A MACDONALD-LAURIER INSTITUTE PUBLICATION
COVID and after:
A MANDATE FOR
RECOVERY
MLI
TRUE NORTH IN CANADIAN PUBLIC POLICY
2020
2021
2022
AUGUST 2021

Canada's attention is finally focused on Indigenous issues. Here's how to move forward in partnership with Indigenous peoples

Ken S. Coates

While the public reaction to the location of unmarked graves around residential schools has been remarkable, it is part of a decades-old pattern: public exposure of the depredations of residential schools; a temporary outpouring of grief and anger; and the gradual disappearance of the issue from the policy debate. Let's make sure this time is really different.

Over the past several weeks, Canadians have wrestled with revelations about the deaths of hundreds of Indigenous children in residential schools. Much of the reaction is, to be frank, difficult to accept. While the discovery of the unmarked graves is unnerving, the knowledge that children died at these schools has been around for generations, shared regularly by former students and Indigenous leaders, and just as systematically ignored by the country.

The author of this document has worked independently and is solely responsible for the views presented here. The opinions are not necessarily those of the Macdonald-Laurier Institute, its Directors or Supporters.

Suddenly in June and July 2021, successive discoveries of more burial sites generated a wave of revulsion, concern, and demands for action. And, in yet another burst of the superficial self-criticism for which Canadians have become well known, some protestors took on defenceless statues and churches and even launched an assault on Canada Day, as if chastising dead politicians and a national celebration would somehow provide succor and transformative support for Indigenous communities long since undermined by colonization and cultural imperialism.

The government of Canada stepped in with a grandiose gesture, offering all Canadians a new national holiday on September 30 on truth and reconciliation, when the citizenry will, most assuredly, spend the day prostrate in sorrow and penance for the evils of governments past. Only Canada would reward millions of non-Indigenous peoples with a day off work to mark the longstanding mistreatment of Indigenous peoples. Even in the process of recognizing the pain inflicted on Indigenous children in residential schools, Canadian politicians have managed to divert attention from the victims and shift it, self-indulgently, to the population at large.

The main questions hanging over this process are simple. How did public recognition of the disasters that were residential schools come about? And what should we do about it? The rest of this commentary seeks to provide some preliminary answers to these critical questions.

Understanding the full and lasting impact of residential schools

Start with the often-ignored origins of the schools. In contrast to the idea that a handful of policy entrepreneurs and national leaders drove this policy – Edgerton Ryerson and John A. Macdonald standing in for the vast majority of 19th century politicians who supported the idea – almost all Canadians backed the residential school movement. The Christian churches put their money, time, and personnel behind the schools and eagerly accepted government financial support for the effort. They did so in the 19th century and the sentiment that residential schools were a good thing for all concerned held throughout most of the 20th century.

But from the beginning there were blemishes on the optimistic, beatific picture most Canadians held about the schools, one promoted extensively by governments and churches that lauded their "civilizing" activities. Early on, the truth started leaking out, as the truth often does. Children drawn from hundreds of miles away often arrived at the schools with tuberculosis and succumbed to the illness, withering and dying in front of their classmates. Diseases attacked the institutions and claimed many more victims.

The graveyards being uncovered today started to fill in the 19th century. Some children fled the schools; and some died in the effort to get back to their homes. School officials and church leaders noted the illnesses and deaths in their reports to government and struggled with the seeming inevitability of loss. They held firm to the idea that, even with the evidence on their desks of hundreds of student deaths and intense personal and family pain for thousands, the schools were essential to the assimilation of Indigenous peoples.

But few people spoke up and those who did were ignored. The overwhelming majority of Canadians, it must be remembered, saw residential schools as inevitable, appropriate, and even a stellar example of the good work the government was doing on behalf of Indigenous peoples in Canada.

Even people with direct exposure to residential schools came slowly to the realization that this government policy was wrong-headed. I was raised in Yukon in the 1960s. Two of the largest public buildings in the North – the Anglican Carcross Residential School and the Catholic school at Lower Post, BC – were seen in generally optimistic terms, even as pressure was mounting to change or even abandon the program. The Baptist residential school in Whitehorse closed down. Richard King, in a 1967 academic study of the Carcross facility, *The School at Mopass: A Problem of Identity*, provided the first comprehensive and damning examination of the mistreatment of the residential students (King 1967), although the book did not have much of an immediate impact on public attitudes. I have strong memories of conversations at church about the "benefits" for the First Nations children of the residential schools.

> *The overwhelming majority of Canadians, it must be remembered, saw residential schools as inevitable [and] appropriate*

Contact with the residential schools by non-Indigenous students was minimal. I attended the Anglican church camp, located on the bench-land behind the Carcross school, for several summers, but interaction with the students held over for the summer was limited to a series of baseball games. A cross-country ski trip to Inuvik in the late 1960s required an extended stay in a Catholic residence hall. For a middle class non-Indigenous student, this time was eye-opening, marked by rigid and strange rituals, austere dorm rooms, authoritarian and mean-spirited nuns, and unpalatable food. But the public impression of residential schools, to the tiny degree that other Canadians paid attention, remained generally positive.

On occasions, Indigenous students spoke out about their experiences; several of my First Nations high school classmates commented about their distaste of their time in residential school, but I cannot say that non-Indigenous people, including myself, gave their comments much notice. We did recognize that residential school students were great basketball players, having long hours of access to the boarding school gym. Even as the number and volume of the Indigenous voices increased, and even as the government realized the flaws of residential schools and dispatched Indigenous students to provincial and territorial schools (where they discovered another culturally hostile and unwelcoming setting), the positive view still held for most Canadians.

Major change came fast and unexpectedly. In 1987, Northern Native Broadcasting Yukon (NNBY) ran a documentary, *The Mission School Syndrome*, on its Saturday night TV program Nedaa (Your Eye). The show attracted a huge audience by Yukon standards, and almost all Yukon First Nations people tuned in. The documentary included a range of perspectives: the Catholic priest lauding the schools; a First Nation woman acknowledging she got better food and better living conditions than when she was at home; Richard King summarizing his work from two decades earlier; and hard-to-watch interviews with former students clearly wrestling with demons left over from their time at school.

Fontaine's brave interview changed the national dialogue and encouraged dozens of other survivors to come forward.

On the Monday morning after the show, the phones at NNBY rang off the hook. Dozens of people phoned in to talk about the documentary. Almost all the calls had two elements: a comment to the effect that "I thought I was the only one who felt that way" and an appeal for help. By week's end, and with support from the Council for Yukon Indians and the government of Yukon, counselling support and healing circles had been provided throughout the territory. The documentary did not immediately air outside Yukon but the impact in the North was tectonic. The mystique of the northern residential schools – a view held only among non-Indigenous people – had been broken.

Across the country, former students, community leaders, and Indigenous professionals spoke out regularly, but recognition of the long-term impact of the residential schools was not forthcoming.

The national transition started three years later, with a shocking and revelatory 1990 interview with Phil Fontaine by *The Journal*'s Barbara Frum (CBC News 1990). With stunning frankness, Fontaine, then the Chief of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, described the widespread sexual and physical abuse he and his classmates experienced at the hands of school personnel. Fontaine's brave interview changed the national dialogue and encouraged dozens of other survivors to come forward.

Still, few major policy initiatives came from this emerging conversation. Indigenous political leaders and residential school survivors continued to speak. But few people in mainstream Canada took notice.

The pattern continued: public exposure of the depredations of residential schools; a temporary outpouring of grief and anger; and the gradual disappearance of the issue from the policy debate. In the early 1990s, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples also documented the problems with residential schools and offered a long list of strong recommendations for action. The commission's report sat on the shelf for years.

Individual stories did not aggregate well and understanding of the collective impact did not emerge immediately. This changed in 1996 with the publication of J.R. Miller's magisterial work, *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools* (Miller 1996). This excellent historical study, followed in 1999 by John Milloy's passionate *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System*, put structure to the hundreds of stories and backed contemporary Indigenous conversations with solid documentary records and insightful analysis (Milloy 1999).

> *Indigenous political leaders and residential school survivors continued to speak. But few people in mainstream Canada took notice.*

Indigenous leaders and former students continued to speak out. Public commentators called for government action. And the government acted, in part. In June 2008, Prime Minister Stephen Harper stood in the House of Commons and made a formal apology to residential school students. In a lengthy process, the federal government paid out over $3.5 billion in compensation to former students, with the largest settlements going to those who suffered from the most egregious personal abuse. In a nation that often equates money with affection and commitment, most Canadians took the compensation payments as the final chapter in a long and complex history.

But there was more to come. Indigenous people spoke up more loudly than ever. The government established the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) under the leadership of Justice Murray Sinclair. From 2008 to 2015, the country heard many more stories about the residential school experiences of thousands and thousands of children. Justice Sinclair's final report, completed with an impressive list of recommendations, attracted the superficial sympathy that has become commonplace in most discussions of Indigenous affairs in Canada.

Justin Trudeau's government, which clearly wanted to move forward on the file, made a series of promises, but conditions in Indigenous communities only improved by inches when giant steps were required. The TRC report discussed – as Indigenous people had pointed out for decades – the large number of child deaths and the existence of unmarked graves. Tut-tutting ensued, but not much happened.

And then, in June 2021, the Tk'emlúps te Secwépemc announced the identification of potentially 215 (later revised to 200) unmarked graves associated with the Kamloops Residential School. A short time later, the Cowessess First Nation in Saskatchewan provided details of an even larger unregistered graveyard associated with the Marieval Residential School. Dozens of Indigenous communities have planned similar studies and additional revelations are sure to follow.

And, at least for a time, the country finally seemed to understand. Thousands posted their feelings on Facebook and Instagram. Hundreds joined vigils that popped up across the country or joined in caravans of remembrance. Many purchased orange shirts bearing the derivative Canadian message of the year: Every Child Matters. Thousands of pairs of children's shoes were left in makeshift memorials to the lost children. The federal government responded, consistent with the pattern, with promises of (small amounts) of money and statements of sorrow and regret. Activists called for the cancellation of Canada Day and a handful of communities went along with the idea. Opposition politicians made speeches. Indigenous leaders, in the main, let the evidence speak for itself. Canada seemed, for once, to be truly mournful.

> *In the coming months and years, the depth and sincerity of the country's response will become clear.*

In the coming months and years, the depth and sincerity of the country's response will become clear. If the historic pattern continues, the somber statements of June 2021 will fade into the political background, although the First Nations, Métis, and Inuit governments will continue their efforts to identify the remains and to reunite the children's remains with their families and communities. Private acts of closure and remembrance, while vital, will do little to heal the multi-generational impacts of the residential school movement.

But Canadians need to learn a broader lesson. It has taken decades for Canadians at large to actually hear what Indigenous students, elders, and community leaders have been saying for decades. The Canadian public and its federal government lurch forward in tiny and reluctant steps, hoping that emotional words and deep apologies will put the issue to rest.

Indigenous leaders know the truth. There are many other residential school equivalents – the *Indian Act*, reserves, pass laws, day schools, the ’60s Scoop, powerful Indian Agents, welfare dependency, government bureaucracy, policing, justice and prison systems, inadequate housing – that lie largely unexamined and unremembered. Residential schools were devastating to the students who attended them and to the families and communities separated from their children. But they were only one of many high-profile and brutal symbols belonging to a set of institutions, policies, and structures that sought to undermine Indigenous cultures, worldviews, and livelihoods.

As Canadians seek to understand the full and lasting impact of the residential school movement – and to finally listen carefully to what Indigenous people have said for generations – they must appreciate that the story is far from being fully told. Canadians need to listen, really and truly listen, to what Indigenous people have to say about the past and what they believe is needed to repair the damage. Canada needs to stop apologizing and start acting in ways that will finally set the past right if that is ever going to be possible.

How should Canada respond to these revelations?

No one could have predicted the response to the identification of potential burial sites for children on the grounds of the former Kamloops Residential School. The “news” was old, in that Indigenous peoples had spoken about this for decades, historians documented the phenomenon, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission publicized it, and Indigenous politicians discussed it extensively.

Yet, despite all this effort, the Canadian public failed to internalize the messages. The large numbers seemingly numbed the reaction and depersonalized the situation. But perhaps non-Indigenous Canadians could not visualize the pain and suffering until confronted with the reality of the deaths of hundreds of children over many decades of residential school operations.

Suggestions about how to move forward from this horrible and difficult spot in our nation’s history range widely. Some commentators have demanded legal action against school staff members credibly accused of abuse. Others, including the new National Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, RoseAnne Archibald, called for reparations for Indigenous peoples. Many have suggested an increase in overall government funding for Indigenous communities, a national statement of reconciliation, increased counselling and support for residential school survivors, major improvements to Indigenous schooling, and other such measures.

If anything has been learned from the discovery of the residential school graves, it is this: Canadians must learn to listen to Indigenous leaders and communities about their history, contemporary challenges, and future directions. The Government of Canada cannot pull back into itself and, with the best of intentions but the full weight of its paternalistic history, come up with "solutions" to the issues facing First Nations, Métis and Inuit people in Canada.

Residential schools are a stark reminder of the negative power of paternalistic government policies. The dismantling of the credibility of the residential school movement must be the starting point for the real commencement of Indigenous empowerment. That would be an appropriate and truly meaningful response to the residential school revelations. Yet what would this reinvention of Indigenous policy look like?

First, Indigenous policy in Canada must be depoliticized. The major political parties in Canada should agree to lift Indigenous policy from partisan politics, in which Indigenous peoples and programs are otherwise used for political purposes. Party leaders should announce, simply, that Indigenous issues are a crucial national priority and will be dealt with differently than other policy matters in this transitional period. The political representatives from all parties need to meet with Indigenous representatives and, with their guidance and full participation, establish Indigenous priorities and determine the best path forward.

> *The dismantling of the credibility of the residential school movement must be the starting point.*

Second, the federal government should reduce all its Indigenous programs and initiatives to a single commitment: over the next 10 years, the quality of government services and infrastructure provided to Indigenous communities would be improved to the national standard. In the past few years, governments have made repeated and bold promises to Indigenous folks and consistently failed to deliver. The country needs to focus on the things it can and must solve. The concept of uniform national standards, after all, underlies the equalization program in Canada and, most assuredly, should apply to Indigenous communities. Federal and provincial governments, working closely with Indigenous communities, would allocate resources to addressing obvious gaps the quality of infrastructure and services. We need to identify the differences and monitor improvements in a public and transparent way.

Major improvements to education, health care, roads, water systems, Internet, electricity, and the like would greatly improve Indigenous lives. So would a housing program that emphasized personal ownership over state-funded housing and that finally addressed the massive problems with over-crowding. The list of action items where many Indigenous communities lag well behind national norms is long: water supplies, fire protection, nursing and medical care, housing, Internet services, job opportunities, and education, as well as language, culture/heritage and other social services. A commitment to uniform national standards works well in northern Scandinavia and is long overdue in Canada. We can afford to do this; what we can't afford is to put it off any longer.

Indigenous communities place a high priority on autonomy and self-administration. The move to Indigenous self-government is one of the most successful initiatives in the country. Not all communities, by their own admission, are immediately ready for full self-government. But with time, capacity-building and community development opportunities, and support from other Indigenous governments, communities can move stepwise toward desired levels of autonomy.

Communities that have signed modern treaties come out from under the *Indian Act*. Many groups – the Nisga'a, the James Bay Cree, Kwanlin Dün – have made major strides in self-government. Economically resourceful First Nations, like Membertou, Osoyoos, English River, Fort McKay, Haisla and Whitecap, are using their financial resources to invest, beyond the control of government, in local cultural, social and infrastructure priorities. Most First Nations are more accountable to their members than are most public governments, with open discussions about budgets, salaries and community investments.

> *The move to Indigenous self-government is one of the most successful initiatives in the country.*

Under effective self-government regimes, Indigenous peoples take responsibility for education, health, on-and-off reserve service delivery, economic development, and natural resource management. These governments work with municipal, provincial, territorial, and federal governments and provide a high measure of accountability and transparency. Indigenous governments are typically intensely democratic, with robust elections and extensive community involvement with policy-making. They will provide more effective government services and programs than the distant Ottawa-based bureaucracy.

Indeed, Indigenous concerns about the nature and impact of government procedures, application processes and oversight have been a long-standing area of contention and debate. Ottawa's controlling mechanisms are the most dominant vestige of Canadian colonialism and they carry a significant cost to Indigenous peoples and governments. Indigenous governments spend a great deal of time, money and effort applying for government grants and reporting on the use and outcomes. These mechanisms weigh heavily on Indigenous governments and tie community activities to the policy and program priorities of the federal government, rather than the needs and interests of community members.

Third, the country needs to change, fundamentally, its approach to resolving legal disputes with Indigenous peoples. Indigenous people must and will always pursue and protect their legal challenges through the courts. But the current process, with hundreds if not thousands of cases winding their way through costly and time-consuming legal processes, is unwieldy and unsustainable.

While the overall direction of Indigenous legal authority is positive – they win the vast majority of their legal challenges – the impact on the communities can be profound and the results, even following a resounding court victory, disappointing. The Tsilhqot'in devoted years and millions of dollars to their successful legal battle to assert Indigenous rights over their traditional territories. While the court ruling clearly recognized Tsilhqot'in authority, albeit over a limited area, the community continues to struggle with myriad economic, legal and other challenges. A court victory can bring substantial benefits, as the Marshall decision on East Coast fishing did in 1999, but returns in most cases are slow incoming.

> *Indigenous peoples place a high priority on land and resources, for both cultural and economic purposes.*

There are better options. New Zealand's Waitangi Tribunal, a permanent commission of inquiry set up by the *Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975*, provides a much more effective and more culturally informed dispute resolution system than the inherently confrontational British legal procedures. Indigenous people have shown their faith in Canada by pursuing legal actions against the Crown, and that confidence has been duly rewarded. All issues do not, however, have to go through long and complex court processes. Justice for Indigenous peoples can be secured in less confrontational and costly ways.

Fourth, Canada should consider a substantial land and resource transfer to Indigenous peoples. This has already happened in some jurisdictions, including modern treaties in Northern Quebec, the Yukon, and the Northwest Territories. In these places, Indigenous people have emerged as major landowners and, in the process, regained power and real authority. Indeed, Indigenous peoples place a high priority on land and resources, for both cultural and economic purposes.

With this in mind, the federal, provincial and territorial governments should allocate appropriate lands to Indigenous control, with the use and management of these lands to be used to sustain Indigenous governments into the future. Examples of such major land transfers can be found in Canada's non-Indigenous past: the northward expansion of Manitoba, British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec and the transfer of control over natural resources to the prairie provinces in 1930. This latter process worked well for Saskatchewan and Alberta; it would now work for Indigenous governments as well. A related process, Treaty Land Entitlement, on the prairies gave land or money to First Nations, with significant and substantial returns across the region. In the North, modern treaties provided such land transfers, with significant benefits to the Indigenous communities and their region. Land – and Indigenous control over development – does matter.

In areas covered by modern treaties in Canada, economic development has proceeded, not without occasional controversies but with much great respect for Indigenous values and aspirations. Recognizing that Indigenous peoples have a legitimate and long-standing stake in the land and resources of the country, and that the nation's mechanisms for sharing prosperity with Indigenous communities have fallen far short of the mark, should not be an enormous leap for Canadians. The symbolic recognition and the new foundation for Indigenous economic opportunity could set this country on a true course for reconciliation.

> *Indigenous governments require steady revenue, with funding tied to the general developments of the Canadian economy.*

The fifth point is the most dramatic. Indigenous governments require steady revenue, with funding tied to the general developments of the Canadian economy. This can be done in a variety of ways: fixed annual contributions from the federal government, a fixed percentage of total government revenue, a specific share of federal resource revenues, tax points, or some other measure. Funds could be distributed to self-governing Indigenous communities on a formula basis that accounts for small size, isolation, and economic opportunity.

The process itself does not matter much, provided it is fair, transparent and appropriate. What is crucial is that the funds available to Indigenous governments be free from partisan politics and tied to the general level of Canadian prosperity. Note, also, that most of the funds provided to Indigenous governments would pay for standard services, such as policing, community infrastructure, health and social services and education – all things Canadians take for granted. The fundamental difference is that the government services would be provided by Indigenous authorities and the priority setting and budget allocations would be done locally and not nationally.

There is a crucial point here about the need for government to listen closely to Indigenous peoples. The tendency is to see policies that restrict resource development as being pro-Indigenous when some communities see them quite differently. The paternalism of governments and non-governmental organizations needs to be replaced with sincere attention to Indigenous governments and people. The interference of the federal and British Columbia governments, plus the active engagement of non-governmental organizations, complicated and misrepresented the situation with the Wet'suwet'en people, adding to community turmoil and sparking misunderstanding across the country about Indigenous preferences.

Conclusion

The national response to Indigenous peoples has, for generations, been incremental: a few more houses, a new teaching position, money for a fire truck, a training program, improved water supply, and some economic development planning money. Incrementalism only maintains inequalities, though a community, an individual or a business occasionally breaks out in the process. Delays in addressing historical injustices and the multi-generational crises created by residential schools and other government policies simply add to the burden facing Indigenous peoples. Incrementalism is the equivalent of doing nothing. Major and transformative change is called for – and, in the wake of the discovery of the residential school graves, the Canadian public might well be ready for a radically new direction.

But we need to remember that federal government policies, including residential schools, are the cause of many of the difficulties facing Indigenous peoples. Such initiatives have also been strongly supported by a Canadian population that has historically shared the paternalism and sense of racial superiority that drove these government initiatives. More government programs are not the solution.

Canadians, if they are truly listening, must prepare themselves for a cacophony of additional voices about the Indigenous reality. Canadians know about residential schools; they had best get ready to learn more about day schools and the experience of Indigenous students in provincial and territorial schools. The story of the 60s Scoop is understood only superficially. There are frightening and upsetting experiences here as well.

At some point, Canadians will also wake up to the devastating personal, family and health consequences of the Indigenous housing crisis. They will question the massive over-representation of Indigenous people in prisons (and the serious challenges facing those prisons when it comes to mental health difficulties) and look beyond the statistics of weak educational performance to see what is going on within the classrooms in on-reserve schools. And maybe – and this is a greater stretch – non-Indigenous Canadians will come to realize the degree to which the lived experiences of First Nations, Métis and Inuit people are defined by acts of racism. This does not mean that all encounters with non-Indigenous peoples are defined by issues of race, but it does mean that virtually all Indigenous peoples are confronted with racism far too often.

Changing a trajectory that has worked against Indigenous peoples for generations is not easy. The step-by-step process adopted to date – a million dollars here, a new program there – only perpetuates the problems of the past. Canada owes Indigenous peoples a much better future. The country will not get there through an endless series of baby steps.

Instead, we need to find the courage, determination, and vision to include Indigenous communities in a full partnership. That courage exists in Indigenous communities, who face the future with remarkable resilience and determination and with a vision for a return to wellness and prosperity that should inspire all Canadians. It is long past the time, as the discovery of the graves testifies, to say we should do better. It is now the time when Canada must do both more and much better.

About the author

Ken S. Coates is MLI's Munk Senior Fellow in Aboriginal and Northern Canadian Issues. He is the Canada Research Chair in Regional Innovation in the Johnson-Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy at the University of Saskatchewan. He has served at universities across Canada and at the University of Waikato (New Zealand), an institution known internationally for its work on Indigenous affairs.

He has also worked as a consultant for Indigenous groups and governments in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia as well as for the United Nations, companies, and think tanks. He has previously published on such topics as Arctic sovereignty, Aboriginal rights in the Maritimes, northern treaty and land claims processes, regional economic development, and government strategies for working with Indigenous peoples in Canada. His book, *A Global History of Indigenous Peoples: Struggle and Survival*, offered a world history perspective on the issues facing Indigenous communities and governments. He was co-author of the Donner Prize winner for the best book on public policy in Canada, A*rctic Front: Defending Canada in the Far North*, and was short-listed for the same award for his earlier work, *The Marshall Decision and Aboriginal Rights in the Maritimes*.

Ken contributes regularly, through newspaper pieces and radio and television interviews, to contemporary discussions on northern, Indigenous, and technology related issues.

References

CBC News. 1990. "Phil Fontaine's shocking testimony of sexual abuse." *CBC News: The Journal*, October 30. Available at https://www.cbc.ca/archives/entry/phil-fontaines-shocking-testimony-of-sexual-abuse.

King, Richard. 1967. *The School at Mopass: A Problem of Identity*. Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

Miller, J. R. 1996. *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools*. University of Toronto Press.

Milloy, John S. 1999. *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879 to 1986*. University of Manitoba Press.

Ideas change the world

WHAT PEOPLE ARE SAYING ABOUT **MLI**

The Right Honourable
Paul Martin

I want to congratulate the **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** for 10 years of excellent service to Canada. The Institute's commitment to public policy innovation has put them on the cutting edge of many of the country's most pressing policy debates. The Institute works in a persistent and constructive way to present new and insightful ideas about how to best achieve Canada's potential and to produce a better and more just country. Canada is better for the forward-thinking, research-based perspectives that the **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** brings to our most critical issues.

The Honourable
Jody Wilson-Raybould

The **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** has been active in the field of Indigenous public policy, building a fine tradition of working with Indigenous organizations, promoting Indigenous thinkers and encouraging innovative, Indigenous-led solutions to the challenges of 21st century Canada. I congratulate **MLI** on its 10 productive and constructive years and look forward to continuing to learn more about the Institute's fine work in the field.

The Honourable
Irwin Cotler

May I congratulate **MLI** for a decade of exemplary leadership on national and international issues. Through high-quality research and analysis, **MLI** has made a significant contribution to Canadian public discourse and policy development. With the global resurgence of authoritarianism and illiberal populism, such work is as timely as it is important. I wish you continued success in the years to come.

The Honourable
Pierre Poilievre

The **Macdonald-Laurier Institute** has produced countless works of scholarship that solve today's problems with the wisdom of our political ancestors. If we listen to the **Institute**'s advice, we can fulfill Laurier's dream of a country where freedom is its nationality.

MACDONALD-LAURIER INSTITUTE

MLI
TRUE NORTH
IN CANADIAN PUBLIC POLICY

323 Chapel Street, Suite 300,
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7Z2
613-482-8327 • info@macdonaldlaurier.ca

@MLInstitute
facebook.com/MacdonaldLaurierInstitute
youtube.com/MLInstitute
linkedin.com/company/macdonald-laurier-institute