

Address to the Council of Elders

March 16th, 2016

Treaty Relations Commission of Manitoba
Suite 400-175 Hargrave Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba

In Treaty One Territory

FINAL (March 16th, 2016)

Nathan Tidridge

Elders . . .

I do not have any Indigenous ancestry. However, I firmly believe in my treaty relationship with the Original People of these lands and that I too am a treaty person.

When I was a boy I spent many summers exploring the lake surrounding my family cottage. Buck Lake, pooling out from either side of the Muskoska-Parry Sound border, was the source of many adventures as I plied its waters in an old canoe. I had burned all the official maps of Buck Lake and its surrounding area, opting instead to make my own. As the years went by, I added islands, rivers, and new lakes to an expanding world of my creation. I discovered a “New World” in nearby Fox Lake, christened islands with names like Royal Britannia and Raymond Island (after my grandfather), and even touched off a canoe war with my neighbours. Over time, traditions were developed that included flags, medals, and epic histories.

Later, I attended Wilfrid Laurier University, publishing the history of my little world, now called “Mainland,” in an effort to preserve it indefinitely. I meticulously gathered everything together with the help of Professor Susan Scott of the Department of Religion and Culture. Susan and I would meet over tea at her home in Waterloo as she gently guided me through the passages and portages of recording personal history. One day as we approached what I thought was the end of the process, Susan smiled at me, her hand covering her cup of tea as wisps of steam escaped through her fingers.

“Nathan,” she began, “how are you going to handle the ideas of imperialism woven into your story?” I could feel my canoe grinding against an unseen rock in the water.

Susan was merely pointing out the obvious: I had not just created my own world, I had conjured up an empire. I had projected my own identity onto the landscape of Buck Lake, and by doing so had displaced histories that had been laid down before I arrived. The very idea that other people

existed on the lake and were building their own worlds — just as personal and intimate — had never occurred to me.

Eventually, a new book emerged, entitled *Beyond Mainland*, where I confessed, “I heard other names attached to the islands, rivers and lakes that seemed so familiar to me. I was scared of those names — their existence implied a loss of control, that I was not the only steward of Buck Lake.” I learned to relax my grip and expand my view of the land and its history, and accept that many people had travelled these same waters. It was then that I first encountered the stories of Indigenous Peoples of the lake and its lands. I learned that “my” lake was part of a long chain that stretched from Georgian Bay into the eastern hinterlands of present-day Muskoka. The sleepy hamlet of Ilfracombe at the foot of Buck Lake has been visited for centuries by the Anishinaabe.

I had never imagined Indigenous Peoples living on the lands and in the waters surrounding my cottage. I had always pictured “Indians” as being from some ancient past, far removed from my life. In school, Indigenous People occupied the first few pages of our history textbooks before vanishing into the mists of a long timeline. Later, when I became a teacher of Canadian history, I was very tentative about exploring First Nations with my students. Resources were scarce and the curriculum did not ask us to dwell too much on the subject (fortunately, that has changed in Ontario). Indigenous history mystified me; it was filled with names difficult to pronounce and an oral tradition that didn’t graft onto my profession’s linear approach. Added to all of this was a layer of ignorance, informed by growing up during the crises in Oka and Ipperwash (not to mention the Caledonia Land Claim that erupted during my second year of teaching). Put simply, it was easier to ignore First Nations than try and make sense of what had happened between our two peoples.

That all changed the moment I walked into the Mohawk Institute – Canada's first Indian Residential School near Brantford, Ontario. It was the smell that still lingers with me – musty, thick. As a teacher, I was ashamed and resolved then and there to take my students every year – a promise I have kept.

Many years ago I read Thomas King's *The Truth About Stories* and it changed my life and teaching practice. Ever since then, I have made a point of reading this passage from his lecture at Massey College to my students every year:

Stories are wondrous things. And they are dangerous. The Native novelist Leslie Silko, in her book Ceremony, tells how evil came into the world. It was witch people. Not Whites or Indians or Blacks or Asians or Hispanics. Witch people. Witch people from all over the world, way back when, and they all came together for a witches’ conference. In a cave. Having a good time. A contest, actually. To see who could come up with the scariest thing. Some of them brewed up potions in pots. Some of them jumped in and out of animal skins. Some of them thought up charms and spells. It must have been fun to watch. Until finally there was only one witch left who hadn’t done anything. No one knew where this witch came from or if the witch was male or female. And all this witch had was a story. Unfortunately the story this witch told was an awful

thing full of fear and slaughter, disease and blood. A story of murderous mischief. And when the telling was done, the other witches quickly agreed that this witch had won the prize.

“Okay you win,” they said. “But what you said just now — it isn’t so funny. It doesn’t sound so good. We are doing okay without it. We can get along without that kind of thing. Take it back. Call that story back.”

But, of course, it was too late. For once a story is told, it cannot be called back. Once told, it is loose in the world.¹

I believe Canadians are having such an experience right now and it is a good thing.

This country now finds itself tasked with repairing its most ancient relationships. It is in this era of Reconciliation that the Crown in Canada has the potential of reclaiming one of its foundational roles in our society. Perhaps the most "Canadian" aspect of the Crown in these lands is its ability to act as a conduit between communities, as well as a gatherer of community.

Canadians need to be educated around the role of the Sovereign as Treaty partner with Indigenous Peoples - a role that immediately emphasizes its relevance to contemporary society as well as reinforcing its role as the very bones of our modern democracy. It should not come as a surprise that during a profoundly important Royal Tour by the Queen in 1973 a Canadian official, likely Jean Chretien, was recorded saying to the British High Commissioner that "the monarchy, and the fact that, on occasions, The Queen can talk directly to the native peoples has helped to prevent in Canada anything like a direct confrontation similar to 'Wounded Knee.'"²

Recently, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission released its final report. Recalling over two centuries of disruptions to the relationships that had served these lands well since settlers first began arriving was the following "Call to Action":

(#45) We call upon the Government of Canada, on behalf of all Canadians, to jointly develop with Aboriginal peoples a Royal Proclamation of Reconciliation to be issued by the Crown. The proclamation would build on the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and the Treaty of Niagara of 1764, and reaffirm the nation-to-nation relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the Crown.

The report goes on to describe this as necessary in establishing what it calls "**an action-oriented Covenant of Reconciliation.**"³

The original Royal Proclamation was issued in the name of King George III following the defeat of New France in 1763, and is often held up as the "Indian Magna Carta" by the Government of

¹ Thomas King, *The Truth About Stories*, (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2003), 9-10.

² Sir Peter Hayman, "The Monarchy in Canada, 1973," confidential despatch to Sir Alec Douglas-Home, August 24, 1973.

³ Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, Volume One: Summary (Toronto: Lorimer, 2015), 196-201.

Canada because, near the end, and after much negotiating, it recognized "Indian Nations," placing them under the protection of the Crown.

The King's representative at the time, Sir William Johnson, after being reminded of the Indigenous presence on the land by Pontiac, his allies and other Nations, recognized that a partnership would need to be kindled in these lands on Indigenous terms, employing Indigenous diplomacy, in order for the Royal Proclamation to be accepted. The Treaty of Niagara was the result.

The very existence of the Covenant Chain Wampum (presented by Sir William Johnson to the assembled nations near the banks of the Niagara River at the end of the great council) tells us that the settler population once "got it" because it was created by the King's Representative and presented on His Majesty's behalf. This wampum is not an Indigenous artifact, rather it is a vice-regal one – a diplomatic device that was employed by early lieutenant governors of Upper Canada.

When looked at holistically, the Royal Proclamation and the Treaty of Niagara can properly be seen as one of the many "Magna Cartas" that continue to live and grow in these lands. The gathering at Niagara extended the great Silver Covenant Chain of Friendship forged with the Haudenosaunee Confederacy near the east coast into the interior of this continent, bringing with it a familial relationship with the Sovereign. This relationship was supposed to inform future treaties, including the numbered treaties and modern treaties forged with the Crown. It also reinforced that the Treaty relationship is a personal one with the Queen regardless of the government, or political developments, of the day.

However, there are problems.

While the Treaty of Niagara was being negotiated, the power of King George the person was already being curtailed by the emergence of what English political writer Walter Bagehot called the Dignified Crown (the King) and the Efficient Crown (powers now exercised by elected ministers, including the prime minister).

This reality was never articulated in the Treaties.

Beyond 1764, the gulf between the Dignified and Efficient Crowns grew larger in British political life, and the emergence of Canada as a distinct political entity in this land added to the confusion. The 1931 Statute of Westminster legally created a distinct Canadian Crown, albeit with a shared monarch, independent of its British ancestor. When Elizabeth II ascended the throne in 1952 she did so as the Queen of Canada, a title formally bestowed on her by the Parliament in Ottawa the following year.

In fact, since the establishment of our first treaty relationships many non-Indigenous peoples have repeatedly reimagined the Crown in these lands without consulting, or seeking the consent of, the Nations that are bound with it. Treaty is a familial relationship, and one of the primary members of the family has been dramatically altered without consulting the others.

While serving as lieutenant governor of North-West Territories⁴, the Honourable David Laird was also minister of the Interior and superintendent general of Indian Affairs – offices he held for two years before his vice-regal appointment. Before becoming lieutenant governor, Laird presided over the creation of the Indian Act. The bill received Royal Assent on April 12th, 1876, five months before Laird assumed vice-regal office and one year before he set his hand to Treaty No. 7 (while he was still superintendent general of Indian Affairs).

Gathering at Blackfoot Crossing in 1877, Lieutenant Governor Laird⁵ is quoted saying, reflecting words that can be found in all the numbered Treaties previous to this one:

*"The Great Spirit has made all things -- the sun, the moon, and the stars, the earth, the forest, and the swift running rivers. It is by the Great White Spirit that the Queen rules over this great country and other great countries. The Great Spirit has made the white man and the red man brothers, and we should take each other by the hand. The Great Mother loves all her children, white man and red man alike; she wishes to do them all good."*⁶

The following day Laird was corrected by a Chief who said *"The Great Spirit, and not the Great Mother, gave us this land . . ."*⁷

When the Treaty was concluded, it is recorded [by Alexander Morris] that ". . . the Lieutenant-Governor said he was much pleased to receive this address from the Chiefs of the great Blackfeet nation, which in fact was to the Great Mother, as the Commissioners were merely acting for her, and carrying out her wishes. He was certain she would be gratified to learn of the approval of the Chiefs and their acceptance of her offers. In return the Great Mother only required of them to abide by her laws."⁸

What I find extraordinary is that the words being used by a lieutenant governor (who was also the superintendent general of Indian Affairs that introduced the Indian Act) knowingly contradict the relationship that would ultimately be established. Was he intentionally, as the official representative of the Queen, invoking the personal and familial relationship – a relationship rooted in love - that is the foundation of Treaty, in order to "close the deal" in such a way that only benefited the government?

Was the "Great Mother" nothing more than a necessary fiction in the mind of her official representative?

At the back of his mind, Laird himself must have had the words he used to explain the Indian Act to his colleagues in the House of Commons:

⁴ 1876-1881.

⁵ The Lieutenant Governor's secretary at this Council was Amédée Forget, who would become the first lieutenant governor of Saskatchewan (1905-1910). Incidentally, Laird was a member of Morris' party for Treaties No. 3, 4 and 5.

⁶ Alexander Morris. *The Treaties of Canada, with the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories*. (Toronto: Willing & Williamson, 1880), 267-268.

⁷ Ibid, 270.

⁸ Ibid, 274.

" . . . they will receive their land and their share of moneys in the hands of Government, and will cease in every respect to be Indians according to the acception of the laws of Canada relating to Indians. We will then have nothing more to do with their affairs , except as ordinary subjects of Her Majesty."⁹

When preparing for this talk I read James Daschuk's *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life* and noticed the active role played by Edgar Dewdney. Appointed by Prime Minister Sir John A. Macdonald to Cabinet in 1879, he served as Indian commissioner for the North-West Territories until 1888. From 1888 to 1891, he went on to serve as minister of the Interior and superintendent of Indian Affairs. During his same time Macdonald also appointed him lieutenant governor of North-West Territories – a position he held during the Northwest Rebellion. Rather than honouring the Treaties, Dewdney set in motion a policy that promoted "sheer compulsion" by employing starvation tactics.¹⁰

During Dewdney's tenure the pass system was imposed on Indigenous populations living on reserves, and in his role as lieutenant governor, Dewdney informed Prime Minister Macdonald "*To compel the Indians to live wholly on their Reserves our Treaty must be altered.*"¹¹ In fact, I was later informed by Professor Peter Russell, Chair of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal People's Research Department, that the Pass System was never legally introduced¹² - Dewdney simply just implemented it and went on to be appointed lieutenant governor of British Columbia in 1892.

However, while there is a temptation to focus on Laird and Dewdney, there were other vice-regal office holders that demonstrated their understanding of Treaty relationships and the unique role that Crown had in them. Professor Michael Asch of the University of Victoria, author of *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*, points to the Earl of Dufferin, governor general of Canada from 1872-1878 and the Hon. Alexander Morris, lieutenant governor of the North-West Territories (1872-1876) and Manitoba (1872-1877).

At the end of an extraordinary and lengthily, address at Government House in Victoria (recounted on the same site this past January by Dr. Asch) Lord Dufferin reminded the assembled crowd:

"From my first arrival in Canada I have been very much occupied with the condition of the Indian population in this province. You must remember that the Indian population is not represented in Parliament, and, consequently, that the Governor General is bound to watch over their welfare and especial solicitude.

In Canada, no Government, whether provincial or central, has failed to acknowledge that the original title to the land existed in the Indian tribes and the communities that hunted or

⁹ David Laird, House of Commons, Debates, 3rd Parliament, 3rd Session, Vol. 1 (March 2, 1876) pp. 342-343. Ottawa: Maclean, Roger and Co., 1876.

¹⁰ Talbot, 160.

¹¹ James Daschuk, *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life*, (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013), 162.

¹² Discussion following address by author to the Canadian Royal Heritage Trust, Toronto, March 10th, 2016.

wandered over them. ... not until (we negotiate treaties) do we consider that we are entitled to deal with a single acre."

The colonial and paternalistic lens of the time still informs the governor general's speech – the Queen's representative sees Anglo-Christian society as a goal for Indigenous communities, and private-property ownership was a vehicle to that end. Still, his words speak to a belief that he held a special relationship with Indigenous Peoples as governor general to the point that he was advocating on their behalf to a provincial government that he perceived as not observing their rights. Strip away the colonial assumptions in his statement, and Dufferin's words are quite remarkable given his audience (a province largely without treaties) and time (September 28th, 1876 – five months after the passage of the Indian Act).

Lord Dufferin's advocacy for Indigenous Rights and perspectives – the Governor General advocated against, and ultimately commuted Ambroise Lepine's (Louis Riel's adjutant) death sentence for the murder of Thomas Scott during the Red River Rebellion – highlights a tension that had developed between the Canadian government and the Imperial vice-regal office after Confederation. In fact, the powers of the office of the governor general would be curtailed after Dufferin's departure in 1878.

Manitoba's second lieutenant governor is also worth noting. Appointed in 1871 by Sir John A. Macdonald, Alexander Morris was an Upper Canadian lawyer and land speculator that saw the future of Canada's prosperity in the untapped resources that could be found in the vast territories of the Hudson's Bay Company. His speeches leading up to his arrival at Upper Fort Garry (modern-day Winnipeg) had all the hallmarks of 19th century imperialism. However, once he arrived in Manitoba and began negotiating Treaty No. 3 as the representative of the Queen, he gained a new perspective on Indigenous Treaties. Morris realized that he was negotiating a new relationship based on reciprocity and respect. Morris also realized, that by being a direct representative of the Queen, he held an extraordinary position. As explained by his biographer, Robert J. Talbot, in his 2009 book "Negotiating the Treaties":

... Morris's position as the representative of the Queen was important to the Ojibwa. The authority of his position and his direct link to the Crown lent credence to his use of language of reciprocity and kinship.¹³

This view is reiterated by Michael Asch who writes:

"It was arguable that, since he was lieutenant governor of Manitoba and thus in direct relationship with Lord Dufferin, he was acting on behalf of the queen independent of the Dominion Government."¹⁴

¹³ Robert J. Talbot, *Negotiating the Numbered Treaties: An Intellectual and Political Biography of Alexander Morris*, (Saskatoon: Purich, 2009), 74.

¹⁴ Michael Asch, 160.

What I find most compelling about Morris is that he learned to embrace the spoken words that surrounded the written Treaties – the spirit and intent of the relationships he was bound to as the representative of the Queen. In the later part of his time as Lieutenant Governor, and the years following his time in vice regal office, he lobbied the government to Honour the Treaties, even requesting an active role for the Queen's Representative to ensure proper their implementation. Following Morris' mandate, the exact opposite was done by the Macdonald government: the office of the Lieutenant Governor was formally severed from overseeing Treaty implementation – the responsibility fully assumed by the Ministry of Indian Affairs.

The Crown in Canada today is very different from the one articulated by Morris and Dufferin. This places the contemporary representatives of the Queen in this country in very awkward positions: By virtue of their offices they become for many active treaty partners in a political system that demands they remain neutral and, above all, follow the advice of their elected ministers. So while the Crown of the 21st century has truly attained its position of being separate from the Government-of-the-day, they have yet to reconcile what has been historically done in its name.

In the words of Thomas King:

*I tell the stories not to play on your sympathies but to suggest how stories can control our lives, for there is a part of me that has never been able to move past these stories, a part of me that will be chained to these stories as long as I live.*¹⁵

Much has been chained to the Crown in these lands, and it is time that they are acknowledged and honoured. To paraphrase Michael Asch, Canadians need to revisit the historical narrative they have been told for so long and restore to it the stories that highlight how we lived together on these lands before our relationships were overcome following Confederation.

An important point was raised by Professor Douglas Sanders when he observed in 1985 "It is common wisdom that the Queen is powerless, and as a result advisors have in the past have often tried to steer First Nations away from petitions to the Crown. Only by ignoring such advice and forwarding their petitions to the King or Queen or their official representatives have Indigenous Peoples initiated changes in the Canadian constitution."¹⁶

Her Majesty and members of the Royal Family understand, and continue to honour their unique relationships with Indigenous Peoples. We need to educate Canadians about these important relationships. There are numerous examples happening right now that include the remarkable work of the Princes Charities Canada and the tireless efforts by other members of the Royal Family and their representatives - I think specifically of the Earl and Countess of Wessex.

Canadians need also to be reminded that the official representatives of the Queen provide them with a medium with which they can reconnect with their treaty partners. There are many

¹⁵ Thomas King, 9.

¹⁶ Douglas Sanders, "Recognition in International Law," in *The Quest for Justice: Aboriginal Peoples andn Aboriginal Rights*, ed. Menno Boldt and J. Anthony Long (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), 302-303.

examples that highlight the vice-regal representatives of the Queen affirming, or even rekindling relationships with Indigenous Peoples.

However, much more can be done. As outlined in my book **The Queen at the Council Fire**, there are specific things that could be enacted by Her Majesty's Canadian Representatives to further Reconciliation that would not violate the convention of responsible government.

Recently I attended the New Years Levee hosted by Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. Her Honour held her levee in Kingston, the old capital of the Province of Canada, to begin to focus conversations toward the sesquicentennial of Confederation. During the formal greeting by the City of Kingston, Anishinaabe Elder Paul Carl told the assembled guests that he would be presenting the representative of the Queen with tobacco.

Some of the members of the public laughed. I believe they meant no disrespect, they just didn't understand the significance of the moment. An opportunity was lost to educate Canadians around the importance, and sacredness, of such a gift. A formalized protocol around such an event that could include a public educational piece would have enhanced such a presentation - not for the elder and lieutenant governor (they both understood the importance of the gift), but for the witnesses around them.

First Nations are independent entities that must be treated with a level of respect that only the Dignified Crown can offer (I would cite the work being done in our sister realm across the Pacific, New Zealand, whose office of the Governor General has been transformed to reflect its unique position as the bridge between Maori and non-Indigenous Peoples). Discussions around integrating Indigenous protocols within the day-to-day lives of the vice-regal offices should become a focus of Her Majesty's Canadian Representatives, as well as a permanent agenda item of the annual vice-regal conferences.

A unique feature of our constitutional monarchy is that the provincial Crowns allow Her Majesty's relationships to adapt to meet the needs of specific regions and Nations - the lieutenant governors prevent a cookie cutter solution from being imposed, allowing relationships to reflect the diverse Nations that are bound with the Dignified Crown across the continent. During a powerful address at a conference exploring the Crown in Canada held in Victoria a few months ago, the Hon. Steven Point stood in the British Columbian Legislature where he introduced us to the idea of "wordless symbolism." His Honour's description of the British Columbian Black Rod, which includes jade carved by Tsimshian elder Clifford Bolton (Soo--Natz), deserves being repeated:

As long as this staff survives and this house stands, Aboriginal People are coming into this house with the Sovereign."¹⁷

While such relationships are being developed across Canada, in some cases they have been piecemeal, or dependent on the interest of vice-regal office-holders.

¹⁷ The Honourable Steven Point, "Address to the delegates of *The Crown in the 21st Century Conference*," Legislative Chamber, Victoria, 15 January, 2016.

Protocols and relationships developed by vice-regal offices, in consultation and with the consent of their Indigenous partners, need to transcend individual governors general or lieutenant governors and instead become embedded in the very heart of our constitutional monarchy. As Alan Corbiere, noted Anishinabee professor, commented in a lecture at the University of Toronto:

*What ends up happening is people that end up succeeding in the role of . . . lieutenant governor . . . don't get apprised of the responsibilities. They have a total lack of knowledge of treaties that have been passed down as well as the diplomatic nature of the discourse when they met in council . . .*¹⁸

For many vice-regal offices across the country the incoming official representative directs what themes will be supported and ceremonies attended. In many ways, the Dignified Crown resets itself with every appointment. This continual resetting contrasts sharply with the radically different approach to time and history taken by Indigenous Peoples. The lack of institutional memory in regards to Indigenous relationships must be remedied.

Maintaining the historic and personal relationships between Her Majesty and Indigenous Peoples must become one of the official and publicized duties of the representatives of the Crown in Canada, and should be seen as a key and contemporary responsibility as important as their duty to ensure there is always a prime minister or premier in place.

Government Houses and/or offices should become regular gathering places - "safe spaces" - for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Peoples to come together in community that observe protocols such as receiving petitions, gift-giving, sacred fires, and feasts and other ceremonies specific to the particular Nation gathered at that time. As Lieutenant Governor Elizabeth Dowdeswell explained in an interview with the National Post last week:

*When [Indigenous Peoples] think of governance they think of the treaties that were signed and those treaties were signed with the Crown so it's part of our ongoing work to convene people, to bring people together in this safe space that transcends politics. To bring people together to learn — aboriginals and non-aboriginal — and to learn about each other.*¹⁹

I see the grounds of Rideau Hall as the perfect place to create such a physical and permanent space. Manitoba's Government House at Upper Fort Garry is an example as it had such a space in its front garden where Lieutenant Governor Morris met with all Indigenous delegations that arrived in Winnipeg. In fact, after arriving yesterday, this was the first place I went – the site has been preserved (albeit with no marker to explain its significance). I love the symbolism of the Crown greeting its Treaty partners in a garden at the very centre of Turtle Island.

¹⁸ Alan Corbiere, "The Treaty of Niagara: Living Treaty and the Necessity of Corporate Memory" (Lecture, University of Toronto, August 1, 2014).

¹⁹ Ashley Csanady, 'Reconciliation is something we need to pay attention to': Ontario LG unveils residential schools exhibit (National Post), March 10, 2016. www.nationalpost.com.

We are living in a very exciting time right now. There are fundamental changes being triggered in these lands. Provincial curricula are being rewritten across the country to incorporate treaty education and Indigenous perspectives in their education systems. In my home province of Ontario Indigenous perspectives have been woven into nearly every subject.

What this means is that a new generation of Canadians are being raised that will no longer tolerate the status quo.

Canadians are beginning to look for ways to reengage their treaty partners. With their unique ability to create community, connect with government and be seen as above the political fray, the Queen of Canada and her representatives are a way to do that. They have a the history and specific relationships needed for such tasks. To put it simply: they are family.

Canadians need to re-engage with its fundamental institutions to understand who they are. Plucking a line from his remarkable book **Harmony**, I quote the Prince of Wales saying "To restore balance to the world, we must find the balance in ourselves."²⁰

As we are learning from the important work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the Residential School Program sought to destroy Indigenous languages and replace them with those that included concepts such as ceding, property ownership and land surrenders. I would argue that the lack of education around foundational institutions such as the Crown in Canada over the past century or so has contributed to the gulf between non-Indigenous Canadians and First Nations. Part of Reconciliation needs to include a re-engagement by Canadians in the mediums that once allowed for communication between our peoples and the gathering of diverse community together in peace and friendship. Canadians also need to have an understanding of how our most fundamental institutions were compromised during the 19th century.

Such steps will not only strengthen Canada, but also our domestic Crown as a contemporary, relevant and fundamental part of its future.

It is time to polish the chain.

Thank you.

²⁰ Tony Juniper and Charles, Prince of Wales, *Harmony: A New Way of Looking at Our World*, (London: Harper, 2010), 297.