



**ENGAGING
HISTORY**

SECTION 3

The Indian Act and the Indian Residential Schools

“The great aim of our legislation has been to do away with the tribal system and assimilate the Indian people in all respects with the other inhabitants of the Dominion as speedily as they are fit to change.” –Sir John A. Macdonald, 1887

In the previous sections, we talked about the ideas that Europeans falsely employed to categorize the Indigenous Peoples of North America. These prejudicial categories soon became instrumental in managing and controlling these nations; indeed, they provided an excuse for moving the First Nations (and Métis) out of the way of the European settlers. In this section, we will examine how some of these views were put into action after Confederation in 1867.

By the 1870s, with the processes of European settlement and the removal of First Nations to reserves under way, the Dominion government faced a number of dilemmas: Was there a solution to the problems faced by the Indigenous Peoples, many of whom were pushed to live on the brink of starvation on small and unproductive plots of lands by European violence? What would long-term solutions look like, besides charity and urgent humanitarian assistance (which the government was frequently forced to provide, however reluctantly)? How did these possible solutions fit with the colonists’ own interests and prejudices?

In addition to the treaties, which were signed under duress with different First Nations, the government passed the Indian Act to formalize its relations with the First Nations. As part of the act, the government also turned its attention to education. At the time, many Europeans believed that with time and Western education, the Indigenous Peoples would assimilate into the settler society, which the Europeans believed to be a positive change. What they considered progress is today recognized an attempt to eradicate indigenous cultures. In a now-famous paper, residential schools scholar John Milloy argues that the Indian Act effectively ended indigenous forms of self-government and made First Nations people wards of the Canadian government. “Successive

federal governments, Liberal and Conservative,” he maintains, “over the next century, in amendments to the 1869 Act and in new Acts, spelled out, in increasing detail, a colonial structure that passed control of First Nations people and communities into the hands of the Indian Affairs Department.”¹

Several options for bringing Western education to the Indigenous Peoples were tried before federation, including manual-labour schools, day schools, and boarding schools. Most if not all of these schools were run by Christian churches, with varying degrees of religious instruction taught along with farming and trade-skills training. The government eventually chose the boarding schools, or the Indian Residential Schools, as its most important institution designed to assimilate the Indigenous Peoples of Canada. The most distinctive characteristic of the Indian Residential Schools system was that it tore indigenous children from their families and left them in the care of complete and often hostile strangers—the schools’ religious instructors.

Guiding QUESTIONS

1. What were the assumptions behind the Indian Act?
2. What were the goals of the Indian Residential Schools?
3. What can the goals of the residential schools tell us about the European views of indigenous cultures? What consequence did those views have for Indigenous Peoples?

¹ John Milloy, “Indian Act Colonialism: A Century of Dishonour, 1869–1969,” National Centre for First Nations Governance, 2008, accessed May 8, 2015, http://fngovernance.org/ncfng_research/milloy.pdf.





© Lebrecht Music and Arts Photo Library / Alamy

The Indian Act of 1876 granted the Canadian government control over many aspects of Indigenous Peoples' lives, including the management of housing, health services, the environment, and other resources on reserves. In this photograph, an indigenous Canadian woman is shown on a reserve in 1930.

The Indian Act

Laws can take abstract ideas and implement them in real life. A law makes following a rule mandatory, and law enforcement ensures that people obey that rule. But while laws can provide order and protection, they can also express prejudice and be used to discriminate.

In 1876, the British North America Act united three British colonies into the first four provinces of the Dominion of Canada, providing Canada with its own government and federal structure. This new Canadian government inherited the colonial legacy of Great Britain, including two legislations: the Gradual Civilization Act of 1857 and the Gradual Enfranchisement Act of 1869. Both aimed to force Indigenous Peoples to give up all ties to their heritage via the acquisition of Euro-Canadian education or by leaving the reserve and becoming owners of private property. Since the 1830s, the British authorities, and later the Canadian government, had set up reserves to settle the Indigenous Peoples and remove them from areas the newcomers desired to settle or develop. The reserves were small, unproductive land tracts where the Indigenous Peoples were forced to live by the act.

Eventually, the Canadian Parliament consolidated the Gradual Civilization Act and the Gradual Enfranchisement Act into the Indian Act of 1876. This new legislation, which still exists today despite its many amendments, brought Status (registered) Indians under federal jurisdiction. The Department of Indian Affairs, formed by the act,

governed nearly all aspects of the lives of First Nations communities, including band membership, reserve infrastructure and services, systems of governance, culture, and education.

The Indian Act of 1876 created the legal category of Status Indian, a category that had long-lasting implications for the First Nations of Canada. Once it entered into law, the act imposed a single common legal definition, lumping together different nations and languages into the broad category of First Nations.

What does it mean to be a Status Indian? The original document of 1876 defined someone as being legally Indian if that person fit these descriptions:

- First. Any male person of Indian blood reputed to belong to a particular band;
- Secondly. Any child of such person;
- Thirdly. Any woman who is, or was, lawfully married to such person.²

A key element was the law's definition of who was Indian and what Indianness was. (The term *Indian* was used several centuries before—the law simply formalized its use. It is worth noting, however, that none of the many clans, bands, alliances, and nations ever called themselves Indian.)

According to the Indian Act of 1876, the “only individuals who could consider themselves Indian were those who could prove they were related, through the male line, to individuals who were already Status Indians,” writes Bonita Lawrence. Thus the policy created “new” members of society whose legal status, rights, and limitations were defined by law; the Indian Act made formal a new Canadian group. Equally powerful was the Indian Act's power to exclude. Among the groups that were not considered Indians were the Inuit and Métis people. Individuals could easily lose their status, and “without Indian Status and the band membership that goes along with it,” Lawrence notes, “Native people are not allowed to live on any land part of an Indian reserve in Canada. . . . They cannot take part in the life of their own community unless they have Indian Status and hence band membership in that community.” In fact, she writes, “the colonial act of establishing legal definitions of Indianness, which excluded vast numbers of Native people from obtaining Indian status, has enabled

the Canadian government to remove a significant sector of Native people from the land.”³

The Indian Act has been reformed many times since 1876. Over the years, its most offensive clauses were repealed or altered, including those restricting the movement of individuals outside of reserves, outlawing indigenous ceremonies, and discriminating against women. But to this day, the Indian Act continues to regulate significant parts of life for Indigenous Peoples in Canada, such as band membership, taxation, band governance, elections, rights to land and other resources, and education.

But however bad this legislation is, it recognizes the First Nations of Canada’s legal relationship with the Canadian government and affirms their rights and status not as minorities but as independent groups.⁴ Few indigenous activists would like to see it simply go away before settling the relationship between the Crown and First Nations on a better foundation.



Library and Archives Canada / PA-185530

In the crowded and understaffed residential schools, the physical and domestic chores performed by students were critical to keeping the schools afloat. Here, children are seen cutting logs at Fort Resolution Indian Residential School in the Northwest Territory.

The Residential Schools

The Indian Act of 1876 made the education of First Nations groups a federal responsibility. The government was authorized to contract with the different provinces as well as with church authorities to establish boarding schools for indigenous education. The Indian Act empowered the Minister of Indian Affairs to enroll and place all indigenous children (excluding, for many years, the Métis) in school. Then Prime Minister Sir John A. Macdonald was very clear about the need to sever the connection between the students and their indigenous communities: “When the school is on the reserve, the child lives with his parents who are savages; he is surrounded by savages, and though he may learn to read and write, his habits and training and mode of thought are Indian. He is simply a savage who can read and write.”⁵

Until 1883, “Canada did not have a residential school system,” but rather, had “a series of individual church-led initiatives to which the federal government provided grants.”⁶ Based on these pre-Confederation religious boarding schools, the government sought partnerships with representatives of the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, and other churches to operate the schools and carry out this mission of Indian education for the state. Education was to be the primary tool to “civilize” the First Nations and prepare them for life as mainstream European-Canadians.⁷ A far cry from the boarding schools for Canada’s privileged children, the residential schools were, in

fact, built on the model of “reformatories and jails established for the children of the urban poor.”⁸ But from 1883 onward, the government sought a system to enroll all First Nations children in schools. Day school and “industrial schools” were to serve alongside the residential schools to meet the challenge. Roughly 150,000 indigenous students (mostly from First Nations communities) went to residential schools, although a great number of indigenous students attended day schools. While both types of schools espoused the mission of civilizing the Indigenous Peoples and were run by the churches, the residential schools left the most painful marks on Indigenous Peoples in Canada.⁹

The government’s residential schools system began with a modest budget of \$44,000 a year in 1883. This money, however, mostly came from cuts to government spending on other indigenous community needs. Thus, the funding of the system was marked by the reluctance of the government to fully invest in the program. Not long after the residential schools system emerged, critics began to denounce its economic utility, its care for student health, its limited academic success, and its failure to create a cadre of young “assimilated Indians.” By the 1940s, the failure of the system as a whole was evident.

The residential schools struggled with poor funding, poor and unsuitable nutrition, unsanitary conditions, and poor medical care. Students lived in crowded dormitories and were rarely isolated when sick. This practice made the schools prone to outbreaks of diseases, and they were hit hard by tuberculosis and flu epidemics, including the Spanish flu epidemic of 1918. Overall, more than 6,000 students died in the residential schools.¹⁰ The death toll of so many students from tuberculosis and other diseases in the schools recently prompted a heated debate about Canada’s responsibility for these deaths.

2 Excerpt from the Indian Act, 1876, “CHAP. 18: An Act to amend and consolidate the laws respecting Indians.”

3 Bonita Lawrence, “Gender, Race, and the Regulation of Native Identity in Canada and the United States: An Overview,” *Hypatia* 18 (2003).

4 Erin Hanson, “The Indian Act,” Indigenous Foundations University of British Columbia First Nations Studies Program, accessed May 12, 2015, <http://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/government-policy/the-indian-act.html>.

5 Quoted in Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *They Came for the Children* (Winnipeg: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2012), 6.

6 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *They Came for the Children*, 6.

- 7 Two models of schooling were pursued: industrial and residential schools. The industrial schools were to focus more on broad work skills and trades. Those were not boarding schools, although the students often lived in a separate building that served as a hostel. The residential schools were to be more academic, though they too were to offer training in farm work (for boys) and domestic skills (for girls).
- 8 *They Came for the Children*, 13. Of course, not all the schools were industrial or residential schools. The majority of indigenous students actually went to day school on the reserve (or in cities). Still, it was the residential school experience that had the most lasting impact on the Indigenous Peoples.
- 9 "Residential School History: A Legacy of Shame," Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health, Ottawa, accessed June 18, 2015, http://www.med.uottawa.ca/sim/data/Images/Residential_Schools.pdf
- 10 John Paul Tasker, "Residential schools findings point to 'cultural genocide,' commission chair says," *CBCNews*, accessed June 15, 2015, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/residential-schools-findings-point-to-cultural-genocide-commission-chair-says-1.3093580>. See also Brenda Elias, "The challenge of counting the missing when the missing were not counted," paper presented at the International Association of Genocide Scholars conference, "Time, Movement, and Space: Genocide Studies and Indigenous Peoples," July 16–19, 2014.



READING 1 **Killing the Indian in the Child**¹¹

By the second half of the nineteenth century, there were growing concerns among European settlers about the future of the integration and assimilation of the indigenous population of Canada. Those concerns stemmed from the frustration of settlers with the persistence of what they called the Indian problem. The expectation that the indigenous groups would simply give up their ways of life and embrace European languages and culture had not materialized. Frustration grew in proportion to the desire to clear the way for new settlers, a goal that could only be achieved either by removing indigenous communities from their land or assimilating them and forcing them to give up their land rights as separate peoples. The educational experiments on or near the reserves proved to be ineffective in encouraging children to give up their culture and traditional ways of life. The students, said a government report, did not “carry back with them to their homes any desire to spread among their people the instruction which they have received. They are content as before to live in the same slovenly manners. . . . The same apathy and indolence stamp their actions as is apparent in the rest of the Indians.”¹² As a result, in both the United States and Canada a new idea began to take root: indigenous children would have to be taken from their parents and educated separately in a boarding school so that the pull of family, tradition, and custom would not affect their assimilation.

But these institutions were not going to be based on the model of the traditional British upper-class boarding schools. To many, the Indian Residential Schools would represent a combination of the Victorian poorhouse, a penal institution, and a religious seminary. Prime Minister Sir John A. Macdonald, who was also Minister of Indian Affairs, commissioned Nicholas Flood Davin, a journalist, lawyer, and politician, to go to Washington, DC, in 1879. Davin was sent to learn about the policy of “aggressive civilization” of Native Americans in the United States, where the idea of separating, educating, and assimilating indigenous children had recently been put into practice.¹³ The key to this policy was a system of “industrial schools” where religious instruction and skills training were combined to help the Native Americans catch up with the demands of Western society. In a confidential report to the Canadian government in 1879 called *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds*, Davin advised Canada to follow this model (the distinction between industrial and residential schools is discussed in the Historical Background section of

this guide, but essentially they were the same). His report, eventually known as the Davin Report, became the “founding document which specified the terms within which industrial schools functioned for almost a century.”¹⁴ It included the following:

The industrial school is the principal feature of a policy known as that of “aggressive civilization.” This policy was inaugurated by President Grant in 1869. But as will be seen, the utility of the industrial schools had long [before] that time been amply tested. Acting on the suggestion of the President, Congress passed a law early in 1869, providing for the appointment of the Peace Commission. This Commission recommended that the Indian should, as far as practical, be consolidated on a few reservations, and provided with “permanent individual homes”; that the tribal relation should be abolished; that lands should be allotted [to individuals] not in common; that the Indian should speedily become a citizen of the United States, enjoy the protection of the law, and made [accountable to it]; that, finally, it was the duty of the Government to afford the Indians all reasonable aid in their preparation for citizenship by education in industry and in the arts of civilization. . . . From 1869 vigorous efforts in an education direction were put forward. But it was found that the day-school did not work, because the influence of the wigwam was stronger than the influence of the school. Industrial Boarding Schools were therefore established, and these are now numerous and will soon be universal. The cry from the Agencies where no boarding industrial schools have been established is persistent and earnest to have the want supplied.

The experience of the United States is the same as our own as far as the adult Indian is concerned. Little can be done with him. He can be taught to do a little at farming, and at stock-raising, and to dress in a more civilized manner, but that is all. The child, again, who goes to a day school learns little, and what little he learns is soon forgotten, while his tastes are fashioned at home, and his inherited aversion to toil is in no way combated. . . .

The Indian character, about which some persons fling such a mystery, is not difficult to understand. The Indian is sometimes spoken of as a child, but he is very far from being a child. . . . The Indian is a man with traditions of his own, which make civilization a puzzle of despair. He has the suspicion, distrust, fault-finding tendency, the insincerity and flattery, produced in all subject races. He is crafty, but conscious how weak his craft is when opposed to the superior cunning of the white man . . .¹⁵

Davin and his generation believed in what J. A. Macrae, the Indian Affairs Department Inspector of the North West, said in 1886:

The circumstance of the Indian existence prevents him from following that core of evolution which had produced from the barbarian of the past the civilized man of today. It is impossible from him to be allowed slowly to pass through the successive stages from the pastoral to an agricultural life and from an agricultural one, to one of manufacturing, commerce or trade as we have done. He has been called upon suddenly and without warning to enter upon a new existence. Without the assistance of the government, he must have failed and perished miserably and he would have died hard entailing expense and disgrace upon the country.¹⁶

At the height of the residential schools system, it was run by an extreme “assimilationist” named Duncan Campbell Scott.¹⁷ Scott, a civil servant in the Department of Indian Affairs, is widely viewed as the most ardent supporter of the residential schools and the policies associated with them: the removal by consent or by force of tens of thousands of indigenous children from their homes, some as young as two or four years of age; the attempts to deprive these children of any connections with their parents; the institution of an underfunded, willfully neglectful system where thousands of students perished from malnutrition, poor medical care, and diseases; the creation of an education system where child labour was a norm and where academic achievements were severely compromised; and the consistent lack of oversight and accountability in a system where physical and sexual abuse were rampant.

In 1920, Scott also pushed for and passed an amendment to the Indian Act making school attendance compulsory for all First Nations children under 15 years of age.¹⁸ While he did not think that education alone was sufficient for civilizing the Indigenous Peoples of Canada, he advocated heavily for it. When he mandated compulsory school attendance in 1920, he stated,

I want to get rid of the Indian problem. I do not think as a matter of fact, that the country ought to continuously protect a class of people who are able to stand alone . . . Our objective is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic and there is no Indian question, and no Indian Department, that is the whole object of this Bill.¹⁹

Connection QUESTIONS

1. Define the word *assimilation*. What is *integration*? What are the similarities and differences in the meanings of the words? Many of the education-system leaders in this reading are described as assimilationists. What were their goals?

2. Why did Davin and his contemporaries think that Aboriginal Peoples needed to be civilized? What, according to Davin, was “aggressive civilization”?
3. What did Davin mean when he said that the “influence of the wigwam was stronger than the influence of the school”? What did it mean in terms of the education policy he recommended?
4. What was Davin’s view of the indigenous people? What were the obstacles to their assimilation? What kind of schooling was Davin advocating?
5. According to the quotation from Duncan Campbell Scott, what was the purpose of the residential schools? What vision is reflected in this paragraph regarding Canadian society?

-
- 11 This phrase is commonly but incorrectly attributed to Duncan Campbell Scott, though his actions as the head of the DIA between 1913 and 1932 suggest that he might have agreed with the idea..
 - 12 *Report of the Special Commissioners Appointed to Investigate Indian Affairs in Canada*, Journals of Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada from 25th of February to 1st June 1858, appendix no. 21, part 3, session 1853, quoted in John Milloy, *A National Crime*, 18.
 - 13 This policy, writes anthropologist Derek G. Smith, “had been formulated in the post-Civil War period by President Ulysses S. Grant’s administration . . . and was passed into law by Congress in early 1869. See Derek G. Smith, “The ‘Policy of Aggressive Civilization’ and Projects of Governance in Roman Catholic Industrial Schools for Native Peoples in Canada, 1870–95,” *Anthropologica* 43 (2001), 254.
 - 14 Derek G. Smith, “The ‘Policy of Aggressive Civilization,’” 254.
 - 15 Nicholas Flood Davin, *Report on Industrial Schools for Indians and Half-Breeds* (1879), in., *Reconciling Canada: Critical Perspectives on the Culture of Redress*, ed. Jennifer Henderson and Pauline Wakeham (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 229–301.
 - 16 Quoted in John Milloy, *A National Crime*, 27.
 - 17 Scott was a civil servant for much of his life and was involved in indigenous affairs throughout his career (he negotiated, for example, one of the treaties). He served as deputy superintendent of the Department of Indian Affairs from 1913 to 1932 and oversaw the operation of the residential schools. Scott, a renowned Canadian poet, appreciated elements of indigenous culture, but he contributed directly to its destruction—perhaps more than anybody. See Nancy Chater, “Technologies of Remembrance: Literary Criticism and Duncan Campbell Scott’s Indian Poems” (MA thesis, University of Toronto, 1999), http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk1/tape7/PQDD_0003/MQ45483.pdf, 25–26. Moreover, in 1924, he proposed an amendment to the Indian Act that was adopted, forbidding Aboriginal people from hiring lawyers without the DIA’s approval to represent them in land and sovereignty claims. For these and many other contributions, Scott is called by experts the “architect of Indian policies” during the first decades of the twentieth century. See also Brian Titley, *A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986), 22.
 - 18 Brian Titley, *A Narrow Vision: Duncan Campbell Scott and the Administration of Indian Affairs in Canada* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986), 91–92. As a result of the amendment, indigenous enrollment rose to about 17,000 in all schools and to over 8,000 in residential schools by the end of his tenure. According to Scott’s reports, at this point, 75% of indigenous children were enrolled in some school, which he attributed to a growing motivation among them to take up Western education. Clearly, the fact that the education was now compulsory, and that since 1930 it included all children between the ages of 7 and 16, had something to do with these numbers.
 - 19 National Archives of Canada, Record Group 10, vol. 6810, file 470-2-3, vol. 7, 55 (L-3) and 63 (N-3).



READING 2 **The Role of the Churches**

The stated purpose of the Indian Residential Schools was to make the Indigenous Peoples of Canada embrace Western values and Christianity (those two sets of beliefs were almost inseparable at the time). In the eyes of many state officials, the agent that could and should bring about such rapid change was the Christian church. Missionaries of all denominations embraced the cause of Christianizing and civilizing the Indigenous Peoples in Canada long before the Davin Report of 1879. Indeed, in the 1880s there were already four church-run boarding schools in operation.²⁰ Frustration with day schools and other forms of missionary work led all the Christian denominations to support the model of boarding or residential schools. In the decades to come, the government turned over operation of most of the residential schools to the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches.²¹ Most people of European descent at the time shared the view that Christianity and civilization supported each other (if they were not actually synonymous). As early as 1852, Rev. Samuel Rose, the principal of Mt. Elgin residential school at the time, explained:

[The education of these] youths has been regarded by me as the work of no ordinary character; an education solemnly important in his connection to the future, with the unborn periods of the time. . . . These youths are to form the class whose histories is to be a most important epoch in the history of the nations to which they belong. . . . This class is to spring a generation, who will either perpetuate the manners and customs of their ancestors, or being *intellectually, morally and religiously* elevated, take their stand among the improved, intelligent nations of the earth, their part in the great drama of the world's doing; or off want of necessary qualifications, to take their place and perform their part, be despised and pushed off the stage of action and ceased to be!²²

A memorandum of the Convention of Catholic Principals in 1924 expressed similar sentiments:

All true civilization must be based on moral law, which Christian religion alone can give. Pagan superstition could not suffice . . . to make the Indians practice the virtues of our civilization and avoid its attendant vices. Several people have desired us to countenance the dances of the Indians and to observe their festivals; but their habits, being the result of free and easy mode of life, cannot conform to the intense struggle for life which our social conditions require.²³

The clergymen and women who took on administrative and teaching roles in the schools often saw themselves as a protective force for the indigenous people



Canada Dept. Indian and Northern Affairs / Library and Archives Canada / e011080274

Although government funded, the residential schools were operated by churches, with clergymen and women serving in most teaching and administrative roles. This photo was taken at Cross Lake Indian Residential School in Manitoba in 1940.

without considering the perspectives of the cultures from which their students came. A 1911 report of the Alberta Methodist Commission said this:

The Indian is the weak child in the family of our nation and for this reason presents the most earnest appeal for Christian sympathy and co-operation . . . [W]e are convinced that the only hope of successfully discharging this obligation to our Indian brethren is through the medium of the children, therefore education must be given the foremost place."²⁴

A 2012 report by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission explains the complicated role of the churches:

To both Protestant and Catholic missionaries, Aboriginal spiritual beliefs were little more than superstition and witchcraft. In British Columbia, William Duncan of the Church Missionary Society reported: "I cannot describe the conditions of this people better than by saying that it is just what might be expected in savage heathen life." Missionaries led the campaign to outlaw Aboriginal sacred ceremonies such as the Potlatch on the west coast and the Sun Dance on the Prairies. In British Columbia in 1884, for example, Roman Catholic missionaries argued for banning the Potlatch, saying that participation in the ceremony left many families so impoverished they had to withdraw their children from school to accompany them in the winter to help them search for food.

While, on one front, missionaries were engaged in a war on Aboriginal culture, on another, they often served as advocates for protecting and advancing Aboriginal interests in their dealings with government and settlers. Many learned Aboriginal languages, and conducted religious ceremonies at the schools in those languages. These efforts were not unrewarded: the 1899 census identified 70,000 of 100,000 Indian people in Canada as Christians.²⁵

Connection QUESTIONS

1. How did Rev. Samuel Rose justify the missions and policies of the residential schools? What purpose did he believe the schools served?
2. What language is used in the different passages from religious leaders to describe Indigenous Peoples and their culture? What language do these religious leaders use to describe their own mission? What might we learn from the contrasts between their motivations and their rationalization for the policy? What might the contrasts reveal about their biases?
3. What, according to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report, was the role of the churches in colonial Canada? Is it possible to reconcile the two main roles identified by the report (an assault on and protection of indigenous culture)? If yes, how?
4. The introduction to Section 2 described Helen Fein's definition of a universe of obligation—the circle of individuals and groups “toward whom obligations are owed, to whom rules apply, and whose injuries call for [amends].”²⁶ How might the religious leaders in this reading have described their obligation to the Aboriginal Peoples? How did they propose to express that obligation? How did those ideas conflict with indigenous beliefs, expectations, and rights? Based on what you've read so far, what might Fein say about the way some of the religious leaders quoted in the reading defined their universe of obligation?

20 Other origins can be traced to pre-Confederation educational experiments in Europe and the array of industrial and missionary schools in the US and Canada. See John S. Milloy, *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 1999), 13–14.

21 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *They Came for the Children*, 15. The two largest religious organizations behind the residential schools were the Roman Catholic Oblates Order of Mary Immaculate and the Church Missionary Society of the Anglican Church (the Church of England). They became the main organizations behind the system, with the Roman Catholic Church running as many as 60% of the schools, the Anglican Church 25%, and the United Church of Canada (created after 1925 as a merger of several Protestant denominations, including the Presbyterians, Methodists, and smaller denominations) running the remainder. The Jesuits, despite their intense missionary work in Canada (early on) and around the world, operated only two residential schools after Confederation. The Methodist and Presbyterian Churches in Britain and the US operated a few schools, as well.

22 Rev. Rose Report, 1852, in Elizabeth Graham, ed., *The Mush Hole: Life at Two Indian Residential Schools* (Ontario: Heffle Publishing, 1997), 230. Emphasis added.

- 23 Memorandum of the Convention of the Catholic Principals of Indian Residential Schools, Lebert, Saskatchewan, August 28–29, 1924.
- 24 T. Ferrier, “Report for the Alberta Methodist Commission,” 1911, quoted in John Milloy, *A National Crime*, 28.
- 25 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *They Came for the Children*, 15.
- 26 Helen Fein, *Accounting for Genocide* (New York: Free Press, 1979), 4.

