155</td>
<td>130,190</td>
<td>83,745</td>
<td>43,695</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>832,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Reserve</td>
<td>48,350</td>
<td>47,070</td>
<td>43,695</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Off Reserve</td>
<td>914,805</td>
<td>83,115</td>
<td>40,045</td>
<td>40,890</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>831,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manitoba

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population¹</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total - Area of Residence</td>
<td>1,103,700</td>
<td>150,040</td>
<td>90,345</td>
<td>56,795</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>953,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Reserve</td>
<td>52,870</td>
<td>52,060</td>
<td>50,970</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Off Reserve</td>
<td>1,050,830</td>
<td>97,980</td>
<td>39,370</td>
<td>56,130</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>952,855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes the Aboriginal groups (North American Indian, Métis and Inuit), multiple Aboriginal responses and Aboriginal responses not included elsewhere.
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APPENDIX L

Aboriginal Identity Population, Percentage Change (1996-2001), for Canada by Prairie Region Census Metropolitan Areas

### Alberta Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population(1)</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>114.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saskatchewan Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population(1)</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manitoba Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Aboriginal Population(1)</th>
<th>North American Indian</th>
<th>Métis</th>
<th>Inuit</th>
<th>Total non-Aboriginal Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Includes the Aboriginal groups (North American Indian, Métis and Inuit), multiple Aboriginal responses and Aboriginal responses not included elsewhere.
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APPENDIX M

Aboriginal Identity Population, for Prairie Region Census Metropolitan Centres, 1951-1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>13,750</td>
<td>29,235</td>
<td>32,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>14,075</td>
<td>15,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>11,920</td>
<td>16,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>6,575</td>
<td>11,020</td>
<td>13,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>16,575</td>
<td>35,150</td>
<td>45,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The 1971 data does not include the Inuit.
2. In 1991 and 1996, these statistics refer to individuals who identified with an Aboriginal identity. Counts for previous years refer to individuals with aboriginal ancestry. Because of changes in the questions on which these counts are based, statistics are not strictly comparable across years before 1991.

(Statistics Canada various years)
### APPENDIX N

Aboriginal Identity Population, for Prairie Region Provinces by Total Age Groups and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total-Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>476,700</td>
<td>499,605</td>
<td>976,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>75,945</td>
<td>80,275</td>
<td>156,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>63,295</td>
<td>66,895</td>
<td>130,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>73,030</td>
<td>77,010</td>
<td>150,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics Canada 2003)

Aboriginal Identity Population, for Prairie Region Census Metropolitan Areas by Total Age Groups and Sex, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Centre</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total-Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>10,445</td>
<td>11,470</td>
<td>21,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>19,290</td>
<td>21,640</td>
<td>40,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>7,285</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>15,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>9,325</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td>20,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>26,045</td>
<td>29,715</td>
<td>55,755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics Canada 2003)
APPENDIX O

Aboriginal Identity Population, Mobility Status 1 Year Ago, for All Age Groups (1 Year and Over), for Canada, Provinces and Territories, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Same address</th>
<th>Change of address</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within the same CSD</td>
<td>Within the same prov./terr. from different CSD</td>
<td>From a different prov./terr. or country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>956,785</td>
<td>746,550</td>
<td>133,935</td>
<td>59,230</td>
<td>17,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador</td>
<td>18,480</td>
<td>15,925</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>13,410</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>13,975</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>77,995</td>
<td>66,045</td>
<td>7,255</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>184,985</td>
<td>146,760</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>146,580</td>
<td>115,860</td>
<td>21,165</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>126,945</td>
<td>94,780</td>
<td>20,555</td>
<td>9,430</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>152,920</td>
<td>114,945</td>
<td>23,130</td>
<td>10,225</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>167,220</td>
<td>125,825</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>12,440</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon Territory</td>
<td>6,425</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Territories</td>
<td>18,360</td>
<td>14,595</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>22,180</td>
<td>18,270</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Aboriginal identity population comprises those persons who reported identifying with at least one Aboriginal group, that is, North American Indian, Métis or Inuit, and/or who reported being a Treaty Indian or a Registered Indian, as defined by the Indian Act of Canada, and/or who reported being a member of an Indian Band or First Nation.

CSD: Census Subdivision

(Statistics Canada 2003)
APPENDIX P

Aboriginal Identity Population, Mobility Status 1 Year Ago, for All Age Groups (1 Year and Over), for Prairie Provinces Census Metropolitan Areas, 2001

**Alberta Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Same address</th>
<th>Change of address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same address</td>
<td>Change of address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within the same CSD</td>
<td>Within the same prov./ terr. from different CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>956,785</td>
<td>746,550</td>
<td>133,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td>152,920</td>
<td>114,945</td>
<td>23,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>21,490</td>
<td>14,855</td>
<td>4,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>39,945</td>
<td>27,685</td>
<td>8,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Saskatchewan Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Same address</th>
<th>Change of address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same address</td>
<td>Change of address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within the same CSD</td>
<td>Within the same prov./ terr. from different CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>956,785</td>
<td>746,550</td>
<td>133,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td></td>
<td>126,945</td>
<td>94,780</td>
<td>20,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>15,265</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>4,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>19,690</td>
<td>12,045</td>
<td>5,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manitoba Region**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Same address</th>
<th>Change of address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same address</td>
<td>Change of address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within the same CSD</td>
<td>Within the same prov./ terr. from different CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>956,785</td>
<td>746,550</td>
<td>133,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td>146,580</td>
<td>115,860</td>
<td>21,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>54,455</td>
<td>38,175</td>
<td>12,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX Q

**Prairie Region**

Municipal Centres Educational Attainment, 1996 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th></th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
<th></th>
<th>Saskatoon</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Aboriginal</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>Non-Aboriginal</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>Non-Aboriginal</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than grade 12</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades certificate/diploma</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-university certificate/diploma</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regina</th>
<th></th>
<th>Winnipeg</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Aboriginal</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>Non-Aboriginal</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than grade 12</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades certificate/diploma</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-university certificate/diploma</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Statistics Canada 1996)