




1865 – 1949

# Confederation Debates

intermediate/senior  
mini unit

<http://hcmc.uvic.ca/confederation/>



**Saskatchewan  
Provincial Edition**





# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	1
ABOUT THE CONFEDERATION DEBATES MINI-UNIT .....	3
Curriculum Objectives .....	4
History 30: Canadian Studies .....	4
Native Studies 10 .....	7
Native Studies 30 .....	8
SECTION 1   CREATING CANADA: SASKATCHEWAN.....	11
Prerequisite Skillset .....	11
Background Knowledge .....	11
Confederation Debates: Introductory Lesson .....	12
Confederation Debates: Biographical Research.....	14
Culminating Activity: The Debate.....	16
Culminating Activity Script.....	18
SECTION 2   CREATING CANADA: FURTHERING INDIGENOUS-CROWN RELATIONSHIPS .....	19
Prerequisite Skillset .....	19
Background Knowledge .....	19
“I Left a Trace”: Lesson 1 .....	20
Museum Curation Activity: Lesson 2.....	22
Museum Curation Exercise.....	28
APPENDICES .....	30
SECTION 1: MATERIALS AND HANDOUTS FOR CREATING CANADA: SASKATCHEWAN AND CONFEDERATION .....	31
Handout: Introduction to Parliament .....	32
Biography Activity Handout .....	33
Exit Card .....	34
Robert Borden in Brief .....	35
Henri Bourassa in Brief .....	36
Frederick W. A. G. Haultain in Brief .....	37
Wilfrid Laurier in Brief.....	38
Frank Oliver in Brief .....	39

Clifford Sifton in Brief.....	40
Thomas Walter Scott in Brief.....	41
Ballots .....	42
Teacher's Rubric for Evaluation of Confederation Debates .....	43
Post-Debate Self-Evaluation.....	44
Additional Resources .....	45
Primary Source: Robert Borden's Views on Confederation .....	47
Primary Source: Henri Bourassa's Views on Confederation.....	51
Primary Source: Frederick W. A. G Haultain's Views on Confederation.....	54
Primary Source: Wilfrid Laurier's Views on Confederation.....	59
Primary Source: Frank Oliver's Views on Confederation .....	65
Primary Source: Clifford Sifton's Views on Confederation .....	69
Primary Source: Thomas Walter Scott's Views on Confederation.....	73
72 Resolutions Handout .....	78
SECTION 2: MATERIALS AND HANDOUTS FOR CREATING CANADA: FURTHERING INDIGENOUS-CROWN RELATIONSHIPS .....	79
Response Log Handout.....	80
Handout: Treaty 6 .....	81
Handout: Alexander Morris.....	86
Handout: Chief Ahtahkakoop .....	90
Handout: Chief Mistahimaskwa (Big Bear).....	94
Handout: George McDougall.....	99
Handout: Ceremonial Pipe.....	102
THE CONFEDERATION DEBATES EDUCATION TEAM.....	104
THE CONFEDERATION DEBATES IS SUPPORTED BY: .....	105

# ABOUT THE CONFEDERATION DEBATES MINI-UNIT

Before each province and territory became a part of Canada, their local legislatures (and the House of Commons after 1867) debated the extent, purposes and principles of political union between 1865 and 1949. In addition to creating provinces, the British Crown also negotiated a series of Treaties with Canada's Indigenous Peoples. Although these texts, and the records of their negotiation, are equally important to Canada's founding, as the Truth and Reconciliation Committee recently explained, "too many Canadians still do not know the history of Indigenous peoples' contributions to Canada, or understand that by virtue of the historical and modern Treaties negotiated by our government, we are all Treaty people."

The vast majority of these records, however, remain inaccessible and many can only be found in provincial archives. By bringing together these diverse colonial, federal and Indigenous records for the first time, and by embracing novel technologies and dissemination formats, *The Confederation Debates* (<http://hcmc.uvic.ca/confederation/>) encourages Canadians of all ages and walks of life to learn about past challenges, to increase political awareness of historical aspirations and grievances and engage present-day debates, as well as to contribute to local, regional and national understanding and reconciliation.

This mini-unit for intermediate/senior-level classes helps students to understand and analyze the key ideas and challenges that preceded the creation of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The first section deals with the debates in the provincial and/or federal legislatures, while the second section addresses more specifically founding treaty negotiations with the First Nations. Each section can be taught independently.

The activities and attached materials will help students understand the diversity of ideas, commitments, successes and grievances that underlie Canada's founding.

By the end of this mini-unit, your students will have the opportunity to:

1. Use the historical inquiry process—gathering, interpreting and analyzing historical evidence and information from a variety of primary and secondary sources—in order to investigate and make judgements about issues, developments and events of historical importance.
2. Hone their historical thinking skills to identify historical significance, cause and consequence, continuity and change, and historical perspective.
3. Develop knowledge of their province/region within Canada, minority rights and democracy, and appreciate the need for reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples.

# Curriculum Objectives

This mini-unit has been broadly designed for intermediate/senior-level classes. The activities described in the pages fulfill the outcomes listed in Saskatchewan's "History 30: Canadian Studies, Unit 2," "Native Studies 10," "Native Studies 30," and "Social Studies 10," and curriculum guides.

The applicable foundational objectives listed in the first three of these curriculum guides are reproduced below.

## History 30: Canadian Studies

### **UNIT TWO: THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: THE ROAD TO DEMOCRACY: FOUNDATIONAL OBJECTIVES**

#### **FOUNDATIONAL OBJECTIVE 1**

Know that within societies, there exists a competition among interest groups for influence over the society's decision-making processes, and that those groups will vary in terms of their ability to influence those processes. Core concepts include:

- Interest Group
  - Know that societies are composed of competing interest groups each with a power base (resources, -numbers, organization) and each desiring decisions that will satisfy its needs/wants.
  - Know that the francophone<sup>1</sup> and anglophone populations of Central Canada possessed the economic and political power to influence the political structure of the proposed new nation
  - Know that the paramount concern of francophone leaders was to secure protection for French Canada's culture, language and religion, and that Confederation would only be possible if that protection was secured.
- Regionalism
  - Know that both regions and populations within the nation often act as interest groups seeking to influence national decision-making processes to secure their respective well-being.
  - Know that there exists regional disparity in terms of political and economic influence over national decision making.
  - Know that the forces of regionalism were to work against centralization of political and economic decision making controlled by one national government.
- Federalism
  - Know that the Canadian federal system of government is one in which political decision making is constitutionally allocated to either the national government or to provincial governments.
  - Know that federalism balances the desire for overall unity with a desire to retain local or regional autonomy.
  - Know that establishment of provincial governments reflected the concern of the both the francophone population of Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces, that a single national government would be dominated by Central Canada and would not represent the interests and well-being of other regions and populations of the nation.
- Decision Making
  - Know that the regions of Canada have varying degrees of political and economic influence over national decision making.

- Know that Central Canada's population had considerable political power, in terms of voters, and that translated into ensuring that Central Canada had a significant influence on how the National Policy was constructed.
- Know that national political leaders were aware of the economic and political power of Central Canada and that awareness influenced policy making.
- Know that the federal government did not involve the Aboriginal population and other residents of Rupert's Land in determining their opinions and needs.
- Métis
  - Know that Canadian acquisition of the North West had consequences for the Metis people of that region.
  - Know that large-scale migration of Euro-Canadian settlers to the North West was seen by the Metis as a threat to their traditional economy and cultural identity.
  - Know that the Metis sought, through negotiations, recognition and protection of their rights and landholdings.
  - Know that provisions of the Metis Bill of Rights included:
    - that the territories must have the right to enter Canada's Confederation as a province;
    - that the people would have the right to send four members of Parliament to Ottawa;
    - that the Metis had the right to control their own local affairs;
    - that the Metis wanted French and English languages to be equal in the schools and law courts; and,
    - that the Metis wanted to keep their customs and their Metis way of life
  - Know that the policies and actions of the Canadian government towards the Metis had a negative impact on the unity of the nation.
- First Nations
  - Know that one of the goals of the Canadian government was to implement policies that would lead to assimilation of the First Nations who resided in the former Rupert's Land.
  - Know that the Canadian government planned to relocate the First Nation peoples to reserves and thereby make the land available for European settlers to establish an agricultural-based economy.
- Treaties
  - Know that the Canadian government planned to acquire the lands of the Canadian West by negotiating
  - treaties with the First Nations and that those treaties extinguished First Nations' land claims.
  - Know that the First Nations and the Canadian government held differing assumptions concerning the terms and meaning of the treaties.
- Indian Act
  - Know that the Indian Act regulated most aspects of the lives of First Nation peoples.
  - Know that the Indian Act defined who was considered to be an "Indian."

## **FOUNDATIONAL OBJECTIVE 2**

Know that the nation's economic well-being depended on the exporting of Canadian products to foreign markets and the development of a national consumer economy. Core concepts include:

- Reciprocity
  - Know that the policies of Canadian governments have tended to seek access to the American domestic market for Canadian products, particularly primary products.

- Know that there are geographic realities that have contributed to the desire to seek reciprocity with the United States.
- National Policy
  - Know that the National Policy articulated different economic roles for the different regions of the nation and that implementation of policies to fulfil those roles have had long-term consequences for the peoples of those different regions.
  - Know that the prevailing economic paradigm provided a compelling need to secure the West.
  - Know that to fulfil the Canadian West's economic role, as envisaged in the National Policy, it would be necessary to accomplish a number of tasks, some of which were to have profound consequences for the peoples of Rupert's Land.

### **FOUNDATIONAL OBJECTIVE 3**

Know that the history of the Canadian peoples .has been greatly influenced by external forces and events. Core concepts include:

- Manifest Destiny
  - Know that many American politicians felt that it was the "manifest destiny" of the United States to take control of all of North America.
  - Know that the perception that the U.S. represented a significant threat to British North America became a catalyst promoting Confederation and the expansion of the nation.

### **FOUNDATIONAL OBJECTIVE 4**

Know that dialectical thinking is a system of reasoned exchange between points of view in which the merits of each case (thesis) are discussed and evaluated. Core concepts include:

- Dialectic Evaluation
  - Know that dialectical evaluation is the process of:
    - defining relevant viewpoints within the information; testing the viewpoints for factual accuracy;
    - testing the viewpoints for their morality;
    - evaluating the factual and moral testing; and;
    - forming a conclusion about the issues.
- Evaluation
  - Know that in determining whether a viewpoint is based on a legitimate moral principle, a variety of moral tests could be applied, including:
    - role exchange: is the principle still considered valid when it is applied to oneself?
    - universal consequences: would the principle still be considered valid if everyone behaved according to its dictates?
    - new cases: is the principle still valid when it is applied to a different but logically relevant case?

### **FOUNDATIONAL OBJECTIVE 5:**

Know that every society will evolve, through debate and consensus, assumptions and practices concerning certain key societal relationships.

- Know that within every society, there will exist a divergence of views ·concerning key societal relationships, including:

- whether individuals, groups, and regions within the nation, possess the means to influence societal and national decision making in a manner to benefit their respective well-being; and,
- whether society has achieved a balance in securing the interests and well-being of particular populations, groups and/or regions of the nation, and securing the interests and well-being of the entire nation.

## Native Studies 10

### **UNIT THREE: LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

Examine the harmful effects of forced change. Recognize that Euro/Canadian government policies intended to 1) remove Aboriginal people from their homelands 2) suppress Aboriginal nations and their governments 3) undermine Aboriginal cultures 4) stifle Aboriginal identity.

- Read, interpret, and summarize written material.
- Compare and contrast different political structures.
- Use symbols to express ideas.
- Dramatize an interpretation of a specific time period in history.

Understand the legislation that affects Aboriginal peoples.

- Interact with specific policies and legislation that put Aboriginal independence in jeopardy.
- Explain ways that colonial and contemporary governments eroded traditional Aboriginal governance.
- Explain ways that legislation discriminated against Aboriginal women.
- Critically analyze the intent and detriment of government assimilation policies.
- Make connections between new reading and prior knowledge.
- Appreciate the resiliency of Aboriginal peoples under oppressive conditions.

Identify the effects of an imposed system of governance on Aboriginal peoples by examining a specific example.

- Empathize with people who have experienced a process of assimilation.
- Question why the government would implement assimilationist policies to the detriment of the people involved.
- Imagine what it would be like to have one's history and identity completely devalued.

Analyze the concept of contractual agreements.

- Brainstorm the components that comprise contracts.
- Imagine situations in which contracts may be necessary.
- Discuss factors that may cause different interpretations of the same agreements.
- Discuss the consequences of breaking an agreement.

Investigate the factors that led to Aboriginal peoples losing their traditional, historical territories.

- Explore the implications, for Aboriginal peoples, of the loss of their land.
- Utilize a variety of sources for information to discover how Aboriginal peoples lost their land.

Understand that Aboriginal peoples had, and have, different experiences with governments regarding their land.

- Research a specific Aboriginal group's experience with their traditional, historical land.
- Compile and present information to show knowledge gained.

Research the unique land agreements between Aboriginal peoples and various governments. Understand the sacredness with which treaties were entered into and signed.

- Respect the sacredness of the treaty making process.
- Research a specific land agreement between Aboriginal peoples and the government.
- View and interpret video productions on treaty.
- Display understanding of the Elders perspectives on treaty and other land agreements.

## Native Studies 30

### **UNIT 1: ABORIGINAL AND TREATY RIGHTS**

Key Understanding: The basis of Aboriginal rights.

- Knowledge. Students will:
  - define the concepts of Aboriginal rights, nation, sovereignty, and treaty.
  - explore how contemporary Aboriginal peoples negotiate for rights and self-determination.
  - assess the positions of Aboriginal leadership in both historical and contemporary times.
- Values. Students will:
  - appreciate the diversity of perspectives relevant to Aboriginal rights.
  - develop respect for process in the negotiation of Aboriginal rights.
  - develop respect for the role of Aboriginal leadership in entrenching Aboriginal rights.
- Skills/Processes. Students will:
  - further develop oral presentation skills.
  - read and interpret symbolic language in oral histories, speeches and legal documents.
  - locate data to support statements and paraphrase information.
  - examine issues from a variety of perspectives.

Key Understanding: The effects of Canada's expansionism of the 1800s.

- Knowledge. Students will:
  - define the concept of confederation.
  - know the impact of *The National Policy* on Aboriginal peoples.
- Values. Students will:
  - appreciate the diversity of perspectives involved in the history of Canada during the 1800s.
  - recognize the historical basis for issues affecting Aboriginal and Canadian governments today.
- Skills/Processes. Students will:
  - identify the main features of *The National Policy* and analyze the impact of it on Aboriginal peoples.
  - analyze and apply sections of *The British North America Act, 1867* which relate to Aboriginal peoples.
  - analyze *The British North America Act, 1867* as relevant to contemporary issues.

Key Understanding: The basis of Treaty rights,

- **Knowledge.** Students will:
  - apply the understanding inherent in the oral tradition of the honour, sacredness and legality of a person's word.
  - identify the major terms and conditions of the treaties made between First Nations and the Crown or Canadian Government.
  - comprehend that the "spirit and intent" of the treaties includes both written and oral promises made during the treaty-making process.
  - synthesize the implementation of treaties within Canada.
- **Values.** Students will:
  - appreciate the negotiation skills and approaches used in treaty making.
  - develop respect for the spirit and intent of Canadian treaties.
- **Skills/Processes.** Students will:
  - compare and contrast the language of treaties and oral histories.
  - analyze and apply protocols when accessing information from Elders, community people and community events.
  - apply planning and organizational skills.

**Key Understanding:** Interpretation and basis for interpretation of Aboriginal and treaty rights.

- **Knowledge.** Students will:
  - illustrate the role of spirit and intent in interpreting the implementation of treaty rights.
  - interpret legal definitions of rights as compared with the spirit and intent of same rights.
  - be able to identify key facts and significance of selected landmark cases in determining Aboriginal and treaty rights.
- **Values.** Students will:
  - appreciate differing points of view within a legal context.
  - value diversity within groups.
  - develop appreciation for Canadian treaties and what they symbolize.
- **Skills/Processes.** Students will:
  - analyze selected case studies to identify their significance in determining Aboriginal and treaty rights.
  - practise group process skill in summarizing and presenting information.

## **UNIT TWO: GOVERNANCE**

**Key Understanding:** The nature of traditional governments and decision-making processes.

- **Knowledge.** Students will:
  - identify basic characteristics of selected Aboriginal systems of governance.
  - interpret the impact of provincial and federal government policies on Aboriginal governance.
  - examine a variety of models for Aboriginal self-government.
- **Values.** Students will:
  - appreciate the role of tradition in contemporary Aboriginal governments.
  - Develop empathy for the impact of inter-governmental policies on Aboriginal governance.
  - develop respect for models of Aboriginal self-government.
- **Skills/Processes.** Students will:
  - compare Aboriginal systems of governance with European systems of governance.
  - analyze the impact of one government on another.

**Key Understanding:** The impact of colonial rule on authority and sovereignty of traditional Aboriginal governments.

- **Knowledge.** Students will:
  - describe the concept of civilization in relation to colonialism.
  - describe the stages in the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the Canadian government.
  - examine ways in which colonial rule disrupted the authority and sovereignty of traditional Aboriginal governments.
  - identify how Aboriginal societies influenced the newcomers.
- **Values.** Students will:
  - Appreciate the continuous impact of cultural contact between nations
  - develop empathy for the Aboriginal peoples of Canada affected by the results of colonialism.
- **Skills/Processes.** Students will:
  - analyze the relationship between Aboriginal and European societies.
  - evaluate information from a variety of sources.
  - view issues from many perspectives through the dialectical process.

Key Understanding: The relevance of the constitution of Canada and Aboriginal rights.

- **Knowledge.** Students will:
  - Identify the chronology of major events in the political history of Aboriginal peoples.
  - describe the impact of political history on the contemporary lives of Aboriginal peoples in Canada.
  - summarize the significance of the recognition of inherent rights of the Indian, Metis and Inuit peoples in the constitution.
- **Values.** Students will:
  - develop empathy for the Aboriginal people of Canada based on the impact of their historical treatment.
  - commit to the principles of social justice, equality, and fairness.
  - develop respect for the challenge of Aboriginal leadership to assert rights in contemporary Canada.
- **Skills/Processes.** Students will:
  - develop critical reading skills while reviewing legislation and policies.
  - examine issues based upon the idea that many perspectives exist for every issue.
  - put historical events into contemporary contexts to understand cause and effect relationships.

# SECTION 1 | CREATING CANADA: SASKATCHEWAN

## Prerequisite Skillset

- Word processing
- Web research
- Interpretation of primary sources
- Cooperative sharing
- Some familiarity with group debate

## Background Knowledge

Students may need to be reminded of the following subjects from the preceding weeks.

### SOCIAL

- French-English divisions in Canada during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries
- The difference between “national” (public) and “denominational” (private) schools

### ECONOMIC

- Importance of Crown Lands and natural resources to creating provincial tax revenues (Ontario, for example, avoided charging its residents property taxes for several decades by renting its Crown lands to lumber companies). An example is provided in the subsequent sections of the lesson plans.

### POLITICAL

- The difference between a legislative union (ex. Great Britain had a single legislature for England and Scotland) and a federal union (with federal and provincial legislatures that each have areas of exclusive jurisdiction)
  - The concept of dividing powers between federal and provincial governments and the respective jurisdictions of each (ex. education, military)
  - Increasing Aboriginal marginalization (especially neglected Treaty Rights)
- The jurisdictional differences between a province and a territory (and especially the concept of provincial autonomy in education, Crown lands and natural resources)
- The suggestion by historical figures like Laurier that colonies like Ontario, Quebec or Nova Scotia entered Confederation as pre-existing and self-governing Imperial entities (and were therefore presumably entitled to full provincial rights) vs. the contention of others like Robert Borden and Frederick Haultain who claimed that all provinces, whether created or pre-existing, were entitled to exact same jurisdictions.

## Confederation Debates: Introductory Lesson

**Lesson:** Introduce Confederation and the concept of debate

**Concepts Used:** Brainstorming, concept map

**Recommended Equipment:** Computer(s) for viewing videos and reading *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* entries

**Materials Provided:** Video, handouts

**Time Needed:** 2 x 40-minute classes

### INTRODUCTION

The teacher will engage students in a brainstorming session with the suggested list of framing questions below.

### BRAINSTORM SESSION

To help students recall background knowledge (see previous page) please discuss the following questions:

1. What was Confederation?
2. What were the most influential ideas in Saskatchewan’s Confederation debates?
3. Who was the most influential individual in Saskatchewan’s Confederation debates?
4. How did linguistic or ethnic tensions impact the debates and our constitution?
5. What are some areas of continuity and change between the Confederation period and today?

### CONCEPT MAP

1. When the brainstorm session has been completed, the teacher will circle the most pertinent/important subjects and sub-subjects that resulted from the brainstorm session.
2. Teachers may add subjects or sub-subjects if important topics were missed during the brainstorm session.
3. Students will then develop a concept map to highlight the important subjects and sub-subjects.
4. A concept map will provide a visual aid for students to see the important subjects and sub-subjects throughout the unit.

### INTRODUCTION TO PARLIAMENT

1. Distribute the “72 Resolutions Handout” to the students and highlight and discuss:
  - a. The fact that representation in the House of Commons is representation by population, and representation in the Senate is by region (ex. the Prairies)
  - b. The division of powers between federal and provincial governments (note that one focuses on national issues like banking, while the other focuses on local concerns like hospitals).
2. Distribute “Introduction to Parliament: The Question Period” handout and review the questions with the class.
3. Show the class any Question Period video posted to <http://www.cpac.ca/en/programs/question-period/>.

4. Pause the video at the start and point out the government side (left), the opposition side (right) and the Speaker of the House (centre).
5. Play several minutes of the video and ask students to fill out and submit the handout for teacher evaluation.
6. When the video is complete and the handouts are submitted, discuss the following points with the class:
  - a. Note that different parties form the government and opposition, and that each take opposite sides on issues
  - b. During Question Period, one person asks questions; the other side answers/rebutts
  - c. The Speaker of the House controls the discussion
  - d. The classroom debate will not have any:
    - i. Yelling
    - ii. Talking over one another

## Confederation Debates: Biographical Research

**Lesson:** Introduce the key historical figures in the Confederation debates

**Concepts Used:** Critical thinking, historical inquiry process, historical thinking, online research

**Materials Used:** Computers

**Materials Provided:** List of biographies, biography handout, primary document handouts, self-evaluation for jigsaw activity

**Time Needed:** 3 x 40-minute classes

### HISTORICAL FIGURE COMPUTER RESEARCH

1. Teachers may wish to familiarize themselves with the key details listed in the historical figure briefs (see appendices) before beginning this activity.
2. Ideally, each student should do the research using their own computer. If there are no computers available, the teacher may wish to print off the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* entries described below. Alternatively, if all students have access to a computer and internet access at home, this activity could be assigned for homework.
3. Divide the students into seven equal-sized groups.
4. Assign each group one of the major historical figures listed below. Alternatively, teachers may allow students to choose their historical figure.
  - a. Robert Borden
  - b. Henri Bourassa
  - c. Frederick W.A.G. Haultain (strong students should be assigned to this speaker)
  - d. Wilfrid Laurier (strong students should be assigned to this speaker)
  - e. Frank Oliver
  - f. Thomas Walter Scott
  - g. Clifford Sifton
5. Distribute copies of the “Biography Activity Handout” (see appendices) to all of the students.
6. Tell students to use Google to search for their historical figure and to find their listing on the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* website as listed (see appendices).
7. Tell the students to read their respective *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* entries and record their answers in the blanks on the “Biography Activity Handout.”

### GROUP DISCUSSION

1. After students have completed their research—in the computer lab, or at home—the students should rejoin their groups (see 3 above) in the classroom.
2. Distribute the “Primary Source” handouts (see appendices) to the groups. (Each student should have their own copy.)
3. Each student will be given a task: reader, writer and discussant. (The reader will read the source to the group; the discussants will contribute to the discussion and the writer will record the group’s ideas on a separate sheet of paper.) There can be more than one student assigned to each role.
4. The teacher will encourage each group to decide which statements and positions were most important. They should then discuss the possible historical significance of these statements.
5. When this work is complete, the students will compare and share these reflections with their group members and determine what facts and ideas they think will be important for their peers to know. Each group member will add these notes to their “Biography Activity Handout.”

**JIGSAW**

1. When all students have shared information with their group, they will separate into a jigsaw activity. The goal of this activity is for all students to learn about every historical figure from their peers.
2. The teacher will assign the students in each group a number between 1 and 7. (ex. students researching Frank Oliver will be labelled 5.)
3. All number 1s, 2s, 3s, 4s, 5s, 6s and 7s will then gather together. Each student should have at least one person from every group to share their information.
4. If there are too many students in the historical figure groups, each member should share a portion of what they learned with the jigsaw group. If there are too few students to divide the historical figure groups among each of the jigsaw groups, one student can present their information to more than one group.

**EXIT CARD**

1. Students will fill out the exit card (see appendices) and hand it in to the teacher for evaluation.
2. An exit card is an exercise designed to engage students with the material learned in class at the end of a lesson. All students will answer questions before leaving class. Exit cards allow teachers to assess the class's understanding of the day's material in preparation for the next lesson.
3. Students will answer the questions and will hand in the exit card to the teacher at the end of the lesson.
4. The exit card questions found in the appendices satisfy the requirements for three historical thinking concepts, historical significance, cause and consequence and historical perspective.
5. The teacher has discretion on whether to mark the exit cards to ensure understanding.

## Culminating Activity: The Debate

**Culminating Activity:** This culminating activity will introduce students to the basics of debate within a historical context and give them an opportunity to compare different historical positions on key issues of the 1860s.

**Concepts Used:** Critical thinking, primary sources, debate, using appropriate vocabulary, historical inquiry process, historical thinking concepts

**Time Needed:** 2 x 40-minute classes

Students/teacher will choose which figure they want to represent, which may be the same as or different than the historical figure they researched.

### MATERIALS (ENCLOSED)

- Mock ballots for optional voting activity, to be printed or photocopied in advance of the lesson (See appendices; the ballot's text is loosely based on the motion that all of the Province of Canada's representatives debated in 1865.)
- Script for teachers to use as "Speaker of the House" (See "Culminating Activity Script" below.)

### OPTIONAL MATERIALS (NOT ENCLOSED)

- Voting booth (set up before the debate begins for optional voting activity)
- Voting box (if the class is also going to do the voting activity)
- Costumes (ex. The teacher may borrow a graduation robe to wear while acting as "Speaker of the House," or find a white wig)

### DEBATE PREPARATION

1. If possible, rearrange the classroom desks to resemble parliament (i.e., the pro-Confederation and anti-Confederation groups will sit across from each other, with teacher standing in between at the front of the room).
2. Students will gather in their historical figure groups and prepare for the debate by composing short answers to the following questions that will be posed during the debate. Each student in the group will write an answer to one of the questions. If fewer than five students are in a group, one or more students may answer two questions.
  - a. What were the benefits of union according to each historical figure?
  - b. Will Saskatchewan have adequate influence within Confederation?
  - c. Local autonomy, or the ability to run things like schools without interference from the rest of the country, was very important to most of Canada's founders. Will the division of powers between federal and provincial governments protect local autonomy?
  - d. Will Saskatchewan's economy benefit from Confederation?
3. Students should practice their speech in front of the other members of their group to remain within a two-minute time constraint.

### DEBATE

1. The Speaker of the House (the teacher) will stand at the front of the classroom (between the pro- and Anti-Confederation sides of the room if the classroom desks have been moved to either side of the classroom). The Speaker of the House will then read from the script enclosed below to bring the debate to order, and will pose important questions.

2. Students will be given the opportunity, after everyone has shared, to offer a direct rebuttal to another student's statement. The Speaker of the House may allow students to rebut a particular point.
3. Once each theme has been addressed and all students have had the opportunity to make their case, the Speaker of the House will motion for adjournment.
4. After the debate is finished, teachers may hold the optional voting activity (below).

#### **OPTIONAL VOTING ACTIVITY**

1. Students should fill out the "Post-Debate Self-Evaluation" handout (see appendices) and submit it to the teacher during the voting activity. If you chose to skip this activity, please proceed to the "Reflection Activity" below.
2. The teacher will invite each student to the front of the classroom to vote.
3. Each student will go to the voting booth, make their mark for or against joining Confederation based on the debates they have just heard, and deposit the ballot into the box or bucket.
4. When every student has voted, the teacher will collect the ballots, count them, and announce the outcome to the class.

#### **REFLECTION ACTIVITY**

1. Debrief session on how Saskatchewan's Confederation debates are important today. Guiding questions for students can include:
  - a. Why was their historical figure important in the Confederation debates?
  - b. What are some ways in which each historical figure responded to challenges and/or created change?
  - c. Was the language in the materials hard to understand? Imagine if English wasn't your first language, as it was for the Indigenous Peoples of Canada.
2. Were you surprised by the opinions Saskatchewan's founders took regarding Indigenous Peoples?

## Culminating Activity Script

1. To bring the House to order, the Speaker will say, "This meeting will come to order."
2. The Speaker of the House will then conduct roll call for the six historical representatives. As each representative is named, students from that historical figure's group will say, "Present."
3. Once everyone is accounted for, the Speaker will read the House rules:
  - a. The Speaker of the House has ultimate power while Parliament is in session.
  - b. All representatives must stand to make their statements but will not leave their desk.
  - c. The Speaker will ask individual students to rise and sit as if they were debating in Parliament.
  - d. No name-calling or insults will be tolerated.
  - e. Representatives may ask to interrupt the current speaker with a question or counter point by raising their hand. The Speaker of the House will decide whether to ask the current speaker to pause.
  - f. Arguments must remain relevant to the subject of the debate. The Speaker of the House has the right to move to another speaker if anyone goes off-topic.
  - g. Students should write down any personal questions or comments for the debrief after the debate.
  - h. Optional: The Speaker may limit the amount of time representatives are allowed to speak (ex. two minutes)
4. The Speaker of the House will then introduce the first main question: "What are the benefits of union?" Each group be limited to a two-minute opening statement.
  - a. Note that each historical figure's vision of their province's size and powers will vary considerably.
5. The Speaker will then introduce the second main question: "Will Saskatchewan have adequate influence within Confederation?" Prompting questions for students may include:
  - a. Is it fair for some provinces to have more representatives than other? Why?
  - b. Should Alberta and Saskatchewan be one province or two? How might this decision impact the Prairie's ability to impact national policies?
6. Before introducing the next main question, the Speaker of the House will say, "Is everyone ready for the next question?" Additional discussion/debate may ensue.
7. The Speaker of the House will then introduce the third main question: "Local autonomy, or the ability to run things like schools without interference from the rest of the country, was very important to most of Canada's founders. Will the division of powers between federal and provincial governments protect local autonomy?" Prompting questions for students may include:
  - a. What powers does the Constitution give to the federal government?
  - b. What powers does the Constitution give to provincial governments?
  - c. Did the founders worry that the federal government would interfere in provincial affairs?
  - d. How did the founders try to minimize and alleviate these concerns about provincial autonomy?
8. Before introducing the next main question, the Speaker of the House will say, "Is everyone ready for the next question?" Additional discussion/debate may ensue.
9. The Speaker of the House will then introduce the fourth main question: "Will Saskatchewan's economy benefit from Confederation?" Prompting questions for students may include:
  - a. Might Saskatchewan be better able to impact its economic development or Canadian trade policies if it becomes a province?
  - b. Should Saskatchewan focus on trading with the United States or with Britain and Canada?
10. When everyone has had the opportunity to state their case, the Speaker will say, "I move for the adjournment of this session of Parliament."

## SECTION 2 | CREATING CANADA: FURTHERING INDIGENOUS-CROWN RELATIONSHIPS

### Prerequisite Skillset

- Word processing
- Interpretation of primary sources
- Cooperative sharing

### Background Knowledge

Based on the background information provided (see appendices), teachers should familiarize themselves with the following ideas and consider how they will be discussed with students. These ideas will help the students think about treaties and the treaty relationship as important parts of Confederation and as founding documents of Canada's constitutional order. Understanding the treaties as important parts of Canada's constitutional architecture demonstrates the role Indigenous Peoples played in shaping the country. Important learning outcomes include:

- Nation-to-Nation relationship
- The Royal Proclamation, 1763 and the Treaty relationship
- The British North America Act, 1867
- The Indian Act, and how it was used to exercise jurisdiction *over* Indigenous Peoples
- Treaty 6
- Historical background on the signing of the Treaties and their main clauses

## “I Left a Trace”: Lesson 1

**Lesson:** Introduce oral tradition, negotiations with the Indigenous Peoples; discuss the possibility of cultural/linguistic misunderstanding

**Concepts Used:** Brainstorming, historical significance, written response log

**Materials Enclosed:** Handouts (see appendices)

**Time Needed:** 2 x 40-minute classes

### THINK, PAIR, SHARE

To introduce students to the idea that history is constructed from traces of the past (see list of examples below), we suggest this introductory activity. The two activities and the follow-up response log engage students by having them analyze their personal experience.

1. After describing what a trace is, ask students to take 10 minutes to record everything that they have done in the last 24 hours (and that would be appropriate for classroom discussion) on a blank sheet of paper. They must draw their reflections. Examples of traces include:
  - a. Telling your parent you loved her/him
  - b. Telling someone you know a story about your past
  - c. Bringing mud into the house
  - d. Things you created with your hands
  - e. Actions that influenced others
  - f. Digital traces
2. Ask the class to identify:
  - a. Which traces were purposeful and which were accidental by marking them with a “P” and an “A.”
  - b. How would someone who is not from Canada interpret your traces? Would they be the same or different?
  - c. Would an historian working 100 years from now be able to interpret your traces the same way you would today? Students should also mark traces that they believe historians would correctly interpret with an “H.”
3. Ask the students to find a partner.
4. The partners will then, without saying a word, exchange their drawings.
5. Tell the students that they are now historians, and instruct them take 5 minutes to examine each drawing and write down observations like:
  - a. What do they believe the drawing describes?
  - b. What is the drawing used for?
  - c. Why do they think the individual thought the drawing was important?
  - d. What does each trace mean?
6. Ask the students to pass the drawings back to their author.
7. Have the class discuss how many items their partners correctly identified. Did they correctly interpret the significance of the “H” items?
8. How many of the “P” items were interpreted correctly? Is the class surprised that their purposeful traces were not always the ones that were interpreted correctly?

### RESPONSE LOG

1. Hand out the “Response Log Handout.” (See appendices.) Students should answer one of the five questions to reflect on the topic. Recommended reflection time is half an hour.
2. If the students do not have time to finish their response, the teacher can assign it as homework.

**VIDEO DEBRIEF**

Debrief the class with one or both of these Indigenous “Trace” videos.

- “Wab Kinew — Heroes” (song about Indigenous heroes). <https://youtu.be/3Ul4KmHlzMc>.
- “The Ballad of Crowfoot,” which examines the situation of Aboriginal people in North America through the figure of Crowfoot, the legendary nineteenth-century Blackfoot leader of the Plains Cree. <https://youtu.be/l-32jc58bgI>.

## Museum Curation Activity: Lesson 2

**Lesson:** Introduce negotiations with the Indigenous Peoples; discuss the possibility of cultural/linguistic misunderstanding, nation-to-nation relationships and museum curation techniques

**Concepts Used:** Historical significance, flow charts

**Materials Enclosed:** Handouts (see appendices)

**Time Needed:** 2 x 40-minute classes

**Note:** Teachers may wish to invite an Indigenous leader into the classroom to tour the exhibit that the students will produce, comment on their interpretations of the “artifacts,” and share their own experiences with the Canadian state and/or reconciliation.


### INTRO/BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR TEACHER TO PREPARE FOR THE MUSEUM CURATION ACTIVITY

#### *Introducing the Treaty Relationship:*

There are two very distinct stories we can tell about Confederation and Canada’s Indigenous Peoples. In one story, Indigenous Peoples are largely invisible. Here, their only presence is found in s.91(24) of the *British North America Act, 1867*, where “Indians, and lands reserved for the Indians” were deemed to be federal, as opposed to provincial, jurisdiction. This has subsequently been interpreted as providing the federal government with a power over Indigenous Peoples and their lands. The *Indian Act* of 1876, which is largely still with us today, was passed on this basis. This created what political philosopher James Tully has called an “administrative dictatorship” which governs many aspects of Indigenous life in Canada. Many of the most profoundly upsetting consequences of colonialism are traceable in large part to the imposition of colonial authority through s.91(24) and the Indian Act of 1876.

But there is another story as well. Canada did not become a country in single moment. Though the *British North America Act, 1867*, created much of the framework for the government of Canada, Canada’s full independence was not gained until nearly a century later. Similarly, the century preceding 1867 saw significant political developments that would shape the future country. Canada’s Constitution is both written and unwritten. Its written elements include over 60 Acts and amendments, several of which were written prior to 1867. The Royal Proclamation, 1763, for example, is a foundational constitutional document, the importance of which is reflected by its inclusion in s.25 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Royal Proclamation, 1763, established a basis for the relationship between the British Crown and Indigenous Peoples in North America. By establishing a procedure for the purchase and sale of Indigenous lands, the proclamation recognized the land rights of Indigenous Peoples and their political autonomy.

Both the pre-Confederation and post-Confederation Treaties form an important part of this history and what legal scholar Brian Slattery calls Canada’s “constitutional foundation.” It is through Treaties such as these that the government opened lands for resource development and westward expansion. It is also through the treaty relationship that Indigenous Peoples became partners in Confederation and helped construct Canada’s constitutional foundations.



For a detailed discussion/background information, and a detailed version of what you will present to the class, consider watching “Legal Fictions of the Indian Act”: <https://youtu.be/PBXnjBX7j3c>.

If you want to present a video to the class on this, consider “Nation to Nation: Honouring the Royal Proclamation of 1763”: [https://youtu.be/eFyuI7gzy\\_0](https://youtu.be/eFyuI7gzy_0).

This helpful article outlines the Crown-Indigenous relationship and the importance of the Treaties: “Why It’s Time to Clearly Define the Crown’s Role with First Nations,” <http://www.macleans.ca/society/why-its-time-to-define-the-crowns-role-with-first-nations/>.

## INTRODUCING TREATY 6: TEACHER BRIEFING

Treaty 6 is one of the 11 “Numbered Treaties” signed between 1871 and 1921. The Treaty was first signed at Fort Carleton in August 1876, where about 2000 Indigenous People attended, and Fort Pitt in September 1876. Several additional signings took place over the next 20 years. Treaty 6 covers an area across the central portions of the present provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. The Indigenous inhabitants of this area are mainly Cree with some Assiniboine, Saulteaux and Chipewyan. In 1876, the government was mainly concerned with making a treaty with the Cree. The Indigenous Peoples on the plains had been concerned about the intentions of the Canadian Government, especially since the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) had supposedly sold the North-West Territories to the government. Cree leaders expressed confusion about this purported sale, arguing that the land was theirs and did not belong to the HBC to sell. They were also concerned about smallpox outbreaks and possible starvation due to the near extinction of the buffalo.

From the Crown perspective, the Numbered Treaties were designed to open lands for settlement and resource development by acquiring ownership of the territory, creating specified “Indian reserves” and convincing Indigenous Peoples to take up an agricultural lifestyle. Historically, the Crown has argued that this is what the treaties do. The treaty texts seem to support this view, though many people have argued that the texts do not accurately reflect the oral agreements that were made at the treaty negotiations or the understandings of the Indigenous signatories.

At the negotiations, there was disagreement among the Indigenous leaders about how to proceed. The lead Crown negotiator, Alexander Morris, sought to allay Indigenous fears by promising that their way of life would not be undermined and that the Queen would protect their interests. Many Indigenous People remained skeptical of the government’s intentions. The Cree leader Poundmaker spoke at the Fort Carleton negotiations, saying: “The Government mentions how much land is to be given us. He says 640 acres one mile square for each band. He will give us, he says,’ and in a loud voice, he shouted ‘This is our land, it isn’t a piece of pemmican to be cut off and given in little pieces back to us. It is ours and we will take what we want” (Taylor).

Poundmaker’s position, however, did not win the day. Concerns about the disappearance of the buffalo and incoming settlement caused many leaders to favour a treaty. After some deliberation, the treaty was signed at Fort Carleton and again the next month at Fort Pitt, though many notable leaders and their communities were absent from the Fort Pitt signing and did not sign until several years later. Some clauses of the treaty are particularly notable. Cree leaders were insistent on a clause committing the government to help them in the event of famine, should there be difficulties in their transition away from buffalo as a primary food source. Thus, the “famine and pestilence clause” was added. It read:

That in the event hereafter of the Indians<sup>1</sup> comprised within this treaty being overtaken by any pestilence, or by a general famine, the Queen, on being satisfied and certified thereof by her Indian Agent or Agents, will grant to the Indians assistance of such character and to such extent as her Chief Superintendent of Indian Affairs shall deem necessary and sufficient to relieve the Indians from the calamity that shall have befallen them...

Morris also agreed to keep a medicine chest at the house of the Indian agent. The medicine chest clause continues to cause interpretive difficulties to this day.

The most contentious issues, however, revolve around land. The government views the treaties as having surrendered all Indigenous lands to the Crown. As John Taylor writes, however: “Once again, it seems that an individual or group of Indians had raised the land question which the commissioners had never discussed any more than absolutely necessary at any treaty negotiation. On those occasions when they were forced to discuss the subject, we do not know precisely what

---

<sup>1</sup> Indians = an archaic term for First Nations

was said. Consequently, we know nothing of what Indians were told about land cession.” Many people have pointed to the need to take into account the oral terms of the treaty as well as the perspective of the Indigenous signatories in determining the meaning of the treaty.

As Taylor points out, one crucial difference between the oral and written texts is one of emphasis. While land was not discussed at length by the commissioners, the cession of land was the foundation of the written documents. He writes:

It is clear from the text of the treaties and from the correspondence about them that the Government saw treaty-making primarily as a means of obtaining peaceful leave from the resident Indians for the settlement and development of the Indians’ territory. The treaty texts go even further and read like deeds of sale. The first provision in the text of Treaty Six is for the Indians of the district described and defined there to “cede, release, surrender and yield up to the Government of the Dominion of Canada for Her Majesty the Queen and her successors forever, all their rights, titles and privileges whatsoever, to the lands included within the following limits...” After a description of the territory intended to have been surrendered by the treaty, there was added for greater certainty, “and also all their rights, titles and privileges whatsoever, to all other lands, wherever situated, in the North-West Territories, or in any other Province or portion of Her Majesty’s Dominions, situated and being within the Dominion of Canada.”

Though the treaty was read in Cree, it is difficult to know what was understood and how highly legalistic language concerning land surrender would have been translated. Further, “there is no mention at all in the recorded speeches of the commissioners of the voluntary and total surrender forever of the Indians’ country. Nor is there any indication that the commissioners attempted to explain a concept which was at the heart of the treaty from the Government point of view and which loomed so largely in the treaty text” (Taylor).

Thus, the Indigenous understanding may have differed significantly. The language of kinship and families ties, as well as references to God, in the treaty negotiations, are very significant. For many Indigenous signatories, the treaties were a sacred matter. The references to God were therefore important. As John Borrows explains, the Indigenous “interpretation was that the treaties were made with the creator as well as with the Crown. First Nations felt encouraged in their view by the presence of Christian missionaries during negotiations, and the Crown’s invocation of God throughout their meetings” (Borrows, 2010). The references to family relations are also important. As Harold Johnson explains, it was through the extension of kinship (or extended family) relations that Indigenous nations creating political relationships and defined the rights, obligations and responsibilities of the parties. The parent-child relationship was not one of submission and obedience, but one that contained many mutual obligations.

The literature on the topic consistently points to an Indigenous understanding not of land surrender, but of some form of sharing. Thus, Taylor concludes that “The Indians might well have understood that they were agreeing to settlers using what they did not require in return for protection for their way of life and some practical assistance in supplementing their traditional means of livelihood. If this was the Indian interpretation, it is considerably at odds with that view of the treaty which regards it as an instrument of comprehensive and final territorial alienation from the Indians to the Crown.”

#### **CITATIONS AND FURTHER READING**

Borrows, John. *Canada’s Indigenous Constitution*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Taylor, John Leonard. “Treaty Research Report - Treaty Six (1876).” *Indian and Northern Affairs Canada*, 1985. <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028706/1100100028708>.


“Treaty 6 Education in Living Sky.” *Treaty 6 Education*.  
<https://treaty6education.lskysd.ca/index.html>.

“Treaty 6.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/treaty-6/>.

## INTRODUCING THE TREATIES OF PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP: HOW TO PRESENT THIS INFORMATION TO THE CLASS

To present these messages in an accessible way to the class:

1. The teacher will write all of the keywords on the board before the students enter the classroom:
  - a. British North America Act, 1867 (remind students that they have a handout on this from the parliamentary activities)
  - b. Indian Act, 1876
  - c. Royal Proclamation, 1763
  - d. Treaty Relationship
  - e. Treaties of Peace and Friendship
  - f. The Crown
2. The teacher will discuss the keywords by mapping out the relationship on their own flow chart at the front of the class visually linking these points as the federal government has traditionally seen it. (i.e., Indigenous Peoples are a jurisdiction of the Crown, wards of the state who needed to be assimilated into dominant Canadian society.) The drawing will be hierarchical:



3. The teacher will then ask the class to draw a second flow chart, and follow the teacher as they describe and link these ideas again according to a nation-to-nation relationship. (i.e., the Crown and Indigenous Peoples have a long pre-Confederation history as co-equal, non-hierarchical partners that was continued after Confederation.) The flow chart will emphasize equality:



## Museum Curation Exercise

1. Divide the class into six groups and assign each group one of the following:
  - a. Treaty 6
  - b. Alexander Morris
  - c. Chief Ahtahkakoop
  - d. Chief Mistahimaskwa (Big Bear) (strong students should be assigned to this historical figure)
  - e. George McDougall
  - f. Ceremonial Pipe
2. Each group will research their artifact using the resources provided in the appendices.
3. Teachers have the discretion to allow the groups to present what they learned in creative ways (ex. diorama, YouTube video), but we recommend that each produce an historical plaque (roughly 200 words).
4. Each group will pair their plaque (or other visual displays) with the historical artifact.
5. The class (teacher, students and Indigenous guest, if applicable) will then re-congregate and tour their collective exhibit.
6. Suggested talking points for each:
  - a. *Treaty 6*
    - i. The treaty uses very complex and technical legal language. Did you find it easy to understand? Would it have been difficult for people who did not grow up with English to understand?
    - ii. Which of the parties to the treaty might have benefitted most from having it written this way? What does this tell us about how power is exercised by creating certain historical accounts?
    - iii. Thinking about our museum exercise, what might be missing from the treaty as it is presented here (ex. did the oral statements vary significantly from the written treaty)?
  - b. *Alexander Morris*
    - i. What were Morris's main goals as lieutenant-governor of the Northwest Territories?
    - ii. Why might Morris have been chosen to negotiate treaties on behalf of the Crown?
    - iii. Why did Morris want to strengthen the power of the Chiefs?
    - iv. Why might Morris have thought it was important that treaties were made?
    - v. Morris's expressed goals were to bring "civilization" and agriculture to Indigenous Peoples in Western Canada. How might Indigenous Peoples have perceived these goals at the time?
  - c. *Chief Ahtahkakoop*
    - i. How much European influence was there on the plains when Chief Ahtahkakoop grew up?
    - ii. What were three main drivers of change on the plains during the time that Chief Ahtahkakoop was chief?
    - iii. What happened in 1867 that impacted the Prairies? What impacts did it have?
    - iv. Why did Chief Ahtahkakoop think a treaty was needed?
    - v. How did Chief Ahtahkakoop view Treaty 6 once it was signed?
    - vi. What happened after the treaty was signed that may have undermined Chief Ahtahkakoop's hopes for it?
  - d. *Chief Mistahimaskwa (Big Bear)*
    - i. Why did Big Bear clash with the Métis?
    - ii. Where was Big Bear when Treaty 6 was signed at Forts Carlton and Pitt? What does this tell us about Big Bear's views on the negotiations?
    - iii. How long did Big Bear hold out before signing a treaty? What caused him to eventually sign?

- iv. Why did many Indigenous Peoples come to see the treaties as having “no value” by 1879?
  - v. Why did Big Bear not want to fight Canada? What approach did the warriors take in 1885?
  - vi. What were the consequences of the 1885 Rebellion for Big Bear?
- e. *George McDougall*
- i. What type of mission did McDougall set up on the North Saskatchewan River? What were some of his goals?
  - ii. What percentage of the Indigenous population was thought to have died in the 1870 smallpox epidemic? How was McDougall personally affected? How did he respond?
  - iii. What two pressing social issues was McDougall involved in? What roles did he play?
- f. *Ceremonial Pipe*
- i. What role did pipe ceremonies play in Treaty 6 negotiations?
  - ii. Why was it important that Alexander Morris took part in a pipe ceremony?
  - iii. Explain the sacred and religious significance of the treaty. How is this related to the pipe ceremony?
  - iv. How might the sacred nature of the treaty have shaped the Indigenous understanding of the Treaty promises?
  - v. Why is the language of kinship important?
7. Ask the class to return to their desks and then raise some or all of the following questions in a debrief discussion:
- a. How do the maps you have seen over the last few days compare to maps of Canada now?
  - b. What do these maps tell us about how Canada was formed?
  - c. Thinking about our museum exercise, how are these maps similar to or different from stories you’ve heard about Canada’s history?
  - d. How do these maps demonstrate the important role of Indigenous Peoples in shaping Canada?
  - e. What do you take from the fact that the treaty borders do not match the provincial borders?

## APPENDICES

# **SECTION 1: MATERIALS AND HANDOUTS FOR CREATING CANADA: SASKATCHEWAN AND CONFEDERATION**

## Handout: Introduction to Parliament



### THE QUESTION PERIOD

What were the main topics discussed in the video?

---

---

---

/5

List the political parties of the different politicians who spoke in the video (ex. “Conservative”).

---

---

---

---

/5

Do the politicians address each other directly? Explain.

---

---

---

/5

How do members of the Parliament behave during Question Period?

---

---

---

/5

Total: /20

## Biography Activity Handout



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

Name of Historical Figure: \_\_\_\_\_

Birth and Death Dates: \_\_\_\_\_

Family Members:

---

---

---

Where were they born? \_\_\_\_\_

Where did they live? \_\_\_\_\_

Pro- or anti-Confederation? \_\_\_\_\_

Reason(s) for pro-Confederation or anti-Confederation position:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Exit Card**

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

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Historical significance: Name the three historical figures you think had the biggest impact on Confederation and write a sentence about each explaining why. (You should have at least one figure from pro- and one from anti-Confederation.)

---

---

---

Cause and consequence: Name one way that Canada would be different if we didn't have Confederation.

---

---

---

Historical perspective: Name one person and one reason they were anti-Confederation.

---

---

---

---

If you were to select a new national capital, what city would you choose? Why did you choose this location? Do you think your choice would be different if you lived in a province other than Saskatchewan?

---

---

---

---



## Robert Borden in Brief

*This summary borrows from the Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry listed in the “Additional Resources” section of this mini-unit.*

Sir Robert Laird Borden was born in Grand Pré, Nova Scotia in 1854. A descendant of Richard Borden, whose family first arrived in Boston from England in 1638, the Bordens later moved to Nova Scotia during the mid 1700s. Although Robert's family was not wealthy, it provided him with good (though incomplete) education that he used to become a teacher. Unsatisfied with his professional prospects, he began apprenticing at a legal firm at a prominent Halifax legal firm in 1874. By the 1880s, he was assigned a variety of important cases from Conservative leaders, including Sir John A. Macdonald. In 1889, he married Laura Bond, the daughter of a successful Halifax hardware merchant. By the 1890s, Borden's legal firm was among the largest in the province.

Borden entered politics in 1896 when he won a House of Commons seat for Halifax after Sir Charles Tupper requested that he run for office. Over the next few years, he moved from being a backbencher to having a seat on the front bench. By 1900, Tupper was eager to retire and Borden, with few political enemies, became the logical choice. Borden initially rejected the idea, but eventually accepted on the condition that he only lead the party for one year while a committee searched for a permanent leader. Neither of these conditions were ever made public, and they quickly fell to the wayside.

Borden devotedly worked as leader of the opposition for the next decade, though he never enjoyed public speaking or debating, and struggled to lead his factious Conservative caucus. He rarely agreed with his French Canadian MPs, and made little effort to understand their nationalist perspectives, or to curb his antagonistic Protestant colleagues from Ontario.

During the 1905 parliamentary debate on the establishment of Alberta and Saskatchewan, Borden clashed with his former Quebec cabinet representative Frederick Debartzch Monk, who wanted the Conservatives to back protections for separate schools on the Prairies. Instead, Borden sided with Ontario and Prairie politicians by rejecting protections for separate schools in the name of provincial autonomy.

After the 1905 debate, Borden would go on to continue favouring English Canadian perspectives. He became Prime Minister in 1911, serving in this role throughout the First World War until 1920. He died in 1937 at the age of 82.




Image held by Library and Archives Canada.



## Henri Bourassa in Brief

*This summary borrows from the Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry listed in the “Additional Resources” section of this mini-unit.*

Henri Bourassa was born on 1 September 1868 in Montreal. His family was active in politics, with different members supporting the Conservatives and *Patriotes*. Bourassa began his formal education in 1876 and studied under a variety of private instructors and institutions. He generally left the latter before completing their programs, however, and was largely self-taught, with a thirst for reading on a wide range of topics.

During the 1880s and early 1890s, Bourassa began to take charge of the Petite-Nation seigneurie. In so doing, he learned about farming, colonization and local institutions. He established a model farm that he continued to work until 1898, and would subsequently use the knowledge he gained to launch himself into politics.

The Riel affair of 1885 as well as Wilfrid Laurier’s rise as Liberal leader—whom Bourassa had known since childhood, led Bourassa to enter politics. First elected as mayor of Montebello, he became known as a skilled orator. He agreed to stand for the riding of Leballe in the 1896 election as Liberal, though he refused to accept party funds and insisted that he would vote according to his convictions rather than party lines. Laurier tolerated this unusually strong independence from the new candidate.

In addition to successfully running for the Leballe seat, Bourassa took up journalism, co-owning a series of publications that emphasized obedience to the Catholic Church (ultramontanism) and the defence of French Canadian rights. His early decision to emphasize ultramontanism over moderate liberalism and compromise, however, frequently put him at odds with Laurier, and he soon resigned his seat in 1899, only to be re-elected as an Independent in January 1900 and then rejoin the Liberal Party later that same year. From that point forward, Bourassa communicate his vision of English-Protestant and French-Catholic relations to Canadians.

He clearly communicated this vision during the 1905 debates concerning the creation of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Laurier, who initially wanted to protect Catholic education rights on the Prairies, consulted Bourassa when drafting the initial legislation. The move, however, precipitated a crisis. Clifford Sifton resigned from the cabinet in protest, and other ministers threatened to join him. Despite pressure from Bourassa to stay the course, Laurier ultimately compromised and allowed Sifton to redraft key portions of the legislation in favour of a public school system. Bourassa openly rebelled against his party, proposed multiple failed amendments and led a mass meeting in Montreal against the Prime Minister’s decision. These moves damaged Laurier’s image, but ultimately did little for the Prairie minority.

After 1905, Bourassa’s attention increasingly shifted to provincial politics and to journalism. He launched a daily newspaper, *Le Devoir*, in 1910, and used this platform to publicize his Catholic and nationalist viewpoints during the ensuing decades. He remained an active political figure, and returned to the House of Commons as an Independent MP for a decade beginning in 1925. He died in 1952.



Image held by Library and Archives Canada.



## Frederick W. A. G. Haultain in Brief

*This summary borrows from the Canadian Encyclopedia entry listed in the “Additional Resources” section of this mini-unit.*

Frederick William Alpin Gordon Haultain was born on November 25, 1857 in Woolwich, England. In 1860, his family moved to what is now Peterborough, Ontario. After completing three years of school at the University of Toronto, Haultain became a lawyer in 1882 and was called to the North-West Territories Bar in 1884. He was first elected to the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories in 1888, and went on to win the next five elections, becoming the territory's first premier in 1897. Haultain's administrations were non-partisan, attracting support of Liberals and Conservatives alike. As premier, Haultain led the territory's pursuit of provincial status, contending that the federal government was not properly attending to the region's needs and insisting that his government would gain the additional funds to remedy these problems and encourage further “settlement.” He also contended that the Prairie territories should admitted as a single province named Buffalo, instead of as two provinces, because he believed that a single province could better resist the influences of larger provinces like Ontario and Quebec.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Liberal government disagreed, and instead created Alberta and Saskatchewan. Frustrations with this decision pushed Haultain towards the Conservatives and, after leaving his position in the Northwest Territories, Haultain led the opposition Provincial Rights Party from 1905 to 1912 in Saskatchewan. He subsequently became the chancellor of the University of Saskatchewan and Chief Justice of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. Haultain retired in 1938, and he died in 1942.



Image held by the  
Saskatchewan Archives

## Wilfrid Laurier in Brief

*This summary borrows from the Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry listed in the “Additional Resources” section of this mini-unit.*



Wilfrid Laurier was born in the parish of Saint-Lin (Laurentides), Lower Canada on 20 November 1841. His father, Carolus, was a bilingual, literate farmer and surveyor who was eager to improve his family's modest economic prospects and went on to become the municipality's first mayor. He also closely followed and sympathized with the *Parti Patriote*, whose rebellion transpired just before Wilfrid's birth.

Early in his childhood, Carolus moved Wilfrid to a school in New Glasgow, a few miles from the family's home, where English language and customs prevailed, and these experiences gave him a fondness for and familiarity with both of Canada's European cultures. He subsequently attended Collège de L'Assomption, where he excelled, though he left the conservative and ultramontane institution with a strong passion for liberalism. He subsequently studied law at McGill College and met Zoé Lafontaine, who he would later marry. After passing his law examinations, Laurier initially practiced law in Montreal before moving to Arthabaskaville (Arthabaska).

Laurier, along with other *Rouges*, initially opposed Confederation, arguing that it would lead to the assimilation of French Canada into an English-Protestant country. Like the *Rouge* leader, Antoine-Aimé Dorion, he decided to work accept his new country. After a brief time in the provincial legislature, Laurier won the federal seat for Drummond—Arthabaska in 1874 and quickly established himself as a moderate liberal intent on winning Quebec over to his party. Prime Minister Alexander Mackenzie recognized Laurier's talent and appointed him Minister of Inland Revenue, bringing him into the inner circle of Canadian politics. During the Liberals' long time in opposition, Laurier continued to emphasize French-Canadian perspectives by contesting, for example, Louis Riel's execution in 1885, while also emphasizing the compatibility of French and English Canada.

When Edward Blake decided to resign as Liberal leader, he surprised many by selecting the French-Canadian Laurier. Indeed, Laurier initially refused, but Blake persisted and Laurier eventually accepted, though he continued to worry that English-Canadians would not accept his leadership. Canadian politics made this especially challenging. Debates concerning the use of French language in the Northwest and Manitoba constantly threatened to divide Canadians. On these occasions, Laurier generally pursued compromise and slowly won the favour of Canadian voters. The tactics paid off during 1896 election when, with the Conservatives in disarray following Macdonald's death, the Liberals won the election.

When it came time to create Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905, Prime Minister Laurier again tried to find compromise when divisions arose around the question of French language and separate schools in the Northwest. The government's initial bill defied Haultain and protected separate schools by reintroducing measures that Haultain's governments had previously overturned. When Clifford Sifton resigned from the cabinet over provincial control of education and others threatened to follow, however, Laurier bowed to political reality and removed these protections. He nevertheless insisted on the establishment of two (rather than one) province, as well as federal control of Crown lands and natural resources. Laurier continued as prime minister until 1911, and he remained as leader of the Liberal Party and a protector of French Canadian interests until his death in 1919.




Image held by Library and Archives Canada.

## Frank Oliver in Brief

*This summary borrows from the Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry listed in the “Additional Resources” section of this mini-unit.*

Frank Oliver was born September 1853 in Peel County, Upper Canada, to English and Irish parents who farmed in Chinguacousy Township. After a falling out with his father, Oliver moved to Toronto and found employment with the *Globe*, where he embraced the newspaper’s Clear Grit liberalism and enthusiasm for “settling” the Prairies. In 1873 Oliver moved to Winnipeg and secured a position with the *Manitoba Free Press*. Anticipating the projected transcontinental railway, Frank set up a store close to Fort Edmonton and soon after launched the *Edmonton Bulletin*. In 1881, he married Harriet Dunlop, whose brother had worked at the *Free Press* and who subsequently had become a partner at the *Bulletin*. When the railway was rerouted further south, however, Oliver’s store failed and his newspaper struggled.

These losses caused him to resent Sir John A. MacDonald’s Conservatives. Oliver subsequently became the second elected member of the Council of the Northwest Territories in 1883 and he fought for public-works funding for the Edmonton district, incorporation of the town, the establishment of schools, and settlement of Métis claims for scrip. He also demanded that the Council have control over local affairs (responsible government), free from federal interference. When Oliver was defeated during the 1885 election, he continued to berate Ottawa through his newspaper. In 1888, he won a seat in the newly established Legislative Assembly. He favored abolishing the official status of the French language in the territories and advocated restricting denominational schooling while expanding the territorial government’s controls. He continued to attack Conservative policies and was impressed by Wilfred Laurier.

After winning a federal seat in 1896 election, the populist Prairie MP fought for the establishment a revenue (as opposed to protective) tariff, for an end to the CPR’s monopoly, and for better terms for the northwest. He soon became a well-known Liberal MP, though his focus on Alberta—and particularly his riding in Edmonton—rarely allowed him to be a unifier within the party. When Clifford Sifton unexpectedly resigned in 1905 over the government’s initial bill to establish Alberta and Saskatchewan, Laurier asked Oliver to become the new Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. This promotion reflected Oliver’s popularity as well as his well-known acceptance of separate school protections and constrained provincial rights. Upon entering the cabinet, Oliver continued to defend Ottawa’s revised school policy and its decision to retain control of the new provinces’ crown lands and natural resources. In subsequent years, he limited immigration policies and expanded deportation powers. Despite claiming that the government spent too much on Indigenous Peoples, that educating them was a waste of resources, and that forcing Indigenous children to leave their homes to study at residential schools was a poor policy, his department ultimately increased spending on Indigenous Peoples, and the number of residential schools increased. He also amended the Indian Act to facilitate the sale, or even expropriation, of Indigenous lands. He remained the Minister of the Interior until 1911, and an MP until 1917. The Mackenzie King government subsequently appointed him to the Board of Railway Commissioners, where he worked until the age of 75. He fell ill suddenly while visiting Ottawa and died on 31 March 1933.




Image held by the City of Edmonton Archives

## Clifford Sifton in Brief

*This summary borrows from the Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry listed in the “Additional Resources” section of this mini-unit.*



Clifford Sifton was born 10 March 1861 in St. Johns, Upper Canada (present-day Arva, Ontario), to a wealthy family of entrepreneurs. He was raised as a Methodist, became a prohibitionist and gravitated toward the moralistic political approaches for George Brown and Alexander Mackenzie. He graduated from Victoria College in 1880, became a lawyer and started a law firm in Brandon Manitoba.

Sifton entered politics in 1882 by assisting his father, John Wright Sifton, with a provincial re-election campaign in Manitoba.

Clifford was himself elected to Manitoba’s Legislative Assembly in 1888. As a Liberal under the leadership of Thomas Greenway, his party protested the Conservative government’s alleged reliance on Sir John A. Macdonald’s support. Greenway’s Liberals won the 1888 general election and Sifton was soon named Attorney General and Provincial Lands Commissioner. Within the cabinet, he helped to establish a new local railway funding policy that worked against the federally backed Canadian Pacific Railroad monopoly. A rising star, he also became the Minister of Education in 1892, and helped to lead the movement to end public support for the province’s separate schools by contending that any federal action on the matter infringed on the Manitoba legislature’s legal autonomy. When this dominion-provincial fight eventually toppled the federal Conservatives, and brought Wilfrid Laurier’s Liberals to power, Sifton was instrumental in developing the Laurier-Greenway Compromise that gave Sifton most of what he wanted.



Image held by Library and Archives Canada

Laurier rewarded Sifton’s role in resolving the Manitoba Schools Question by making him the new federal Minister of the Interior. As a federal politician, he carried great weight in cabinet, and promoting the western provinces and integrating them into Canada’s economy by advancing railway construction and agricultural settlement. Sifton’s immigration policies were wildly successful, spurring mass settlement on the Prairies by American, British, Western and Eastern European settlers. Under Sifton’s watch, the Crown also encouraged settlement by negotiating with Indigenous populations to develop agreements such as Treaty No. 8 in 1899.

Clifford Sifton was in favour of the establishment of Alberta and Saskatchewan as provinces in 1905. He wanted the western territories to join Canada as two provinces rather than one because he believed that separate and autonomous governments would be more responsive to the different populations and industries. He did not, however, support the educational clauses of the Autonomy bills, which gave separate schools more rights than the existing territorial government under Premier Frederick W. A. G. Haultain wanted. Once again, Sifton wanted a single, “national” school system for the province. Since he recognized that this was unachievable, however, he asked Laurier to change the bill to conform with existing separate school rights in the Northwest. Laurier initially resisted, but Sifton’s resignation, along with threats of rebellion from many within the Liberal caucus, led him to accept Sifton’s demand.

Sifton remained an MP until 1911, and sometimes spoke out against key Liberal policies like the reciprocity deal of 1911 with the United States. After leaving Parliament, he was knighted in 1915. He spent the First World War years promoting Canada’s First World War effort, and convinced many Western leaders to join Sir Robert Borden’s Union government. He later died of heart failure in 1929.



## Thomas Walter Scott in Brief

*This summary borrows from the Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry listed in the “Additional Resources” section of this mini-unit.*

Thomas Walter Scott was born on 27 October 1867 in Ilderton, Ontario. As a young man, he moved to Manitoba to work on his uncle's farm and then worked for the *Weekly Manitoba Liberal* in Portage la Prairie. In 1886, he moved with his boss to Regina, where he became co-owner of the *Regina Standard*. He went on to purchase the *Moose Jaw Times* and the *Regina Leader*. These moves allowed him to meet with local politicians, and he soon developed an interest in public affairs, including the Northwest school question. During the 1900 federal election, Scott successfully stood as the Liberal candidate for Assiniboia West. He quickly gained prominence by attacking the Canadian Pacific Railway and was re-elected to this seat in 1904.

Scott expressed similarly strong views during the subsequent parliamentary debates concerning the creation of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Instead of supporting Haultain's desires for a single province, local control of crown lands and no separate schools, Scott sided with his leader, Wilfrid Laurier, by supporting the establishment of two provinces, federal control of Crown lands and protections for separate schools.

Given Haultain's opposition to Laurier's policies, the former territorial leader's decision to campaign for the Conservatives during two subsequent by-elections, and Scott's loyalty to the Liberal party, it was not surprising that Scott was selected to lead Saskatchewan's Liberal Party on 16 August 1905. During the subsequent election campaign, his party ran on the slogan “Peace, Progress, and Prosperity”—peace with Ottawa, progress in terms of the province's development, and prosperity for its inhabitants. He won a majority government and, over the next eleven years, his government focused on building up infrastructure, including the roads, railways, bridges, telephone systems, the University of Saskatchewan and province's capital building.

In 1916, Scott retired. In 1936, Scott was admitted into the Homewood Sanatorium after a lifelong battle with depression. He died two years later on 23 March 1938.




Image held by the  
Saskatchewan Archives

## Ballots

### **BALLOT**

Be it resolved that Saskatchewan should join Confederation.

Yes       No

---

### **BALLOT**

Be it resolved that Saskatchewan should join Confederation.

Yes       No

---

### **BALLOT**

Be it resolved that Saskatchewan should join Confederation.

Yes       No

## Teacher's Rubric for Evaluation of Confederation Debates

	4	3	2	1	Points
Factual Information	Significant contribution to the debate.  Student was able to provide historical information relating to their character.	Reasonable contribution to the debate.  Student missed a few crucial elements of historical information about their character.	Minimal contribution to the debate.  Student missed a significant number of crucial elements during the debate.	Unsatisfactory contribution to the debate.  Student did not provide enough crucial pieces of historical information about their character.	
Comprehension	Student fully understands the historical content and significance of the debate. Speech is well prepared and all questions are answered during the debate.	Student somewhat understands the historical content and significance of the debate. Speech is prepared and major concepts are understood.	Student vaguely understands the historical content and significance of the debate. Speech is somewhat prepared but major concepts are missed or misunderstood.	Student does not understand the historical content and significance of the debate. Speech is not well prepared and student has not contributed significantly to the debate.	
Delivery	Student clearly articulates during the jigsaw and debate. All questions are answered and delivered articulately.	Student reasonably articulates during the jigsaw and debate and questions are reasonably answered.	Student sometimes articulates during the jigsaw and debate but there are a few misunderstandings.	Student does not articulate during the jigsaw and debate and does not deliver the speech well and there are many misunderstandings.	
Rebuttal	Student can effectively rebut during the debate.	Student can adequately rebut during the debate.	Student has limited rebuttal during the debate.	Student is not able to rebut during the debate.	
Historical Thinking	Student shows significant understanding of historical thinking concepts and uses them throughout the debate (e.g., speaking as their historical figure would as opposed to giving their own views).	Student shows a general understanding of historical thinking concepts and uses some throughout the debate (e.g., can somewhat speak as their historical figure would).	Student shows some understanding of historical thinking concepts and uses a few throughout the debate (perhaps with some misunderstanding or citing their own views).	Student shows little understanding of historical thinking concepts (e.g., not speaking as their historical figure would or giving irrelevant arguments).	
Total					



## Post-Debate Self-Evaluation

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

Your self-grade: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe your contribution to the group:

---

---

What would you do to improve your group work next time?

---

---

---

What would you do to improve your debating skills next time?

---

---

---

How could your team improve next time?

---

---

---

Teacher comments:

---

---

Teacher grade:

## Additional Resources

### GENERAL RESOURCES

“The Confederation Debates.” <http://hcmc.uvic.ca/confederation/>.

Borrows, John. *Canada’s Indigenous Constitution*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Canada. “Highlights from the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.” Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100014597/1100100014637>.

“Confederation.” *Canadian Encyclopedia*.

<http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/confederation/>.

Friesen, Gerald. *The Canadian Prairies: A History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.

Hall, Anthony J. “Indigenous Peoples: Treaties.” *Canadian Encyclopedia*.

<http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/aboriginal-treaties/>.

Taylor, John Leonard. “Treaty Research Report - Treaty Six (1876).” *Indian and Northern Affairs Canada*, 1985. <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028706/1100100028708>.

Tidridge, Nathan. “Why It’s Time to Clearly Define the Crown’s Role with First Nations.” *Macleans*. <http://www.macleans.ca/society/why-its-time-to-define-the-crowns-role-with-first-nations/>.

Treaty 6.” *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. <http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/treaty-6>.

“Treaty 6 Education in Living Sky.” *Treaty 6 Education*. <https://treaty6education.lskysd.ca/index.html>.

Tidridge, Nathan. “Why it’s time to clearly define the Crown’s role with First Nations.” *Macleans*. <http://www.macleans.ca/society/why-its-time-to-define-the-crowns-role-with-first-nations/>.

### VIDEO LINKS

Question Period. <http://www.cpac.ca/en/programs/question-period>.

### CHIEF AHTAHKAKOOP

Christensen, Deanna. *Ahtahkakoop: The Epic Account of a Plains Cree Head Chief, His People, and Their Vision for Survival, 1816-1896*. Shell Lake, Sask.: Ahtahkakoop Publishing, 2000.

Christensen, Deanna. “Ahtahkakoop (C. 1816–96).” *The Encyclopedia of Saskatchewan*. [http://esask.uregina.ca/entry/ahtahkakoop\\_c\\_1816-96.html](http://esask.uregina.ca/entry/ahtahkakoop_c_1816-96.html).

### ANGLIN, TIMOTHY WARREN

Baker, William M. “Anglin, Timothy Warren.” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. [http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/anglin\\_timothy\\_warren\\_12E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/anglin_timothy_warren_12E.html).

### BORDEN, ROBERT

Brown, Robert Craig. “Borden, Sir Robert Laird.” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. [http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/borden\\_robert\\_laird\\_16E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/borden_robert_laird_16E.html).

**BOURASSA, HENRI**

Bélanger, Réal. "Bourassa, Henri." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/bourassa\\_henri\\_18E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/bourassa_henri_18E.html).

**CEREMONIAL PIPE**

Borrows, John. *Canada's Indigenous Constitution*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

**HAULTAIN, FREDERICK W. A. G.**

"Sir Frederick William Haultain." *Canadian Encyclopedia*.  
<http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/sir-frederick-william-haultain/>.

**LAURIER, WILFRID**

Bélanger, Réal. "Laurier, Sir Wilfrid." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/laurier\\_wilfrid\\_14E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/laurier_wilfrid_14E.html).

Clippingdale, Richard. *Laurier, His Life and World*. Montreal: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1979.

**MCDougall, George**

Nix, James Ernest. "McDougall, George Millward." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mcdougall\\_george\\_millward\\_10E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mcdougall_george_millward_10E.html).

**CHIEF MISTAHIMASKWA (BIG BEAR)**

Wiebe, Rudy. "Mistahimaskwa." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mistahimaskwa\\_11E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mistahimaskwa_11E.html).

**MORRIS, ALEXANDER**

Jean. "Morris, Alexander." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/morris\\_alexander\\_11E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/morris_alexander_11E.html).

**OLIVER, FRANK**

Hall, David John. "Oliver, Frank." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/oliver\\_frank\\_16E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/oliver_frank_16E.html).

**SCOTT, THOMAS WALTER**

Barnhart, Gordon. "Scott, Thomas Walter." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/scott\\_thomas\\_walter\\_16E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/scott_thomas_walter_16E.html).

**SIFTON, CLIFFORD**

Hall, David John. *Clifford Sifton*, Vol 2, *A Lonely Eminence, 1901–1929*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2011.

Hall, David J. "Sifton, Sir Clifford." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*.  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/sifton\\_clifford\\_15E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/sifton_clifford_15E.html).



## Primary Source: Robert Borden's Views on Confederation

*When the House of Commons debated creating Alberta and Saskatchewan, Robert Borden said the following points:*

### PROVINCIAL RIGHTS

“My position is that if you apply to these provinces the terms of the constitution as they are to-day, they will give to these provinces the absolute right to deal with their own educational Affairs.”

*House of Commons, 24 March 1905, pg. 2115.*

“So therefore I have good reason to congratulate the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon his change of heart, because when I myself on October 14, 1903, moved in this House a resolution declaring that in the opinion of this House, the time had come when the government should take this question into immediate consideration, not one member of the government, not the right hon. gentleman himself, nor one of his colleagues ventured<sup>1</sup> to say one single word upon this all-important<sup>2</sup> subject. They put up in their place two or three gentlemen from the Northwest Territories of Canada to argue as strenuously<sup>3</sup> as they could that the granting<sup>4</sup> of a provincial status should not be accorded to these provinces in the immediate future. The resolution which I moved at that time, after reciting the unanimous resolutions passed by the legislature of the Northwest Territories set forth:

“That under the provisions<sup>5</sup> of the British North America Act and amending<sup>6</sup> Acts, the people of the several provinces of Canada enjoy large powers of local self-government committed to and exercised by the executive and legislature of each province.

“That the time has arrived when the same powers of local self-government should be granted to the people of the Northwest Territories of Canada and to this end the said representations and prayers contained in the said humble addresses should be taken into immediate consideration and acted upon forthwith.”<sup>7</sup>

*House of Commons, 21 February 1905, pg. 1459.*




Image held by Library and Archives Canada.

<sup>1</sup> Ventured = dared or risked

<sup>2</sup> All-important = very important

<sup>3</sup> Strenuously = vigorously

<sup>4</sup> Granting = giving

<sup>5</sup> Provisions = conditions or requirements found in a legal document

<sup>6</sup> Amending = changing

<sup>7</sup> Forthwith = immediately

## SEPARATE SCHOOLS

"It is not, in my opinion, a question of separate schools, but a question of provincial rights. It is not a question of separate schools, but of provincial self government. It is not a question of separate schools but of constitutional home rule. It is a question of those privileges and liberties of which the right hon. gentleman, up to the present at least, has claimed to be the champion and exponent.<sup>8</sup> No one appreciates or respects more highly than I do the moral and ethical training which the Roman Catholic Church bestows upon<sup>9</sup> the youth of Canada who were born within the pale of that church. I esteem at the highest the value of the moral training of the children of this country; and I am free further to confess that I appreciate more highly perhaps than some others the consistency and devotion<sup>10</sup> of Roman Catholics, in this and other matters of their faith, wherein they give to the Protestants of this country an example from which the latter might well learn valuable lessons. {...} It was in that school that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) learned long ago the lesson which he seems to have somewhat forgotten to-day. In the province of Quebec, there is and there is rightly, a strong spirit in favour of provincial rights. And it is because I interpret the constitution in the light of that spirit that I take the stand upon this question which I take to-day. Let me illustrate my meaning by one further statement. If any hon. member of this House or any man in this country should seek<sup>11</sup> to insert in this Bill a provision forbidding the establishment of separate schools in the Northwest, I would combat that proposal to the end, because I would consider it as absolutely in the conflict with the provincial rights which I desire to see maintained. I take this stand because I believe that not only in the light of the constitution, but in the light of the highest wisdom and statesmanship,<sup>12</sup> education should be left absolutely to the control of the people of the new provinces."

*House of Commons, 22 March 1905, pgs. 2932–2933.*

"I base my case and my contention<sup>13</sup> upon the terms of the constitution. I do not argue against separate schools; I do not argue for separate schools. It is not for me to determine that question for the people of the Northwest; it is for the people of the Northwest, under the terms of the constitution, to determine that matter for themselves. I shall always endeavour<sup>14</sup> to respect the opinions of my fellow-country-men, of whatever race and of whatever creed.<sup>15</sup> But I do not think it is wise to attempt to step outside of the limits of the constitution to provide remedies which have no warrant<sup>16</sup> within the terms of our national charter."

*House of Commons, 22 March 1905, pg. 1905.*

"Under the law the majority of ratepayers in a district can establish such schools as they think fit, and it would not make the slightest difference whether they were all Protestants or partly Protestants and partly Roman Catholics; or whether they had among them Jews and Mormons—they would be a majority for the establishment of a school. And, when these schools had been established the minority could establish separate schools. But the word 'separate schools' to my mind does not impart<sup>17</sup> anything more than separation; it does not involve the idea that the separate Schools so established should be absolutely under the control of the persons who established them, any more than is the majority school. I do not think that any such result could

<sup>8</sup> Exponent = supporter or advocate

<sup>9</sup> Bestows upon = gives

<sup>10</sup> Devotion = religious observance

<sup>11</sup> Seek = try or attempt

<sup>12</sup> Statesmanship = skillset to manage public affairs

<sup>13</sup> Contention = disagreement

<sup>14</sup> Endeavour = try

<sup>15</sup> Creed: set of beliefs (religious or not) that guide someone's actions

<sup>16</sup> Warrant = ground or justification

<sup>17</sup> Impart = communicate

follow without a fuller and more definite expression of that intention than we find in the Act of 1875.”

*House of Commons*, 8 June 1905, pg. 7155.

#### **CONTROL OF CROWN LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

“So far as the control of the lands is concerned, I adhere to the opinion I before expressed in this House: that the people of the northwest when they are granted<sup>18</sup> provincial rights are fully capable of dealing with these lands; that they are entitled to<sup>19</sup> the control of these lands just as much as the people of the eastern provinces of Canada are entitled to the control of their provincial domain. I see no distinction... Are they not the people chiefly<sup>20</sup> interested? May we not rightly conclude that if these lands are handed over to them, they will so deal with them as to best conserve their own interests by forwarding and assisting a vigorous policy of immigration? May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision<sup>21</sup> in this Bill with regard to free homesteads<sup>22</sup> and the prices of those lands, and obtain to it the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories. I see no possible constitutional difficulty because after all the question of the lands is not a question of legislative power until the lands are handed over to the people and become the public property of the provinces.”

*House of Commons*, 22 March 1905, pgs. 2929–2930.

“In order to make myself perfectly clear, I would like to say a word—I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, for I know how difficult it is to make a consecutive legal argument with constant interruptions, those who have practised in courts have had some experience of that. What I meant to say is simply this, that I thought the lands ought to be handed over, but if we are to concede<sup>23</sup> the principle that the government do not intend to hand them over, then in that case the best thing to do was that which I suggested [to hand them over with specific federal regulations]. I did not intend at the time to deal with the question of legislative power. I may say besides to the Minister of Justice that I think the question of the lands stands so far as legislative power is concerned on a somewhat different basis from that of the educational clauses.”<sup>24</sup>

*House of Commons*, 3 May 1905, pgs. 5337–5538.

“Another argument in favour of entrusting these lands to the people is that the lands can be better administered and controlled in the province than at Ottawa. They can be better administered and controlled by officers of the provincial government in touch with the people and comparatively near at hand than by the officers of the Dominion government. What reason is there, as I have said before, why a citizen of Ontario should have the right and privilege to deal with the minerals and public lands of his own province at Toronto, while the citizen of the Northwest must be obliged for the same purpose, to write or send to the city of Ottawa.”

*House of Commons*, 5 July 1905, pg. 8797.

<sup>18</sup> Granted = given

<sup>19</sup> Entitled to = deserving of

<sup>20</sup> Chiefly = mainly

<sup>21</sup> Provision = condition or stipulation

<sup>22</sup> Homesteads = a homestead includes the land, the house and other buildings on a property

<sup>23</sup> Concede: =accept

<sup>24</sup> Clauses = portions of text in a legal document that are specific to a case or issue

**ONE PROVINCE VS. TWO**

“... it would be better to do as my hon. friend from Hamilton proposed, to make only one province. I have not considered very fully the proposal of the member for South York. I would be more favourably impressed with the suggestion of the member for Hamilton which would result in creating only one province in the south, leaving possibly a new province to be formed in the north. But I am not prepared to say at this moment that I would favour either of these proposals, because I am under the impression that after all a great deal may be said in favour of the idea that you have in the south a territory which is practically settled, and that the territory in the north which it is proposed to add to that is to a very considerable extent of the same character, and may be opened up by the same mode of settlement.”

*House of Commons*, 9 May 1905, pgs. 5648–5649.



## Primary Source: Henri Bourassa's Views on Confederation

*When the House of Commons debated creating Alberta and Saskatchewan, Henri Bourassa said the following points:*

### SEPARATE SCHOOLS

"I am in favour of the principle of the Bill; that is, I am in favour of giving the North-west Territories their autonomy, but the Bill does not contain what in my opinion is a sufficient guarantee of the rights of the minorities that we are bound to<sup>1</sup> protect, and therefore I cannot vote with those who are opposed to any kind of guarantee to the minorities, nor can I vote for a Bill which in my opinion does not give a sufficient measure of guarantee."

*House of Commons, 5 July 1905, pgs. 8865–8866.*

"All asked, and all I still ask, is that what is given to Catholics where they are a minority in a district should be given to them in a district where they are a majority. Of course I know they are entitled to more; I know that we give more to the Protestants in Quebec, and that if we were to reduce the Protestant schools in Quebec to the condition of the Catholic schools in the Northwest Territories there would be such an agitation for disallowance<sup>2</sup> as no government here could resist. As I have stated, to my mind, the least that could be given for the protection of the minority in the Northwest would be the right to form separate schools of the character defined in the ordinance<sup>3</sup> of 1901 in every district, whether they be a majority or a minority. That is the position I have taken. While I am sure the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont), spoke in all good faith, at the same time I do not want to have him misrepresent me. In Quebec we have no such thing as church schools; but we have given and do give to the Protestant minority the full right to have schools conducted according to their wishes at which their children can receive such religious instructions as they see fit without interference from the government, and I think we should have the same thing in the west."

*House of Commons, 29 June 1905, pg. 8522.*

"Was it enacted that separate schools should exist in the Northwest Territories only for the time that they should be under our care and supervision? Was it only a provisional<sup>4</sup> disposition? No. Mr. Blake stated that we should avoid introducing into that new country the religious disputes that had existed in the other provinces, because the parliament of Canada wanted to invite Roman




Image held by Library and Archives Canada.

<sup>1</sup> Bound to = likely and somewhat obligated to

<sup>2</sup> Disallowance = refusing to allow

<sup>3</sup> Ordinance = law or regulation

<sup>4</sup> Provisional = temporary

Catholics to settle in the Northwest Territories as freely as all other class of people. Was it hinted that the Roman Catholic who went there to settle would have the liberty of education, as long as the provisional government existed, but that the moment this parliament, which had given its pledge of honour that that liberty should exist for all time to come, formed a provincial government, that government would be free to wipe out this privilege? After a man had tilled<sup>5</sup> the soil for twenty five or thirty years in the hope that his children would reap<sup>6</sup> the benefit of his labour and have the same liberty that he had enjoyed, was it intended that the federal parliament should then say to him: 'You shall have your liberty no longer' and leave him at the mercy of the majority which has given evidence that it would not permit him to have that freedom?"

*House of Commons, 28 March 1905, pg. 3260.*

"I would ask any hon. member on either side of the House, why should the people of the Northwest Territories be in a different, position from those of Ontario and Quebec? Are we in Ontario and Quebec interfered with,<sup>7</sup> is our liberty curtailed,<sup>8</sup> because there is in our constitution some restriction as to our power of encroaching<sup>9</sup> upon the rights of the minority? And, if it was found best to prevent the majority in Ontario and in Quebec from dealing improperly with the minority, why should not the majority in the Northwest Territories be checked in the same way, should they feel inclined to deal less fairly with the minority than the minorities in Ontario and Quebec are dealt with?"

*House of Commons, 28 June 1905, pg. 8304.*

"When you speak of the liberty granted to the Roman Catholic to go into a non-sectarian<sup>10</sup> school there is no such thing as liberty. He may abide by<sup>11</sup> the law if he be forced to send his child to such a school, but his religious liberty is interfered with. When, by any measure in this House or in any provincial parliament you force a Roman Catholic to send his children to a non-sectarian school, you are committing an act of injustice just as direct, just as much against the conscience of the Roman Catholic, as if you would force the Protestant minority in the province of Quebec to contribute to Roman Catholic denominational schools."<sup>12</sup>

*House of Commons, 28 March 1905, pg. 3268.*

"I believe, the whole clause<sup>13</sup> means that either the majority or the minority must be considered not in the light of whether they belong to this place or to that place, but whether they belong to the Protestant or Catholic religion. What is guaranteed is the right to the majority to choose what kind of schools they would have with respect to the division that has been adopted throughout the Dominion of Canada, so far as the separation of schools is concerned. If the Catholics are in the majority they can organize Catholic schools under the guidance of the state under the same limitation that is provided in the former portion of the section; and if the majority is Protestant the majority may organize either a Protestant school or a non-sectarian school, because it is well known that on this question Protestants are not a unit and that sometimes they prefer sectarian and sometimes non-sectarian<sup>14</sup> schools."

*House of Commons, 8 June 1905, pg. 7142.*

<sup>5</sup> Tilled = cultivated

<sup>6</sup> Reap = harvest

<sup>7</sup> Interfered with = stopped or slowed down

<sup>8</sup> Curtailed = limited

<sup>9</sup> Encroaching = going beyond a set limit

<sup>10</sup> Non-sectarian = non-denominational

<sup>11</sup> Abide by = fully accept

<sup>12</sup> Denominational school = a school that observes a specific religious group's value and beliefs

<sup>13</sup> Clause = portion of text in a legal document that is specific to a case or issue

<sup>14</sup> Non-sectarian = not related to a sect/religious group

"I entirely agree with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in the words he uttered<sup>15</sup> this afternoon when he said that if we want to build up a nation we can only do it on the principle of conciliation<sup>16</sup> and fair-play to everybody. But if we are to put such a principle into practice there must be one law for all—one law for Protestants and Catholics alike, one law for French, English, Scotch and Irish. What has been done by the territorial government would be qualified as an infamous act of tyranny had it been done by a Catholic government at the expense of a Protestant minority... If that had been the only attempt of the majority in the Northwest to deprive the minority of their rights, I would not be raising my voice in protest to-day. But the Protestant majority went further. They withdrew<sup>17</sup> from the minority the right to choose their own textbooks...<sup>18</sup> They also deprived the minority of their right to choose their own inspectors to inspect their schools,<sup>19</sup> and of the right to give normal school<sup>20</sup> training to their own teachers. They went so far as to compel<sup>21</sup> the nuns to go out of the convents and take off their religious garbs if they desired to receive diplomas entitling them to teach; and this order was passed by the paternal government of Mr. Haultain. Those religious teachers who were qualified in France and England and in the province of Quebec, who had been teaching, some of them, for thirty-five years, were put on the same footing as young girls who had not diplomas, unless they chose to submit to Mr. Haultain's Russian<sup>22</sup> ruling."

*House of Commons*, 28 June 1905, pg. 8320.

#### **CONTROL OF CROWN LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

"However, I may say in passing that I thoroughly agree with the position that was taken by the government on the land question. Starting from the same point of view I have just stated, namely, that we must put the stamp of Canadian nationality on these Territories, I think it was the duty of the federal government to retain<sup>23</sup> within their powers the right to legislate over the granting of the lands upon which one half of the population of Canada will be called upon at no distant period to live and to prosper. Although I have the greatest confidence in the public spirit and patriotism of the men who are now at the head of public affairs in the Northwest Territories, I say that before long the time may come when they will not be powerful enough to resist the pressure of the newcomers into that country, men that have perhaps no interest in the unity of Canada, who are not attached to the soil of Canada, who have had no part in the past history of Canada, and who, therefore, by numerical strength, may try to force some obnoxious<sup>24</sup> legislation on the government of these Territories. I say, therefore, that for the protection of the Northwest, for the protection of the present representatives of the Northwest, for the protection of the statesmanship<sup>25</sup> of the men who are now at the head of affairs there, it was good policy on the part of the government to retain the control and administration of the public lands in the Northwest."

*House of Commons*, 28 March 1905, pg. 3253.

<sup>15</sup> Uttered = expressed

<sup>16</sup> Conciliation = settling differences

<sup>17</sup> Withdraw = took away

<sup>18</sup> Note: Choosing textbooks is key to deciding what will be taught in classrooms.

<sup>19</sup> Note: Here Bourassa is afraid that inspectors might not evaluate separate school teachers fairly, or by rules that were acceptable to Catholics.

<sup>20</sup> Normal school = public school in charge of teacher training

<sup>21</sup> Compel = force

<sup>22</sup> Russian = slang, in this case, for primitive

<sup>23</sup> Retain: = keep

<sup>24</sup> Obnoxious = unpleasant and potentially harmful

<sup>25</sup> Statesmanship = skillset to manage public affairs



## Primary Source: Frederick W. A. G Haultain's Views on Confederation

*When the Northwest's Legislative Assembly debated provincial status, Frederick Haultain said the following points:*

### SUMMARY STATEMENT

"We have a clear and definite policy and we are united on it. We believe in one province with all rights of other provinces: we believe in the full control of the lands, the mines, the minerals and all the royalties of this country: we believe in adequate compensation for all the public lands that have been used for Federal purposes: we believe in getting a fair adjustment of any outstanding<sup>1</sup> debt there may be against the Territories; we believe in the subsidy<sup>2</sup> being given, not on a population of 400,000 people, but that it should be as large as that received by any other province; in fact, we believe in being treated the same as the other provinces, and that is the proposition we made to the Federal Government, with the provision that we be made into one province and not into a number of small ones. I believe that in this we are backed up by a loyal following in this House and knowing the justness of our claim we rest assured of the outcome. (Cheers.)"<sup>3</sup>

*The Leader*, 3 April 1902.

### REASONS FOR BECOMING A PROVINCE

"As practical men they must conclude that the present institutions would not do if joined with the financial embarrassment. Outside of the method of direct taxation<sup>4</sup> the only method open was to negotiate for entrance to Confederation. There was no question that when we went in we would receive more money than we receive now. Whether we would receive all that the Territories were entitled to was a different question, depending on the Government and the Legislature of the day, depending on the men entrusted with the negotiations. The settlement would not be consummated to-day, nor possibly next year, but the question was one which it seemed to him the new Legislature would have to take up, and he thought it was the most important question that the new Legislature would have to deal with. He made this statement for the Government as showing that the future attitude of this Government would have the end of provincial establishment in view."

*The Leader*, 13 September 1898.




Image held by the  
Saskatchewan Archives

<sup>1</sup> Outstanding = unpaid

<sup>2</sup> Subsidy = money given by an entity

<sup>3</sup> Cheers = applause from fellow politicians.

<sup>4</sup> Direct taxation = direct taxes are paid directly by the people to their government

"Mr. Haultain rose and was received with cheers. He moved the following resolution:<sup>5</sup>

1. "Whereas<sup>6</sup> by the British North America Act 1866 it was, among other things, enacted that it should be lawful for... the Parliament of Canada, to admit Rupert's Land and the North-Western Territory, or either of them into the Union on such terms and conditions in each case... as the Queen should think fit to approve..."
8. "And whereas under the several authorities so given the Parliament of Canada has created political institutions in these Territories bearing<sup>7</sup> a close analogy to those which exist in the several Provinces of the dominion;
11. "And whereas repeated representations have been made in various ways to the Government of Canada with a view to obtaining just and equitable financial assistance towards providing for the proper and effective administration of local affairs in the Territories and for the public necessities of their rapidly increasing population;
12. "And whereas such representations have been met by intermittent<sup>8</sup> and insufficient additions to the annual grant the provision so made by the Parliament of Canada, never bearing any adequate proportion to the financial obligations imposed by the enlargement and development of the political institutions created by itself;
13. "And whereas it is desirable that a basis should be established upon which the claims of the Territories to suitable financial recognition may be settled and agreed upon;
14. "Therefore be it resolved that an humble address to His Excellency the Governor General be adopted by this House praying him that he will be pleased to cause the fullest enquiry<sup>9</sup> to be made into the position of the Territories, financial and otherwise, and to cause such action to be taken as will provide for their present and immediate welfare and good government, as well as the due fulfilment of the duties and obligations of government and legislation assumed, with respect of these Territories, by the Parliament of Canada;
15. "And be it further resolved that, whereas by the British North America Act 1871 it was (amongst other things) enacted that the Parliament of Canada may from time to time establish new Provinces in any Territories forming for the time being part of the Dominion of Canada but not included in any Province thereof, and may, at the time of such establishment, make provision for the constitution and administration of such Province, His Excellency be also prayed to order, enquiries to be made and accounts taken with a view to the settlement of the terms and conditions upon which the Territories, or any part thereof shall be established as a Province, and that before any such Province is established opportunity should be given to the people of the Territories through their accredited<sup>10</sup> representatives of considering, and discussing such terms and conditions."

*The Leader*, 30 April 1900.

"... The Territories were simply the creature of the dominion parliament, and without reference to the Territories, were it so inclined, it [Parliament] could make a province or provinces. But they [the territorial government] did claim as a moral right to be treated in analogy to the other provinces; they claimed the right to discuss and negotiate; and if they had not the power to dictate terms, or to be one party to an agreement, they claimed to be treated in the same way as citizens in other parts of the Dominion were treated. The resolution had left out anything that could be called the controversial<sup>11</sup> side of the question. The question whether there should be one, two,

<sup>5</sup> Note: Haultain's resolution is much longer than the text reprinted here. This handout only reproduces certain key sections.

<sup>6</sup> Whereas = in view of the fact that; common term used in resolutions

<sup>7</sup> Bearing = having as a characteristic

<sup>8</sup> Intermittent = something that is not continuous, that comes and goes

<sup>9</sup> Enquiry = investigation

<sup>10</sup> Accredited = officially recognized

<sup>11</sup> Controversial = something that causes discussions and on which people disagree

three or a dozen provinces was not for them to discuss. It was one of the most difficult things in drawing that resolution to so do it as to avoid controversy."

*The Leader*, 30 April 1900.

#### **PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY**

"We have a clear and definite policy and we are united on it. We believe in one province with all rights of other provinces: we believe in the full control of the lands, the mines, the minerals and all the royalties of this country: we believe in adequate<sup>12</sup> compensation<sup>13</sup> for all the public lands that have been used for Federal purposes: we believe in getting a fair adjustment of any outstanding debt there may be against the Territories; we believe in the subsidy<sup>14</sup> being given, not on a population of 400,000 people, but that it should be as large as that received by any other province; in fact, we believe in being treated the same as the other provinces, and that is the proposition we made to the Federal Government, with the provision that we be made into one province and not into a number of small ones. I believe that in this we are backed up by a loyal following in this House and knowing the justness of our claim we rest assured of the outcome.<sup>15</sup> (Cheers.)"

*The Leader*, 24 March 1902.

#### **CONTROL OF CROWN LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

"He indicated that this Government would demand the cession<sup>16</sup> to the Territories of all lands, minerals, etc., as have the original provinces—entering Confederation, and would base the claim upon a legal and constitutional right,—a right which he inferred<sup>17</sup> might be prosecuted<sup>18</sup> before the highest tribunal in the realm if necessary."

*The Leader*, 13 September 1898.

"Every one of the older provinces had their lands, and Manitoba had a payment in lieu of<sup>19</sup> them. One of the reasons the C.P.R.<sup>20</sup> was constructed was because of a pledge<sup>21</sup> given to British Columbia. There was not a line within that province, and it agreed to give a certain amount of its land for the construction of the C.P.R. For that reason and on that account the Dominion paid British Columbia \$100,000 a year, which the people of the North-West Territories helped to pay: for that rocky belt along which the line ran. In the case of the Territories the whole land grant was simply made, and the claim was that the federal authorities own this country, and dealt with it for Dominion purposes. The question arose<sup>22</sup> why should not the Territories be granted a portion of these lines? Why should any distinction be made between the Territories and the provinces?"

*The Leader*, 30 April 1900.

<sup>12</sup> Adequate = sufficient

<sup>13</sup> Compensation = remuneration

<sup>14</sup> Subsidy = money given by an entity

<sup>15</sup> Outcome = result

<sup>16</sup> Cession = act of giving something, in this case lands, to someone else

<sup>17</sup> Inferred = concluded

<sup>18</sup> Prosecuted = brought to trial

<sup>19</sup> In lieu of: =in place of

<sup>20</sup> C.P.R. = Canadian Pacific Railway

<sup>21</sup> Pledge = promise

<sup>22</sup> Arose = came into existence

## BENEFITS OF ONE PROVINCE

"How much does the Territories contribute to the interest of provincial debts and how much will the Dominion wish to charge back as an offset<sup>23</sup> to the amounts spent for opening up this country? How much is to be claimed on account of lands? These were the questions which could not be settled in a day. There were, however, only the two alternatives—go on and obtain larger financial recognition as we are,—and if we can not get it, take the only step open and become a province—one province of the whole Territories as they stand to-day, not cut off in any portion, either in the north (Yukon) or in the East to the benefit of Manitoba—one strong province, with all the resources of its gold mines in the Yukon, and the golden wheat fields of Eastern Assiniboia, which if they do not yield nuggets,<sup>24</sup> yet do yield 40 bus.<sup>25</sup> to the acre."

*The Leader*, 6 December 1897.

"As a member from Alberta he was not prepared to advocate any scheme which meant the division of Alberta from the rest of the Territories and making it into a province.... The diversity of interests which existed between various parts of the Territories had been spoken of as giving a good strong ground for dividing the Territories up. What sort of a province did the hon. Gentleman wish it to be? Did they want to have one sheep farm, or one wheat field, or one sort of a field devoted<sup>26</sup> to some other sort of industry which their own insignificance would allow them to describe? If they wished to have a good strong province, strong in its own resources, they should have a diversity of resources (hear, hear.)<sup>27</sup> Much better than having a comparatively small amount of land devoted to one or two interests would it be if they could have very large area such as the organized Territories were to-day with their diversity of interests, but not conflict of interests. They should look forward to having a very much stronger and better province than there would be if they had to be divided up. Was there as much diversity of interest or conflict of interest, if they liked to use the expression, between the most remote<sup>28</sup> portions of the Territories as there was between any sections of the older provinces? There was no conflict. He did not think any member of the House could state that at any time in the history of the House there was any conflict of interest between those portions of the Territories known as Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan...."

*The Leader*, 8 October 1896.

"If they were going to confine themselves at once to the particular rights or the particular claims of smaller portions of this country they might take the position proposed by the hon. members from Banff and Lethbridge, and cut the whole country into small plots so that every man might be a province unto himself with three acres and a cow."

*The Leader*, 8 October 1896.

## SEPARATE SCHOOLS

"There was a policy connected with the Normal school<sup>29</sup> item—connected with their School policy, to give to every child a good, plain, practical education—, to give it to all children associated together without regard to race, religion or position. He thought their school policy had been attended with remarkable success, in that the animosities<sup>30</sup> arising from certain difficult and

<sup>23</sup> Offset = compensation

<sup>24</sup> Nuggets = a solid lump (of gold in this case)

<sup>25</sup> Bus. = bushels

<sup>26</sup> Devoted = dedicated

<sup>27</sup> Hear, hear = fellow MPs agreeing with Haultain.

<sup>28</sup> Remote = distant, far away

<sup>29</sup> Normal school = public school in charge of teacher training

<sup>30</sup> Animosities = strong dislikes

delicate questions in other portions of Canada had been avoided here without any less practical or satisfactory results. To-day the Territorial school system was, if not in name, in reality a National school system. They had a policy for the training of teachers, which had already resulted so well that the Territories are practically independent as regarded the supply of teachers, with the supply of higher grade teachers exceeding the demand."

*The Leader*, 13 September 1898.



## Primary Source: Wilfrid Laurier's Views on Confederation

*When the House of Commons debated creating Alberta and Saskatchewan, Wilfrid Laurier said the following points:*

### SUMMARY STATEMENT

"There is only one great measure which it is proposed to introduce and that is a Bill granting autonomy to the western territories. We think the time has come when the western territories should have full partnership in confederation, when we should admit them as members of the Canadian family as full provinces."

*House of Commons, 16 January 1905, pg. 39.*

### CONTROL OF CROWN LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

When we came to consider the problem before us it became very soon apparent to me, at all events, that there were four subjects which dominated all the others; that the others were of comparatively minor importance, but that there were four which I was sure the parliament of Canada and the Canadian people at large might be expected to take a deep interest in. The first was: How many provinces should be admitted into the confederation coming from the Northwest Territories—one, or two or more? The next question was: in whom should be vested<sup>1</sup> the ownership of the public lands? The third question was: What should be the financial terms to be granted<sup>2</sup> to these new provinces? And the fourth and not the least important by any means was the question of the school system which would be introduced—not introduced because it was introduced long ago, but should be continued in the Territories."

*House of Commons, 21 February 1905, pg. 1426*

"In whom should the ownership of the lands be vested? Should they belong to the provinces or to the Dominion? A strong plea<sup>3</sup> was presented to us on behalf provinces. It was represented that as a matter of law and of equity, the public lands in these two provinces should belong to their governments. This plea was no doubt suggested by the fact that at the time of confederation, all the parties to the original contract, that is to say, the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec, each retained<sup>4</sup> her own lands; and when at a later day the province of British Columbia was admitted to the Dominion, she also retained her lands. But, Sir,



Image held by Library and Archives Canada.

<sup>1</sup> Vested = given power over something

<sup>2</sup> Granted = given

<sup>3</sup> Plea = petition

<sup>4</sup> Retained = kept

the cases are not at all parallel. When the provinces which I have named came into confederation, they were already sovereignties. I use that term, because barring<sup>5</sup> their dependence as colonies they were sovereignties in the sense of having the management of their own affairs. Each had a department of government called the Crown Lands Department, which was entrusted<sup>6</sup> with the power of dealing with those lands, either for revenue or for settlement. But the case of these new provinces is not at all similar. They never had the ownership of the lands. Those lands were bought by the Dominion government, and they have remained ever since the property of the Dominion government, and have been administered by the Dominion government. Therefore I say the two cases are not in any way parallel; they are indeed absolutely different. When the provinces which I have named came into confederation they retained the ownership of their lands; but when the two new provinces come into the Dominion, it cannot be said that they can retain the ownership of their lands, as they never had the ownership.

"Therefore, the proposition that in equity and justice these lands belong to the provinces is not tenable.<sup>7</sup> But for my part I would not care, in a question of this importance, to rest the case on a mere abstract proposition. We must view it from the grounds of policy; and from the highest grounds of policy, I think it is advisable that the ownership of these lands should continue to be vested<sup>8</sup> in the Dominion government. We have precedents<sup>9</sup> for this. This is a case in which we can go to the United States for precedents. They are situated very much as we are regarding the ownership of lands and the establishment of new states. Whenever a new state has been created in the American Union, the Federal government has always retained the ownership and management of the public lands. And when we take the records of our own country, we know that when Manitoba was brought into the Dominion, that province was not given the ownership of her lands, but it remained in the Dominion government..."

"The current of immigration is now flowing, into these Territories in an unprecedented volume, and we are therefore compelled<sup>10</sup> to say to the new provinces that we must continue the policy of retaining the ownership and control of the lands in our own hands. It is conceivable that if these lands were given to the new provinces, the policy of either one of them might differ from ours and clash with our efforts to increase immigration. It might possibly render these efforts nugatory.<sup>11</sup> For instance, if either of the new provinces, under the strain<sup>12</sup> of financial difficulty, were to abolish the free homesteads, which have proved so beneficial and so great an inducement<sup>13</sup> to immigration, one can readily understand what a great blow that would be to our immigration policy. Or if the price of government lands for sale were to be increased over the present very moderate rate, that would also be another blow to that policy. But I frankly admit, and we must all recognize, that the provinces in the west, in being deprived of the public lands, are deprived of a valuable source of income. And in that way they complain that they are put on a footing of inequality as compared with the older provinces of the Dominion. Realizing that fact, it is the duty of parliament to make ample, even generous, provision which will compensate the provinces for the retention of<sup>14</sup> the lands by the Federal government, and I believe that in making this provision we shall have the full support of hon. members whether on one side or on the other."

*House of Commons, 21 February 1905, pgs. 1432–1433.*

<sup>5</sup> Barring = aside from

<sup>6</sup> Entrusted = given with confidence

<sup>7</sup> Tenable = defendable

<sup>8</sup> Vested = given power over something

<sup>9</sup> Precedents = past examples

<sup>10</sup> Compelled = caused

<sup>11</sup> Nugatory = of no value or importance

<sup>12</sup> Strain = excessive tension

<sup>13</sup> Inducement = incentive or motivation

<sup>14</sup> Retention of = continued control over

## BENEFITS OF TWO PROVINCES

"How many provinces should be admitted into the confederation? There is considerable variety, as everybody knows, in the area of the different provinces of the confederation. Prince Edward Island has an area of 2,184 miles.... British Columbia 372,630.... Now, the Territories which are today under the control and jurisdiction of the local legislature have exactly the same area as that of the seven provinces of the Dominion... I believe that when provinces are not the result of historic tradition, when they have not come to us formed and when we have the control of events, it is preferable that the provinces should be as near as possible about the same size. Therefore, it is impossible to suppose that this immense territory of 1,112,527 miles should be formed into one single province."

*House of Commons*, 21 February 1905, pg. 1427.

"Mr. Haultain refers to the fact that we proposed to establish two provinces instead of one. We differed from Mr. Haultain on this point also. We thought it would be preferable to have two provinces in that vast domain; Mr. Haultain thought it would be better to have only one province. But I appeal to the judgment of my hon. friend who has taken us to task<sup>15</sup> because we have not adopted the ways and means of Mr. Haultain, and I ask him if he is prepared to say that there shall be one province in that immense territory instead of two—that we should create there one province which would have almost twice the area of the largest province of the Dominion."

*House of Commons*, 15 March 1905, pgs. 2505–2506.

## PRAIRIE INFLUENCE WITHIN CONFEDERATION

"Let us not dispute<sup>16</sup> in advance with what we have nothing to do at present. The question is how many senators shall we take for these two new provinces? We provide for giving them each six as the maximum. Manitoba has four senators. British Columbia has three; we cannot increase the number for Manitoba nor can we increase the number for British Columbia. Under such circumstances when, on the one side of the new provinces there are three senators and on the other side four, it seems to me that in giving to each of the new provinces six as a maximum, we go as far as we ought to go at present. But this is only a temporary arrangement. In my estimation<sup>17</sup> we will have to have a new group of senators not now, but in the future; and when we form this new group we must remember that in order to keep within the spirit of the constitution we cannot base that group upon representation by population, the idea of population must be eliminated."

*House of Commons*, 9 May 1905, pg. 5680.

## SEPARATE SCHOOLS

"Sir, we [the Liberal party] have taken the ground on more than one occasion, we again take this ground and it is the ground upon which we stand in dealing with the present case, that wherever a system of separate schools exists that system comes into force and is constitutionally entitled to the guarantees which are embodied<sup>18</sup> in section 93 of the British North America Act. Be that system much, be it little, whatever it is, it is entitled to those guarantees."

*House of Commons*, 22 March 1905, pg. 2925.

<sup>15</sup> Has taken us to task = has denounced or reproached us for something

<sup>16</sup> Dispute = argue about something

<sup>17</sup> Estimation = rough calculation

<sup>18</sup> Embodied = incorporated

"The privilege is given to the minority, to a certain minority, that is to say to the Protestant or Catholic minority. There must be some reason for the difference. In the discussion which is going on to-day in certain parts of the country you often hear: But if you give that privilege to the minority, Why not give it to the Jews, the Mormons and the Greek Church? I am not concerned with these; that is a matter for the local legislature? But so far as this parliament is concerned, we have only to deal with the law as we find it, that is to say the privileges given to the Protestant or to the Catholic minority, not to any other. When this law was first established in the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, and subsequently in the province of Manitoba, the great body of the Canadian population was divided between Catholics and Protestants. There were very few people of other denominations.<sup>19</sup> There are more now, but at that time there were no denominations to be reckoned with<sup>20</sup> except the great body of Protestants and the great body of Roman Catholics and the law was made for them. Now if you give the privilege to the minority whether it be Protestant or whether it be Catholic to secede<sup>21</sup> from a school which has been established by the majority since the privilege is given to the Protestants or to the Catholics, it is because there must be in the school something offensive to the con-science of the Protestant or of the Catholic. You cannot conceive any reason for distinction and separation except for that."

*House of Commons*, 8 June 1905, pg. 7146.

"I say that this parliament should, according to that constitution, give to the minority in the new provinces the same rights and privileges that are given to the minorities in the new provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Sir, what seems to me this very proper legislation is opposed throughout the length and breadth of our country—no, I will not say that,—but in certain portions of our country—and in the name, I might almost say the sacred name, of provincial rights. But it is remarkable that the men who at this day, are insisting the most upon what they call provincial rights have taken no heed<sup>22</sup> of the fact that, in the very letter of the constitution on which they rely there is an abbreviation of provincial rights wherever there exists in any province a system of separate schools. Provincial rights are the basis of our constitution. All parties now admit these rights and recognize them, whatever may have been their position in the past. But, Sir, it is an old saying that there is no rule without its exception; and, in the very letter of the constitution, an exception has been made concerning provincial rights wherever there is a system of separate schools in any province. Now here is the law upon this point."

*House of Commons*, 22 March 1905, pg. 2917.

"The government has been warned, threatened from both sides of this question, from those who believe in separate schools and from those who oppose separate schools. These violent appeals<sup>23</sup> are not a surprise to me, at all events, nor do I believe they are a surprise to anybody. We have known by the experience of the past, Within the short life of this confederation, that public opinion is always inflammable whenever questions arise<sup>24</sup> which ever so remotely<sup>25</sup> touch upon the religious convictions of the people. It behooves<sup>26</sup> us therefore all the more at this solemn moment to approach this subject with care, with calmness and deliberation and with the firm purpose of dealing with it not only in accordance with the inherent<sup>27</sup> principles of abstract justice, but in accordance with the spirit—the Canadian spirit of tolerance and charity, this Canadian

<sup>19</sup> Denominations = parts of Christianity, for example, Catholic, Methodist, Mennonite

<sup>20</sup> Reckoned with = could not be ignored

<sup>21</sup> Secede = formally separate

<sup>22</sup> Heed = notice or attention

<sup>23</sup> Appeals = asks with a sense of urgency

<sup>24</sup> Arise = come into existence

<sup>25</sup> Remotely = in a distant way

<sup>26</sup> Behooves = benefits

<sup>27</sup> Inherent = natural attribute or characteristic

spirit of tolerance and charity of which confederation is the essence and of which in practice it ought to be the expression and embodiment.”<sup>28</sup>

*House of Commons*, 21 February 1905, pg.1442.

“I reminded the House a moment ago that it was not the intention of the fathers of confederation, it was not the intention of Sir John Macdonald or Mr. Brown<sup>29</sup> to limit confederation to the narrow bounds it had in 1867. They had made provision in the very instrument of confederation, to extend it over the northern part of the continent; they had made provision to take in British Columbia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island; they had made provision to take in also the Northwest Territories, which were then uninhabited, but which now have a teeming<sup>30</sup> population and are at our doors asking admission. Is it reasonable to suppose, if the Confederation Act recognizes that other provinces were to come into confederation similarly situated to Ontario and Quebec, that the same privileges should not be given to the minority as were given to the minority in Ontario and Quebec? What would have been the value of the invitation to enter confederation, if the provinces invited to enter, had been told that the security to the minority given to Ontario and Quebec was a privilege which they need not expect from us?”

*House of Commons*, 21 February 1905, pg. 1451.

“I am not here to advocate separate schools as an abstract proposition but we have introduced into this Bill the two propositions, that the minority shall have the power to establish their own schools and that they shall have the right to share in the public moneys. It is the law to-day. It is in accord with the constitution, with the British North America Act, and I commend it even to the biased<sup>31</sup> judgement of my hon. friend: If we were in the year 1867 and not in the year 1905, and, if we had to introduce into this dominion the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, would my hon. friend tell me that these provinces would not have the same rights and privileges in regard to separate schools as were granted to Ontario and Quebec? Would he tell me that when you say to Ontario and Quebec: You shall have your separate schools, Alberta and Saskatchewan should be denied that privilege? The thing is preposterous.<sup>32</sup> Let us rise above such considerations. In everything that I have said I have refrained<sup>33</sup> from saying a single word upon the abstract principle of separate schools. I approach the question upon another and a broader ground, I approach the question not from the view of separate schools, but I approach it on the higher ground of Canadian duty and Canadian patriotism. Having obtained the consent of the minority to this form of government, having obtained their consent to the giving up of their valued privileges, and their position of strength are we to tell them, now that confederation is established, that the principle upon which they consented to this arrangement is to be laid aside and that we are to ride roughshod<sup>34</sup> over them? I do nothing that is a proposition which will be maintained in this House, nor do I believe it is the intention of the House. I offer at this moment no opinion at all upon separate schools as an abstract proposition, but I have no hesitation in saying that if I were to speak my mind upon separate schools, I would say that I never could understand what objection there could be to a system of schools wherein, after secular matters have been attended to, the tenets<sup>35</sup> of the religion of Christ, even with the divisions which exist among His followers, are allowed to be taught. We live in a country wherein the seven provinces that constitute our nation, either by the will or by the tolerance of the people, in every school,

<sup>28</sup> Embodiment = visible and/or tangible representation

<sup>29</sup> George Brown = the leader of Upper Canadian Reformers (present-day Ontario Liberals)

<sup>30</sup> Teeming = abundant

<sup>31</sup> Biased = partial

<sup>32</sup> Preposterous = absurd

<sup>33</sup> Refrained = resisted the temptation

<sup>34</sup> Ride roughshod = ignore the rights of others

<sup>35</sup> Tenets = principles

Christian morals and Christian dogmas<sup>36</sup> are taught to the youth of the country. We live by the side of a nation, a great nation, a nation for which I have the greatest admiration, but whose example I would not take in everything, in whose schools for fear that Christian dogmas in which all do not believe might be taught, Christian morals are not taught."

*House of Commons*, 21 February 1905, pgs. 1457–1458.

---

<sup>36</sup> Dogmas = points of view or beliefs held by a group and recognized as true by an authority such as a church



## Primary Source: Frank Oliver's Views on Confederation

*When the House of Commons debated creating Alberta and Saskatchewan, Frank Oliver said the following points:*

### PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY

"We knew that we must have the means or we cannot have the success. We must have the means with which to build roads, to provide schools, to take care of all these requirements of civilization which fall to the lot of the provinces; and without those means, without that money, if we cannot go forward as provinces, we had better not undertake the responsibility of it. We find that in the condition in which we are at the present time the Territories receive a matter of nearly a million and a quarter dollars of revenue from this Dominion, or of subsidy,<sup>1</sup> in the place of a provincial subsidy. Outside of that, there are expenditures<sup>2</sup> which, in the provinces, are borne out of the provincial funds, but which, so far, have come out of the Dominion treasury, and which aggregate<sup>3</sup> something like half a million dollars."

*House of Commons, 24 March 1905, pg. 3155.*

### CONTROL OF CROWN LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES

"As to the ownership of the lands; it has been urged that these lands are the property of the province, should remain<sup>4</sup> the property of the province and should be administered by the province for the benefit of the revenue of the province. It matters not to me what the legal rights of the province or the Dominion respectively are in that case. The lands belong to Canada whether administered by the province or by the Dominion; the settlement of these lands is for the benefit of all Canada. Whatever method of administration will give us the best results in the way of the settlement of these lands is the policy that is best not only for the Dominion but for the province. As a representative of the west, I believe the idea of using the lands of the west as a source of provincial revenue would be a very great detriment to these new provinces and to the country at large. I am aware that the provinces must have revenue, and failing any other source I would say: Certainly we must have revenue from the lands. But if we can get adequate revenue from other sources than the lands, then we certainly do not want the lands used as a source of revenue. I can easily understand that with a change of policy on the part of the federal government, a change of policy back to What it was say twenty years ago, when it was believed to be the proper policy to




Image held by the City of Edmonton Archives

<sup>1</sup> Subsidy = money given by an entity

<sup>2</sup> Expenditures = expenses or costs

<sup>3</sup> Aggregate = form once put together

<sup>4</sup> Remain = continue to be

take everything that could be taken out of the land in the way of cash payment; then possibly it would be better that the lands should be in the hands of the province rather than in the hands of the Dominion. But, so long as we have a land policy the basic idea of which is the land for the settler, it is certainly better for us and for the Dominion that the lands should be administered by the federal authorities."

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pg. 3157.

"When they hold that the land was a value in itself, I say they are mistaking the point altogether. The land only has a value in so far as it is in demand by settlers. When my hon. friend made his careful calculation as to setting apart certain tracts of land,<sup>5</sup> and the Dominion government advancing money on the security of that land, he based the success of his project on the idea that the country would continue to prosper, that settlement would continue to increase, that the price of land would continue to rise. Now that supposition is all based on the success of the administration in securing progressive settlement upon the land, and if circumstances arise in which that increase of value does not continue, then his whole calculation falls to the ground. The first thing is to have such a policy and such an administration as will bring settlers into the country, as will give value to the land, as will give revenue to the Dominion, and will do all those desirable things that my hon. friend depicted<sup>6</sup> as occurring if the land were in the hands of the provincial authorities. The thing is to get the settler, and the question of who administers the land is a small consideration. It is a small matter whether it is the Dominion or the province, but we say that the Dominion is in a better position to administer the lands satisfactorily and well than is the province."

*House of Commons*, 15 May 1905, pg. 6031.

## SEPARATE SCHOOLS

"There seems to be some objection on the part of some of these gentlemen who have so petitioned parliament against separate schools. I admit that I, too, hold similar objections, but these gentlemen do not seem to be aware that those separate schools have been in existence in the Northwest Territories for 20 years to my knowledge; that they are in existence because of legislation passed unanimously 30 years ago by this parliament, as the leader of the opposition said, and repeated and reiterated,<sup>7</sup> subject to repeal<sup>8</sup> or amendment<sup>9</sup> by this parliament at any time during the past 30 years, and there never was a word of protest from the Ministerial Association of Winnipeg, from the Orange Grand Lodge of eastern or western Ontario, from the preceptory<sup>10</sup> of the Black Knights of Ireland in Strathcona, nor from any of those other petitioners, during that whole 30 years during which it was in the power of this parliament to do away with this national out-rage of separate schools in the Northwest. It is within the power of parliament to-day; it is not too late. But there is not a man here who will move, nor has there been a suggestion made to this House, that separate schools in the Northwest Territories should be abolished,<sup>11</sup> not a word. Do these gentlemen really mean what they say or do they know what they say? Is this a demonstration of objection to separate schools or is it an attempt to wreck<sup>12</sup> the Liberal government on a second school question? If this attack is honest, if it is against the separate schools and not against the French premier, it is in order for the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the gentlemen behind him to introduce a Bill into this parliament as they

<sup>5</sup> Tracts of land = large portions of land

<sup>6</sup> Depicted = described

<sup>7</sup> Reiterated = repeated with emphasis

<sup>8</sup> Repeal = abandonment or cancellation

<sup>9</sup> Amendment = change in the wording of a text to clarify it or to change its overall meaning

<sup>10</sup> Preceptory = headquarters of a community of knights

<sup>11</sup> Abolished = put a definite end to something

<sup>12</sup> Wreck = destroy

yet may do to abolish separate schools in the Northwest by repealing the section of the Northwest Act. I am against separate schools but I want some company in my position and I do not seem to be able to find it. It is not the first time I have been alone in this House, but I seem to be just as lonesome now as I ever was, notwithstanding all these petitions on this very interesting subject. These separate schools have been authorized in the Northwest Territories by Act of this parliament for 30 years at least and they have been in actual existence in the North-west Territories for 20 years by Act or ordinance of the Northwest legislature. There has been no word of protest in parliament or out of parliament, there has been no word of petition in the Northwest legislature, or amongst the people against that provision.”

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pgs. 3161–3162.

“That is the purpose of the Act—not the defining of anything about what they were before they came into the union. On the face of it it has no reference whatever to whether a province was organized before or not. If there was a class of persons who had rights at the union, when they came into the union they should continue to have those rights—that is the whole intent and meaning of the section; there is no other explanation. That is as Mr. Haultain understood it; that is as any man, I think, must understand it if he reads it with due care. That being the case, the British North America Act being the constitution of this country, I say that, although I am no lover of separate schools, although I do not believe in separate schools as so many of our people do, this government would certainly be doing very much less than its duty if it undertook, under all the circumstances of the case especially, to deviate from the terms of the British North America Act or took any other course than loyally to carry out its provisions.”<sup>13</sup>

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pg. 3165.

#### BENEFITS OF ONE PROVINCE

“I would like to point out further in this connection, as it was my duty to state in the House yesterday in regard to another matter, that it is very difficult to define the line between the ranching country and the farming country, for the reason that a country which a few years ago was understood to be solely a ranching country is now being occupied by hundreds, if not thousands, of people for the purpose of grain raising. There are settlements being made for strictly agricultural purposes to-day in the Alberta district, immediately south of the district of Calgary represented by my hon. friend, in localities which, seven years ago, were considered to be strictly ranching country; and the people in those settlements have raised magnificent crops of wheat on that very land, and are depending on wheat raising for their success. So along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the very country he speaks of as exclusively ranching, several towns have started up recently which are dependent for their success on the success of farming in those localities. So that you cannot draw an exact line dividing farming country from ranching country, and my position is maintained, that the hon. gentleman’s argument is good as against any division, but it is not good as against this particular division between Saskatchewan and Alberta.”

*House of Commons*, 9 May 1905, pgs. 5613–5614.

#### LACK OF INDIGENOUS CONSULTATION

“I beg to repeat that the proposal of the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to exclude this district of Athabaska from the proposed provinces is an attempt to exclude that district from the representation in this parliament which it will necessarily have as a part of the proposed: province of Alberta. It is also a declaration that the district of Athabaska, which, as I have already

---

<sup>13</sup> Provisions = arrangements made beforehand

pointed out to the House, contributes a very considerable amount of the general trade of this country, is not entitled to representation, is not entitled to that consideration which a civilized community is considered to be entitled to, and which must be extended to it if the country is to develop and progress.

"Now, perhaps it is not, of very great interest to hon. gentlemen on the other side whether the two or three hundred white people who live in that district today secure their rights or not and whether they are to be taxed without representation or not. Perhaps it.. makes very little difference to them whether the few thousands of half-breeds,<sup>14</sup> 'mere' half-breeds who are in that country are to be taxed without representation or not. But I do submit that it makes a great deal of difference to this country whether that district of Athabaska,—whether these great valley watered by the Athabaska and Peace rivers—are developed for settlement and trade, to furnish a market to the manufacturers and business houses of this eastern country. I say it makes a very great deal of difference whether a policy is pursued which will bring about that end or whether that country is to be excluded from the beneficial operation of provincial and Dominion government. because it has only a few white people and half-breeds at the present time. The hon. member (Mr. W.F. Maclean) has seen fit to put on record the views we have heard expressed in this House all day yesterday and today on the part of the opposition. And, for the purpose of campaigning<sup>15</sup> in the west. I can only wish that they should stand up and unanimously vote for this proposition."

*House of Commons*, 9 May 1905, pg. 5647.

"I estimated 5,000 whites and half-breeds, and the census gives about 1,500 Indians<sup>16</sup>—a total of about 6,500, as a mere estimate. The Indians are entitled to be considered in such an estimate as well as, the Indians of Macleod or elsewhere... I have not the half-breeds as distinct from the whites. The distinction I drew was between voters and non-voters—between whites and half-breeds on the one side and Indians on the other."

*House of Commons*, 23 June 1905, pg. 8028.

"I believe that, as a matter of fact, the schedules for Saskatchewan have been drawn up without a knowledge of the number of whites and half-breeds in the eastern part of Athabaska. That eastern part of Athabaska is not under Indian treaty, and the fact that it is not under Indian treaty is evidence that there is not supposed by any authority to be any considerable population of white men in that district. If there was any considerable white population it would have been a necessity for the government before now to have secured a treaty from the Indians. I have every reason to believe that there is not either a large white or Indian population."

*House of Commons*, 23 June 1905, pg. 8055.

<sup>14</sup> Half-breeds = an archaic term for Métis

<sup>15</sup> Campaigning = running a political campaign

<sup>16</sup> Indians = an archaic term for First Nations Peoples



## Primary Source: Clifford Sifton's Views on Confederation

*When the Northwest's Legislative Assembly debated provincial status, Clifford Sifton said the following points:*

### SIFTON'S RESIGNATION FROM LAURIER'S CABINET

"As members of the House are aware, I returned to the capital on Thursday afternoon. I immediately took occasion to read carefully the speech which the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had delivered in introducing the Bill. I regretted that in the right hon. gentleman's address I found some principles enunciated<sup>1</sup> with which I am unable to agree. On Friday, the next day after I returned, at the earliest possible moment, I procured a copy of the educational clause of the Bill which my leader had introduced... That is the clause which is contained in the Bill which was introduced by the leader of the government. Between Friday, when I procured a copy of the clause, and Monday morning I gave the subject my best consideration, and I had the privilege in the meantime of having an interview with the Prime Minister on the subject. As the result of such consideration I determined that I could not endorse or support the principle of the educational clauses. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, my duty became perfectly clear, and on Monday morning I wrote to the Prime Minister tendering<sup>2</sup> my resignation as a member of the cabinet. Subsequently, I expressed the desire that my resignation should be acted up on at once and to that wish the Prime Minister has now assented."<sup>3</sup>

*House of Commons, 1 March 1905, pgs. 1852–1853.*

*After Laurier's government changed the education section of the autonomy bills to restrict separate school rights, Sifton explained his reasons for supporting the new bill:*

"I came to the conclusion that, whatever anybody else might do, my course was perfectly clear: I should, when this question came up, be in a position to speak with a freedom with which a member of the government could not speak, and I should be called upon to decide to what extent and how far I would be prepared to compromise opinions which I had publicly expressed, and opinions which I still hold in order not to destroy the government of the country. That question which comes to every man in public life sooner or later, comes to-day to a good many men in this House of Commons. The question is how far a man is justified in compromising his opinion for the purpose of preventing a political crisis. That is a question which nearly every man in this House has had to decide before; but perhaps no person has had to decide it under quite as remarkable circumstances as the present. For myself, as to the political effect upon myself, I care



Image held by Library and Archives Canada.

<sup>1</sup> Enunciated = expressed in clear terms

<sup>2</sup> Tendering = presenting

<sup>3</sup> Assented = formally accepted

not for that. I have relieved myself, I think, of the imputation<sup>4</sup> that the course I have taken has been influenced by considerations of office or the considerations of my party remaining in office; and therefore I have to say, having given the subject the best consideration that I am capable of giving it, and having given it that consideration not only from the stand-point of the position of affairs in this parliament but from the standpoint of the position of affairs in the Northwest Territories in time to come, that I can, though not with very much enthusiasm, and with some degree of reluctance, give my support to the Bill.”<sup>5</sup>

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pg. 3122.

#### **SEPARATE SCHOOLS AND PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY**

“For my part, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying what my own opinion would be: it would be that the province ought to be left entirely free to deal with its own educational affairs. But, I would not get at it in the way that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) does, by saying, the constitution does that, but as there is a certain amount of doubt about it I would strike out the limiting clause and I would make it so clear that there would not be any doubt in the minds of any one.”

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pg. 3117.

“I do not think that my political friends in past years have had any cause to complain that I have not been willing to do my share of the fighting, or that I have not been willing to take my share of the blame. If men are going to act together politically, when one makes a mistake the rest have to take the blame, and I have always been willing to take my share of the blame, and have always been willing to shoulder the load along with the rest. But I declare, and I am serious—if I had not been serious about it I would still have been a member of the government—I declare that I would join with anybody in Canada to resist the pass-age of that Bill in the terms in which it was placed before the House by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have nothing more to say with regard to that. It was an unpleasant necessity for me to speak of it, but there are occasions on which people have to do things which constitute a very unpleasant necessity.”

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, 3106.

“It seems to me that almost everybody will agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance that the man in the street, hearing the hon. gentleman who leads the opposition [Robert Borden] say that he stands by the constitution, and hearing the right hon. gentleman who leads the government say that upon the rock of the constitution he stands, and seeing these two hon. gentlemen both standing on the rock of the constitution but coming to diametrically opposite conclusions will be likely to say: I cannot hope to understand the law or the constitution, but I do want to know what kind of schools they are going to have in the Northwest Territories.”

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pg. 3099.

“And the conclusion, therefore, is this—that if this legislation is carried into effect it preserves just the two privileges which I spoke of the privilege of the Roman Catholic or Protestant minority to have a separate school house, and the privilege of having religious instruction between half-past three and four o’clock in the afternoon. But there cannot be under this system any control of the school by any clerical or sectarian body. There cannot be any sectarian teaching between nine o’clock in the morning and half-past three in the afternoon. So that, so far as we have objections

<sup>4</sup> Imputation = insinuation

<sup>5</sup> Note: Sifton supported the Liberals’ bill to create Alberta and Saskatchewan after his resignation convinced Laurier to allow him to remove most of the protections for separate schools from the bill.

to separate schools based upon the idea of church control, clerical control, or ecclesiasticism in any form, this system of schools is certainly not open to that objection."

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pg. 3110.

#### **CONTROL OF CROWN LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

"That is a subject of vast importance in the Northwest Territories, and I must say that I take the responsibility of having, in all probability, induced my colleagues to accept the view which is the effect of the Bill that is before the House; that is to say, that the subject of irrigation<sup>6</sup> for the present should be retained within the control of the federal government. The reasons can be given in a few words and to my mind they are absolutely conclusive. At the present time the right to use some of the principal streams which are of the utmost importance in connection with the irrigation in the Northwest Territories, is a subject of discussion between Canada and the United States and international complications have already arisen in regard to these streams. Obviously, if irrigation were under the administration of two provincial governments, it would be difficult to adjust a question such as that. In addition to that questions are going to arise in a comparatively short time between the residents of the western province and the residents of the eastern province in regard to the right of user of the water of these streams which flow from one into the other. It would seem to me most desirable, until the difficulties respecting international questions and the difficulties respecting interprovincial questions are settled, and until the irrigation system is further developed and a body of law upon the subject is built up, that the control should remain in the hands of the federal government. When a few years have elapsed,<sup>7</sup> when the system is more fully developed, when it becomes a matter merely of local administration then there seems to be no good reason why the subject should not be relegated<sup>8</sup> to the provincial governments."

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pg. 3098.

#### **BENEFITS OF TWO PROVINCES**

"So far as the question of the number of provinces is concerned, I formed the opinion which, I think, will be shared by almost every person on careful investigation of the case, that it was not desirable that this vast territory should be formed into one province. Certainly it was not desirable to carry out the old idea which prevailed that there were to be four provinces. I think the best opinion of the House will be met by the decision which the government has reached, that the medium course should be taken, and, that instead of one or four, we should have two provinces. Not only is the question of area to be considered as was shown by the Prime Minister in his remarks in introducing the Bill, but you must consider also the even more important question of population. The population of this one province, if this territory were made into one province, would eventually have such a preponderance<sup>9</sup> as compared with the other provinces that it could not be said to be wise to make such an arrangement. These provinces are composed of territories which, almost acre for acre, is arable land<sup>10</sup> and capable of sustaining population. No other provinces in the Dominion can be similarly described. And to make one province of that particular territory whose capacity for sustaining population is, on the average, so much greater than that of any other province in the Dominion, giving it ultimately so much greater population than the other provinces, would certainly and obviously be unwise. Other considerations supported the same conclusion. The western and eastern portions of this territory lend themselves to different industrial conditions. Great grazing areas<sup>11</sup> exist in the west such as are

<sup>6</sup> Irrigation = man-made watering system used in agriculture

<sup>7</sup> Elapsed = passed, as in time

<sup>8</sup> Relegated = transferred

<sup>9</sup> Preponderance = dominating influence

<sup>10</sup> Arable land = land that can be used for farming

<sup>11</sup> Grazing areas = land that can be used as pastures, for cattle

not found in the east. Mining possibilities on a large scale are to be found in the western part of the territory, and in the north, towards Edmonton, we have what is known as a mixed-farming district. Different classes of local legislation will be needed, and different conditions must be recognized in the two portions of the territory. Everybody who knows the conditions of that territory will be satisfied that the best results will result from having two local governments and two legislatures. Each of these legislatures and each of these administrations will have ample<sup>12</sup> scope for all the energy it may see fit to display in the development of the resources of the great territory which is committed to its charge. And this parliament may be satisfied, I think, that that arrangement which is suggested will give the surest guarantee that the future development of these territories will be best facilitated."

*House of Commons*, 24 March 1905, pgs. 3093–3094

---

<sup>12</sup> Ample = more than enough



## Primary Source: Thomas Walter Scott's Views on Confederation

*When the House of Commons debated creating Alberta and Saskatchewan, Thomas Scott said the following points:*

### SUMMARY STATEMENT

"I repeat, in conclusion, that I am satisfied with the propositions contained in these Bills and that they are the most important that ever have been presented to this parliament nobody disputes. I am satisfied that they will result not only in the immediate future, but in the interim the existence of two provinces in no sense inferior to, in every way equal with their sister provinces—enjoying absolute religious equality, full provincial rights, an efficient<sup>1</sup> free public or common, non-sectarian school system controlled by the state and on a plan guaranteeing the perfect autonomy of every conscience and scruple<sup>2</sup>—in a word, enjoying freedom in every reasonable and British sense of the term;—and that the provisions of these Bills will enable the people of these new provinces to carry on their great work, and fulfil the duties that fall upon them as self-governing provinces in this Dominion with every measure of success."

*House of Commons, 31 March 1905, pgs. 3647–3648.*

### PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY

"I have endeavoured<sup>3</sup> to explain to the House very clearly my position on that point—that there are no two provinces in Canada with exactly the same measure of autonomy, and probably the people of the Northwest Territories would not be willing to accept the exact position occupied by any other single province in Canada. I believe that the provisions of these Bills will place the Northwest Territories in a position as nearly as possible of absolute and satisfactory average equality with the other provinces of Canada."

*House of Commons, 31 March 1905, pg. 3617.*

"Of course any autonomy proposition is a matter of comparison. There is no such thing as absolute autonomy. We are not professing<sup>4</sup> to grant absolute autonomy to the people of the Northwest Territories. All we are professing to do, and all we are asked to do, is to put the people of the Territories in an equitable position compared with the other provinces. All the Territories asked was that in the matter of local self-government, they should be put on an equal footing<sup>5</sup>




Image held by the  
Saskatchewan Archives

<sup>1</sup> Efficient = well working

<sup>2</sup> Scruple = hesitation to do something that one believes could be the wrong thing to do

<sup>3</sup> Endeavoured = tried

<sup>4</sup> Professing = claiming

<sup>5</sup> Put on equal footing = made somebody/something equal to somebody else/something else

with the other provinces. It is therefore necessary to make some comparison between the conditions which these new provinces will enjoy and those enjoyed by the other provinces."

*House of Commons*, 31 March 1905, pg. 3604

"Well, I am bound<sup>6</sup> to say that I think the friendship of the hon. member for Carleton [Robert Borden] will bear a little analysis. If it has a sentimental feature, something that is not going to cost anything, something that is not going to bear on any other section of Canada, our hon. friends opposite are great friends of the Northwest, but, whenever we come down to a substantial matter like limiting the self governing powers of the people of the Northwest in regard to their actual and substantial resources the boot is on the other foot.<sup>7</sup> That is an entirely different aspect of the case. There are hon. gentlemen behind my hon. friend from Carleton who are great friends of the people of the Territories too. It would be such an awful thing if any power of self government were denied to the people of the North-west Territories, but they are anxious to take away about half the territory of the people of the Northwest Territories."

*House of Commons*, 31 March 1905, pg. 3596

#### **SEPARATE SCHOOLS**

"And let me tell him<sup>8</sup> that he will very much more readily get the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories to leaving in perpetuation<sup>9</sup> a system of schools which is absolutely satisfactory to Protestant and Catholic alike than he will get their consent to any such invasion of their rights as is involved in his suggestion. On the sentimental question of lands, on the sentimental side of the school question hon. gentlemen opposite or a section of them, headed by the leader of the opposition, are great friends of the Northwest Territories, but when it comes down to substantial<sup>10</sup> things, as I said, the boot is entirely on the other foot. Talk about invading autonomy. Why, Sir, no such radical and substantial invasion of Northwest autonomy as this suggestion involves—as read and repeated again here now by himself—could be imagined by an avowed<sup>11</sup> enemy of provincial rights."

*House of Commons*, 31 March 1905, pg. 3597.

"It is exactly what I wanted, I would not care to assent to<sup>12</sup> anything else. it is just what the Northwest wanted, it is in fact, stated a little less clearly in his Bill, just what Mr. Haultain asked for in his draft Bill. It is just what the Northwest people voted for in the general election of 1902 and what the assembly more than once unanimously voted for, or thought they were voting for. I would ask again if the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has ever heard a protest from anyone in the Territories against the condition of things existing there. I say there is no objection so far as I have ever heard. There are I think in the Northwest Territories 11 separate schools, nine Roman Catholic and two Protestant. One of them is at Edmonton, and the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has already spoken; I venture<sup>13</sup> to say he has not heard in the town of Edmonton any protest from anybody against the existence of that separate school there. Another one is at Strathcona and another at Wetaskiwin and the same remark will apply to my hon. friend for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot). The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M.S. McCarthy) spoke the other day and he did not enter any protest against the separate school. There is one at Lethbridge and

<sup>6</sup> Bound = obligated

<sup>7</sup> The boot is on the other foot = the side that has the advantage has changed to be the opposite of what it previously was

<sup>8</sup> Him = Robert Borden

<sup>9</sup> Perpetuation = continuation of something that already exists

<sup>10</sup> Substantial = considerable or significant

<sup>11</sup> Avowed = recognized publicly

<sup>12</sup> Assent to = accept

<sup>13</sup> Venture = dare

one at MacLeod. If the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) is still here he may be able to say whether there is any protest in his district against the existence of the two separate schools in that district. There is another one at Regina and another one at or near Wapella. Speaking of the Regina separate school, I say that it is satisfactory to all the people in Regina and that any proposition to abolish<sup>14</sup> the separate school in existence in Regina would be more unsatisfactory to the Protestants who live there than to the Roman Catholics.“

*House of Commons*, 31 March 1905, pg. 3631.

#### **SEPARATE SCHOOLS AND MINORITY RIGHTS**

“I presume that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is “to-night representing the hon. Member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden), and I would ask, when the leader of the Opposition put the question to the representatives of the minority who sit with him in this parliament how many of them expressed their willingness to have the guarantee left out and to leave the matter to the justice of the majority. It is not for me as a member of the majority to answer this question, it is not to the majority, it is to the members of the minority that that question is put. If they say they are willing I would say that possibly we might consent to leave out the guarantee, although as a matter of fact I prefer to have the guarantee left in this shape so that there will be no uncertainty in these provinces. Can we blame the members of the minority after all when we look at the history of Manitoba and the Territories? We have cut the minority privilege down there from what it was originally interpreted to mean. It was originally interpreted by the legislature of the Territories, the Old Northwest council, to mean that there should be church control for Roman Catholic schools. We have cut that down. We all know what occurred<sup>15</sup> in Manitoba and what occurred in regard to the French language.”

*House of Commons*, 31 March 1905, pg. 3633

“When our friends of the minority decline, as, in my judgment, they have good reason to decline, looking at the history of the school question in the Northwest, to have the guarantee cut out of the Bill, then it is reasonable for me as a member of the majority, in view of the fact that it is not going to violate any principle of sound public policy, to leave the guarantee in. Indeed, as I have explained, I prefer to have the guarantee left in in this shape, and, so far as the educational provisions are concerned, I vote for these Bills without any hesitation. This is exactly the proposition I want, for the following reasons:—

“1. It removes all uncertainty.

“2. It respects the minority conscience, without violating any sound public principle.

“3. It provides securely against agitation<sup>16</sup> in future.

“4. It perpetuates a system which has in practice proved to be eminently<sup>17</sup> satisfactory to all classes.

“5. It means coercion<sup>18</sup> in no sense or adaptation of the word, because it merely guarantees what would be continued by the almost universal will of the provinces.

<sup>14</sup> Abolish = put a definite end to something

<sup>15</sup> Occurred = happened

<sup>16</sup> Agitation = protests

<sup>17</sup> Eminently = greatly

<sup>18</sup> Coercion = convincing someone by force

“6. It continues a system preferable in its practical working out to the public school system of Manitoba, where the minority have a theoretical grievance,<sup>19</sup> which, interested parties are constantly able to exaggerate, and who continue to chafe under what they believe to be an infringement on their rights.

“7. It furnishes a possible common ground of action by the members of this House, and thus maintains unity. No common action was possible either upon the original section 16 or upon the amendment of the leader of the opposition.

“8. More than all, it is satisfactory to me as a citizen of, and one of the majority in, the Northwest, because it not only reasonably secures minority rights, but it absolutely secures majority rights against such invasion as was attempted by parliament in 1896 in the case of Manitoba. It is the only absolute guarantee of educational autonomy contained in any suggestion made to this House, excepting only that of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), to specifically make the provinces free and get imperial ratification of the free charters.”

*House of Commons, 31 March 1905, pg. 3634.*

#### **CONTROL OF CROWN LANDS AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

“The particular benefit to the provinces in the plan that is being adopted as opposed to the plan of transferring the public domain to the local governments, is found in the fact that we have from the start an assured revenue; whereas, if the lands were transferred to the local governments, and if no change of policy were put into effect by them, they would have great difficulties, in the initial years of their provincial experience, in getting enough revenue to carry on the affairs of government. Moreover, their financial position is assured in the far future years, fifty or one hundred years hence, as long as this confederation lasts; whereas, on the other hand, and in the case of some of the other provinces fifty or one hundred years hence, the Crown domain cannot be worth very much to those provinces so far as concerns their revenues. The principle of the provincial right to a beneficial interest in the land is recognized in the most substantial manner, and I am pleased to be able to say, because I believe it to be the truth, that the people of the Northwest are eminently satisfied. I venture to say that there is scarcely<sup>20</sup> a man in the Northwest, who is not actuated<sup>21</sup> by partisan<sup>22</sup> sentiment, but has stated, either to himself or to his neighbours, that this is a better proposition than would be the proposition to turn over the lands to local management.”

*House of Commons, 31 March 1905, pg. 3608.*

“The duties of the immigration Department, too, would follow the land. The new provinces could not be easily equipped for these onerous<sup>23</sup> duties. It took the federal authorities many years to bring immigration work up to its present status. They have it now in a state of high efficiency, with experienced agents at work in various parts of the world. It is important that the good work shall continue to go on undisturbed. A handsome equivalent, either in cash or in interest-bearing credit,<sup>24</sup> will suit the new provinces much better than the extra responsibilities which are involved in the ownership and control of the public domain.”

*House of Commons, 31 March 1905, pg. 3609.*

<sup>19</sup> Grievance = official complaint formulated about something that is believed to be wrong or unfair

<sup>20</sup> Scarcely = not often

<sup>21</sup> Actuated = motivated

<sup>22</sup> Partisan = biased toward one party

<sup>23</sup> Onerous = difficult or taxing

<sup>24</sup> Interest-bearing credit = credit that regularly pays money to the lender

"This subject was persistently placed before the people, and the provisions<sup>25</sup> of the Bill in this regard were, so far as I could learn, unanimously endorsed by the people. We do not want a policy of the land for revenue; we want a policy of the land for the people, and the members who parade<sup>26</sup> the fact that certain lands in the Northwest are to-day worth certain money are only giving evidence of the desirability, of the necessity for, and of the success of, the policy of giving away the land to anybody who will take it and use it. The idea that you could derive from the whole land of the country the same value that you can for a small part of it when you are using the greater part of it for the purpose of attracting settlers, is an idea that is absolutely absurd, and one which I think will not be approved of by even our western friends on the other side of the House."

*House of Commons*, May 8. 1905, pg. 5526.

"My hon. friend knows my view with regard to the proposals which are before the House. My view is that this parliament has the discretion<sup>27</sup> to give such constitution to these new provinces as it chooses to give. We are proposing to pay a certain amount of money to them in lieu of their public domain. I have been out in that country recently and have conversed with scores of<sup>28</sup> men who take an interest in this question, and they all agree with me that this proposal is far better for the provinces even than the proposal to transfer the land unrestrictedly to the new provinces, and that as between the proposal that is being put into effect and the suggestion to turn over the public domain with my hon. friend's restriction, there is no comparison at all."

*House of Commons*, May 8. 1905, pg. 5549.

#### BENEFITS OF TWO PROVINCES

"One of the questions which had to be considered in connection with this matter was the question of the number of provinces — whether there should be one province, as was contemplated<sup>29</sup> in the request made by the Northwest government and legislature, or more than one province. I may be permitted to say that I was myself quite strongly in favour of the proposition that only one province should be created; and even yet, looking at the question purely from the local and territorial point of view, I can see no reason why one government, one legislature, one set of machinery, should not have been sufficient for that territory. But, on the other hand, I was bound<sup>30</sup> to recognize, as the people of the Territories generally have recognized that the other partners in confederation had a right to an opinion in this matter, and the decision which has been come to, to create two provinces, is, I think, generally satisfactory to the people of the Northwest as a whole."

*House of Commons*, 31 March 1905, pg. 3601.

<sup>25</sup> Provisions = arrangements made beforehand

<sup>26</sup> Parade = exhibit something in a manner that attracts attention

<sup>27</sup> Discretion = choice

<sup>28</sup> Scores of = a large number of


<sup>29</sup> Contemplated = considered

<sup>30</sup> Bound = obligated



## 72 Resolutions Handout

### PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION



### DIVISION OF POWERS

Federal Powers			
Provincial Powers			

## **SECTION 2: MATERIALS AND HANDOUTS FOR CREATING CANADA: FURTHERING INDIGENOUS-CROWN RELATIONSHIPS**



## Response Log Handout

Name:	
Date:	
Answer one of the five questions below:	
Mark out of 5	
Questions I have:	
Mark out of 5	

Please answer **ONE** of the following questions:

- Were there any things you did that left no trace or that left only traces that would not be preserved? What does this suggest about the historical record?
- What might future historians think about you if they were able to study your traces?
- If the historian was from a difficult culture or language, would they understand your trace?
- What if historians only examined traces that you left purposefully? How much of a trace would you have left?
- What other kinds of traces, relics, testimony and records would help historians learn about our society?
- Would it have been easier if you had recorded your traces with words? What if these words were in another language?



## Handout: Treaty 6

ARTICLES OF A TREATY made and concluded near Carlton on the 23rd day of August and on the 28th day of said month, respectively, and near Fort Pitt on the 9th day of September, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six, between Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, by Her Commissioners, the Honourable Alexander Morris, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and the Honourable James McKay, and the Honourable William Joseph Christie, of the one part, and the Plain and Wood Cree and the other Tribes of Indians,<sup>1</sup> inhabitants of the country within the limits hereinafter<sup>2</sup> defined and described by their Chiefs, chosen and named as hereinafter mentioned, of the other part.

Whereas the Indians inhabiting the said country have, pursuant to<sup>3</sup> an appointment made by the said Commissioners, been convened<sup>4</sup> at meetings at Fort Carlton, Fort Pitt and Battle River, to deliberate<sup>5</sup> upon certain matters of interest to Her Most Gracious Majesty, of the one part, and the said Indians of the other.

And whereas the said Indians have been notified and informed by Her Majesty's said Commissioners that it is the desire of Her Majesty to open up for settlement, immigration and such other purposes as to Her Majesty may seem meet, a tract of country bounded and described as hereinafter mentioned, and to obtain the consent thereto of Her Indian subjects inhabiting the said tract, and to make a treaty and arrange with them, so that there may be peace and good will between them and Her Majesty, and that they may know and be assured of what allowance they are to count upon and receive from Her Majesty's bounty and benevolence.<sup>6</sup>

And whereas the Indians of the said tract, duly convened in council, as aforesaid, and being requested by Her Majesty's said Commissioners to name certain Chiefs and Headmen, who should be authorized on their behalf to conduct such negotiations and sign any treaty to be founded thereon, and to become responsible to Her Majesty for their faithful performance by their respective Bands of such obligations<sup>7</sup> as shall be assumed by them, the said Indians have thereupon named for that purpose, that is to say, representing the Indians who make the treaty at Carlton, the several Chiefs and Councillors who have subscribed hereto, and representing the Indians who make the treaty at Fort Pitt, the several Chiefs and Councillors who have subscribed hereto.

And thereupon, in open council, the different Bands having presented their Chiefs to the said Commissioners as the Chiefs and Headmen, for the purposes aforesaid, of the respective Bands of Indians inhabiting the said district hereinafter described.

<sup>1</sup> Indians = an archaic term for First Nations Peoples

<sup>2</sup> Hereinafter = from now on

<sup>3</sup> Pursuant to = following

<sup>4</sup> Convened = brought together

<sup>5</sup> Deliberate = decide

<sup>6</sup> Benevolence = kindness

<sup>7</sup> Obligations = duties

And whereas, the said Commissioners then and there received and acknowledged the persons so presented as Chiefs and Headmen, for the purposes aforesaid, of the respective Bands of Indians inhabiting the said district hereinafter described.

And whereas, the said Commissioners have proceeded to negotiate a treaty with the said Indians, and the same has been finally agreed upon and concluded, as follows, that is to say:

The Plain and Wood Cree Tribes of Indians, and all other the Indians inhabiting the district hereinafter described and defined, do hereby cede,<sup>8</sup> release, surrender and yield up to the Government of the Dominion of Canada, for Her Majesty the Queen and Her successors forever, all their rights, titles and privileges, whatsoever, to the lands included within the following limits, that is to say:

Commencing at the mouth of the river emptying into the north-west angle of Cumberland Lake; thence<sup>9</sup> westerly up the said river to its source; thence on a straight line in a westerly direction to the head of Green Lake; thence northerly to the elbow in the Beaver River; thence down the said river northerly to a point twenty miles from the said elbow; thence in a westerly direction, keeping on a line generally parallel with the said Beaver River (above the elbow), and about twenty miles distant therefrom, to the source of the said river; thence northerly to the north-easterly point of the south shore of Red Deer Lake, continuing westerly along the said shore to the western limit thereof; and thence due west to the Athabasca River; thence up the said river, against the stream, to the Jasper House, in the Rocky Mountains; thence on a course south-easterly, following the easterly range of the mountains, to the source of the main branch of the Red Deer River; thence down the said river, with the stream, to the junction therewith<sup>10</sup> of the outlet of the river, being the outlet of the Buffalo Lake; thence due east twenty miles; thence on a straight line south-eastwardly to the mouth of the said Red Deer River on the south branch of the Saskatchewan River; thence eastwardly and northwardly, following on the boundaries of the tracts conceded<sup>11</sup> by the several treaties numbered four and five to the place of beginning.

And also, all their rights, titles and privileges whatsoever to all other lands wherever situated in the North-west Territories, or in any other Province or portion of Her Majesty's Dominions, situated and being within the Dominion of Canada.

The tract comprised within the lines above described embracing an area of 121,000 square miles, be the same more or less.

To have and to hold the same to Her Majesty the Queen and Her successors forever.

And Her Majesty the Queen hereby agrees and undertakes to lay aside reserves for farming lands, due respect being had to lands at present cultivated by the said Indians, and other reserves for the benefit of the said Indians, to be administered and dealt with for them by Her Majesty's Government of the Dominion of Canada; provided, all such reserves shall not exceed in all one square mile for each family of five, or in that proportion for larger or smaller families, in manner following, that is to say: that the Chief Superintendent of Indian Affairs shall depute<sup>12</sup> and send a suitable person to determine and set apart the reserves for each band, after consulting with the Indians thereof as to the locality which may be found to be most suitable for them.

Provided, however, that Her Majesty reserves the right to deal with any settlers within the bounds of any lands reserved for any Band as She shall deem fit, and also that the aforesaid reserves of land, or any interest therein, may be sold or otherwise disposed of by Her Majesty's Government

<sup>8</sup> Cede = give up

<sup>9</sup> Thence = from there

<sup>10</sup> Therewith = with

<sup>11</sup> Conceded - given up

<sup>12</sup> Depute = give responsibility for

for the use and benefit of the said Indians entitled thereto,<sup>13</sup> with their consent first had and obtained; and with a view to show the satisfaction of Her Majesty with the behaviour and good conduct of Her Indians, She hereby, through Her Commissioners, makes them a present of twelve dollars for each man, woman and child belonging to the Bands here represented, in extinguishment of all claims heretofore<sup>14</sup> preferred.

And further, Her Majesty agrees to maintain schools for instruction in such reserves hereby made as to Her Government of the Dominion of Canada may seem advisable, whenever the Indians of the reserve shall desire it.

Her Majesty further agrees with Her said Indians that within the boundary of Indian reserves, until otherwise determined by Her Government of the Dominion of Canada, no intoxicating liquor<sup>15</sup> shall be allowed to be introduced or sold, and all laws now in force, or hereafter to be enacted, to preserve Her Indian subjects inhabiting the reserves or living elsewhere within Her North-west Territories from the evil influence of the use of intoxicating liquors, shall be strictly enforced.

Her Majesty further agrees with Her said Indians that they, the said Indians, shall have right to pursue their avocations<sup>16</sup> of hunting and fishing throughout the tract surrendered as hereinbefore<sup>17</sup> described, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be made by Her Government of Her Dominion of Canada, and saving and excepting such tracts as may from time to time be required or taken up for settlement, mining, lumbering or other purposes by Her said Government of the Dominion of Canada, or by any of the subjects thereof duly authorized therefor by the said Government.

It is further agreed between Her Majesty and Her said Indians, that such sections of the reserves above indicated as may at any time be required for public works or buildings, of what nature soever,<sup>18</sup> may be appropriated for that purpose by Her Majesty's Government of the Dominion of Canada, due compensation being made for the value of any improvements thereon.

And further, that Her Majesty's Commissioners shall, as soon as possible after the execution of this treaty, cause to be taken an accurate census of all the Indians inhabiting the tract above described, distributing them in families, and shall, in every year ensuing the date hereof, at some period in each year, to be duly notified to the Indians, and at a place or places to be appointed for that purpose within the territory ceded, pay to each Indian person the sum of \$5 per head yearly.

It is further agreed between Her Majesty and the said Indians, that the sum of \$1,500.00 per annum<sup>19</sup> shall be yearly and every year expended by Her Majesty in the purchase of ammunition, and twine for nets, for the use of the said Indians, in manner following, that is to say: In the reasonable discretion, as regards the distribution thereof among the Indians inhabiting the several reserves, or otherwise, included herein, of Her Majesty's Indian Agent having the supervision of this treaty.

It is further agreed between Her Majesty and the said Indians, that the following articles shall be supplied to any Band of the said Indians who are now cultivating the soil, or who shall hereafter commence to cultivate the land, that is to say: Four hoes for every family actually cultivating; also, two spades<sup>20</sup> per family as aforesaid: one plough for every three families, as aforesaid; one

<sup>13</sup> Thereto = to

<sup>14</sup> Heretofore = before now

<sup>15</sup> Intoxicating liquor = alcohol

<sup>16</sup> Avocations = hobbies

<sup>17</sup> Hereinbefore = before

<sup>18</sup> Soever = of any kind

<sup>19</sup> Annum = year

<sup>20</sup> Spades = shovels

harrow for every three families, as aforesaid; two scythes and one whetstone,<sup>21</sup> and two hay forks and two reaping hooks, for every family as aforesaid, and also two axes; and also one cross-cut saw, one hand-saw, one pit-saw, the necessary files, one grindstone and one auger for each Band; and also for each Chief for the use of his Band, one chest of ordinary carpenter's tools; also, for each Band, enough of wheat, barley, potatoes and oats to plant the land actually broken up for cultivation by such Band; also for each Band four oxen, one bull and six cows; also, one boar and two sows, and one hand-mill when any Band shall raise sufficient grain therefor. All the aforesaid articles to be given once and for all for the encouragement of the practice of agriculture among the Indians.

It is further agreed between Her Majesty and the said Indians, that each Chief, duly recognized as such, shall receive an annual salary of twenty-five dollars per annum; and each subordinate officer, not exceeding four for each Band, shall receive fifteen dollars per annum; and each such Chief and subordinate officer, as aforesaid, shall also receive once every three years, a suitable suit of clothing, and each Chief shall receive, in recognition of the closing of the treaty, a suitable flag and medal, and also as soon as convenient, one horse, harness and wagon.

That in the event hereafter of the Indians comprised within this treaty being overtaken by any pestilence,<sup>22</sup> or by a general famine, the Queen, on being satisfied and certified thereof by Her Indian Agent or Agents, will grant to the Indians assistance of such character and to such extent as Her Chief Superintendent of Indian Affairs shall deem necessary and sufficient to relieve the Indians from the calamity<sup>23</sup> that shall have befallen them.

That during the next three years, after two or more of the reserves hereby agreed to be set apart to the Indians shall have been agreed upon and surveyed, there shall be granted to the Indians included under the Chiefs adhering to the treaty at Carlton, each spring, the sum of one thousand dollars, to be expended for them by Her Majesty's Indian Agents, in the purchase of provisions for the use of such of the Band as are actually settled on the reserves and are engaged in cultivating the soil, to assist them in such cultivation.

That a medicine chest shall be kept at the house of each Indian Agent for the use and benefit of the Indians at the direction of such agent.

That with regard to the Indians included under the Chiefs adhering to the treaty at Fort Pitt, and to those under Chiefs within the treaty limits who may hereafter give their adhesion thereto (exclusively, however, of the Indians of the Carlton region), there shall, during three years, after two or more reserves shall have been agreed upon and surveyed be distributed each spring among the Bands cultivating the soil on such reserves, by Her Majesty's Chief Indian Agent for this treaty, in his discretion, a sum not exceeding one thousand dollars, in the purchase of provisions for the use of such members of the Band as are actually settled on the reserves and engaged in the cultivation of the soil, to assist and encourage them in such cultivation.

That in lieu of waggons, if they desire it and declare their option to that effect, there shall be given to each of the Chiefs adhering hereto at Fort Pitt or elsewhere hereafter (exclusively of those in the Carlton district), in recognition of this treaty, as soon as the same can be conveniently transported, two carts with iron bushings<sup>24</sup> and tires.

And the undersigned Chiefs on their own behalf and on behalf of all other Indians inhabiting the tract within ceded, do hereby solemnly promise and engage to strictly observe this treaty, and also to conduct and behave themselves as good and loyal subjects of Her Majesty the Queen.

<sup>21</sup> Whetstone = used for sharpening

<sup>22</sup> Pestilence = disease or illness

<sup>23</sup> Calamity = chaos or burden

<sup>24</sup> Bushings = the piece a tire fits on

They promise and engage that they will in all respects obey and abide by the law, and they will maintain peace and good order between each other, and also between themselves and other tribes of Indians, and between themselves and others of Her Majesty's subjects, whether Indians or whites, now inhabiting or hereafter to inhabit any part of the said ceded tracts, and that they will not molest the person or property of any inhabitant of such ceded tracts, or the property of Her Majesty the Queen, or interfere with or trouble any person passing or travelling through the said tracts, or any part thereof, and that they will aid and assist the officers of Her Majesty in bringing to justice and punishment any Indian offending against the stipulations<sup>25</sup> of this treaty, or infringing the laws in force in the country so ceded.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Her Majesty's said Commissioners and the said Indian Chiefs have hereunto subscribed and set their hands at or near Fort Carlton, on the days and year aforesaid, and near Fort Pitt on the day above aforesaid.

Reproduced from: "Treaty Texts - Treaty No. 6." *Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada*.  
<http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028710/1100100028783>.

---

<sup>25</sup> Stipulations = conditions or details



## Handout: Alexander Morris

Alexander Morris was a lawyer, judge, businessman, politician, and public servant. He was born 17 March 1826 in Perth, Upper Canada, eldest son of William Morris and Elizabeth Cochran. He was married in November 1851 Margaret Cline of Cornwall, Canada West, and they had 11 children. He died. 28 Oct. 1889 in Toronto, Ont.

Alexander Morris was born to privilege, privilege which he used to expand the fortunes of his family and his country. He spent his childhood in the military settlement of Perth among the mercantile and political elite of which his father was a leading member. His son inherited a network of political friends and a strong moral sense of duty. Educated initially at Perth Grammar School, Alexander was sent to Scotland in 1841 where he spent two years at Madras College, St. Andrews, and at the University of Glasgow.

In 1847 Morris moved to Kingston to study law as an articled clerk, along with Oliver Mowat, under John A. Macdonald. He was admitted into the second year at Queen's College. He "worked so hard his health gave way,"<sup>1</sup> and in 1848 he left Kingston and returned to Montreal. In January 1849 he matriculated into McGill College and later that year became the first person to graduate in arts. He completed his legal apprenticeship in the office of William Badgley and John Joseph Caldwell Abbott in Montreal, and in 1851 was admitted to the bar in both Canada East and Canada West.

Like other young men of his time in the Province of Canada, Morris had dreams of imperial greatness. Business interests, family connections, and personal inclination<sup>2</sup> led to him to argue that Canadians should look beyond local disputes and take their rightful place in the building of an empire. He did not hesitate to express his ideas publicly, and his essay, *Canada and her resources*, was awarded 2nd prize in 1855 by Governor General Sir Edmund Walker Head and the Paris exhibition committee in Canada. A plodding,<sup>3</sup> descriptive pamphlet, it predicts a glorious future for this "fertile British Province" where "political liberty . . . educational advantages and religious privileges" would surely "attract men of energy and industry."<sup>4</sup> In 1849 Morris had become vice-president of the Mercantile Library Association in Montreal and lectured his fellow members on "The North American Indian,<sup>5</sup> their origin, present conditions and oratory," an early indication of one of the consuming passions of his later life. A lecture in 1858 to the Mercantile Library Association, and then to the mechanics' institute at Hemmingford, Canada East, on "The Hudson's Bay and Pacific territories" hammered home another theme of the day: opposition to the Hudson's Bay Company, and annexation by Canada of its territories. Morris saw Canada as the



Image held by Library and Archives Canada.

<sup>1</sup> Gave way = deteriorated

<sup>2</sup> Inclination = nature

<sup>3</sup> Plodding = unexciting

<sup>4</sup> Men of energy and industry = hard workers

<sup>5</sup> Indians = an archaic term for First Nations Peoples

rightful owner of Rupert's Land, and felt that HBC activities must be curtailed if Canada's new empire was to flourish.

In 1861 he was elected as a Liberal-Conservative for Lanark South in Canada West; his father had represented Lanark in the Upper Canadian assembly for more than ten years. According to Morris, "the people brought me out without my knowledge and returned me by a majority of upwards of four hundred so that my sphere of influence is widening. I was very reluctant to accept but as it was my father's County . . . could not say no." Morris's ten years in parliament were useful if not outstanding. He clearly served his constituents to their satisfaction and provided consistent support to Macdonald. He introduced two liberal reforms, the abolition of public executions and the municipal registration of vital statistics, which found easy acceptance. He gave the impression of being less partisan<sup>6</sup> than many of his colleagues and was thus able to be a conciliator<sup>7</sup> at a crucial time in Canadian political history.

From July to December of 1872 Morris served as the first chief justice of the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba. In addition, he acted as administrator of Manitoba and the North-West Territories after the departure of Lieutenant Governor Archibald in mid October. As lieutenant governor, Morris was responsible for the administration of federal moneys, Indigenous affairs, crown lands, and customs, and also served in a private capacity as Macdonald's own representative. One of the more significant of Morris's accomplishments during his five-year term as lieutenant governor of Manitoba was the rapid introduction of responsible government in the new province.

Morris was lieutenant governor of the North-West Territories from 1872 to 1876 when the North-West Territories Act of 1875 established a government for the territories independent of that for Manitoba. He was faced with the task, as the Manitoba Daily Free Press in Winnipeg said, "of bringing order out of chaos in a territory larger than half the continent of Europe." Always hampered by an apparent lack of both interest and funds on the part of the federal government, and by the requirement for legislation to be approved by Ottawa before coming into force, Morris was responsible for establishing a mail service (started in 1876), licensing stipendiary<sup>8</sup> magistrates,<sup>9</sup> and making provision for liquor regulations and, eventually, for making treaties with and assisting the Indigenous peoples of the region. He constantly advocated the establishment of a police force in the west. "The preservation of order in the North West," he told Macdonald, was "the most important matter of the future"; he was conscious of the presence of the Sioux, which might well provoke other Indigenous tribes, and also of the influence of the threats to survival caused by the dying out of the buffalo. The presence of "men in red coats" he saw as necessary to prevent outbreaks such as those in Minnesota in 1862. The Cypress Hills massacre in June 1873 pointed out the need for law forces on the prairies and Morris emphasized to Macdonald the importance of bringing to justice the whites responsible for the massacre.

It was in Indigenous affairs that Morris seemed to find the greatest satisfaction. Between 1873 and 1876 he involved himself personally as the queen's representative in bargaining and treaty-making with the Indigenous peoples, signing on behalf of the crown treaties nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6, which encompassed a large portion of the territory between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains, and revising treaties nos. 1 and 2. Each of these treaties required considerable preparation, diplomatic skill, and quickness of mind during the negotiations as well as a willingness to follow up on the promises made. Morris attended to all these duties, and the peaceful settlement of the northwest owes something to him as well as to the weakened physical state of the Plains First Nations.

<sup>6</sup> Partisan = biased toward one party

<sup>7</sup> Conciliator = mediator

<sup>8</sup> Stipendiary = receiving a stipend (sum of money) on contract

<sup>9</sup> Magistrates = low-level judges

After some difficulties and almost three years of protracted negotiations, the “North-West Angle Treaty,” or Treaty no. 3, was signed on 3 Oct. 1873. Although two earlier treaties had been signed in 1871 by Lieutenant Governor Archibald with Indigenous peoples in what is now southern Manitoba, Treaty no. 3 was the prototype for those that followed. Treaty no. 3 transferred large areas of land long before they were required by settlers, and included provisions regarding the resources on the lands being transferred. The revisions later made to treaties nos. 1 and 2 incorporated<sup>10</sup> provisions regarding annuities<sup>11</sup> and cash settlements similar to those in Treaty no. 3.

Although he felt that no expense should be spared in making treaties, Morris was under constraints from Ottawa to offer only limited annuities and gifts. In response, he argued with Ottawa that if annuities were limited, there should be allowance for granting schools and other educational provisions for the Indigenous peoples. He also successfully argued that they had always been led to expect their rights would be recognized before settlement took place, and therefore that treaties should be made well in advance of settlement to preserve peace and goodwill.

Following the practices confirmed in the Proclamation of 1763 and the treaties concluded by William Benjamin Robinson in the 1840s and 1850s, Morris recognized the aboriginal rights of the Indigenous peoples to their lands, accepted their relinquishment of these rights, and in return guaranteed to them what must have seemed a continuation of their way of life by permitting hunting and fishing on the unsettled lands in the territories they had ceded. The principle of allotting<sup>12</sup> small reserves in scattered locations was not simply to avoid arousing the jealousy of settlers or to diminish the military strength of the Indigenous nations.

Morris also believed that it was “of importance to strengthen the hands of the Chiefs and Councillors by a due recognition of their offices and respect being shewn<sup>13</sup> them. They should be strongly impressed with the belief that they are officers of the Crown, and that it is their duty to see that the Indigenous peoples of their tribes obey the provisions of the treaties.” To this end, suits, medals, rifles, and larger annuities were to be given to chiefs and councillors and though Morris, like many settlers, tended to overestimate the political power of the Indigenous chiefs, it is likely that this material assistance enabled them to maintain a stable leadership in their rapidly altered world.

All these methods were conservative but, from the viewpoint of many Indigenous leaders the goal was nevertheless revolutionary: assimilation. Although in 1876, during negotiations at Fort Carlton (Sask.) on Treaty no. 6, Morris assured Big Bear [Mistahimaskwa] that the government did not intend to “interfere with the Indian’s daily life” or “bind him,” but “only help him to make a living on the reserves,” it is true that anticipation of gradual social and economic change was an integral part of each treaty. Most western treaties made provision for education on the reserve, to, in Morris’s words, “train the new generation in the arts of civilization,” and “a very important feature” of all treaties was the supply of “agricultural implements, oxen, cattle (to form the nuclei of herds), and seed grain,” the tools necessary to transform hunters into farmers. Like many Victorians, Morris saw the advantages of the proposed way of life not simply in terms of helping new wards to become self-supporting; by “elevating” the [Indigenous population, “Canada will be enabled to feel, that in a truly patriotic spirit, our country has done its duty by the red men of the North-West, and thereby to herself.” In a classic imperialist manner Morris considered the rewards of empire due only to those who recognized the responsibilities of their self-assumed burden and fulfilled their Christian duty.

<sup>10</sup> Incorporated = included

<sup>11</sup> Annuities = annual payments

<sup>12</sup> Allotting = giving them

<sup>13</sup> Shewn = shown to

Treaty-making had not been easy. The stakes were high, and the tact and stamina required were considerable. But for Morris the opportunity to play this role in the transformation of the west, of which he had dreamed so long ago, was an immensely satisfying experience. The symbolism of treaty-making, the language, and the ceremony also seem to have appealed to his sense of the dignity of his position, and he was to feel their loss keenly. After the Canadian parliament passed the North-West Territories Act in April 1875 Morris appeared dejected<sup>14</sup> and suffered a loss of interest in his work. In November he wrote to Macdonald: "My sphere here, has lost its attraction, by the proposed cutting off, of the North West. I wish I had been left to complete my work there, during the remainder of my term of two years. However I have settled the Indian policy & the work will go on. Now that I am in health, I am weary of the loneliness & want of companionship here, & to my family, it is an exile." When the act was proclaimed on 7 Oct. 1876 David Laird became lieutenant governor of the North-West Territories but Morris continued as lieutenant governor of Manitoba and assumed as well the lieutenant governorship of Keewatin District which was created at the same time to the north (as far as the Arctic Ocean) and east of Manitoba; he retained these posts until December 1877. Morris had not been consulted in the drafting of the 1875 act, and he would have preferred to see the administration of the territories conducted from Winnipeg (Fort Pelly was the proposed seat of government). When a reconstituted<sup>15</sup> council was appointed for the territories with three members, all of them white government officials, he wrote that "it is a crying shame that the half breeds [Metis] have been ignored. It will result in trouble and is most unjust." At his death on 28 Oct. 1889 at the age of 63, Morris was eulogized as "a kindly man, a faithful public servant, a loyal elder of the church, working for his day and generation, and one whose public life was without a stain." From a more distant perspective he may be seen as a man of considerable ability with the advantage of being born into a well-connected political family in a small society in the mid 19th century. He shared the visions of young men of his class and through family and fortune was able to play a brief part in shaping the future of an expanding nation. He had the geniality of spirit and generous manner one might expect from a successful professional man who had suffered few setbacks in his career, and the concern for expanding the family's position that would not be uncommon in the first son of a Scots immigrant. An epitaph<sup>16</sup> might be found in a note from his eldest son, Alexander Cline, to his youngest son, Edmund, in 1894: "Father never failed to make a friend of everyone he met, and his success in life was in no small measure due to this. You inherit a good name. Make the best of it."

Reproduced from Friesen, Jean. "Morris, Alexander." *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. 2017, [http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/morris\\_alexander\\_11E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/morris_alexander_11E.html) and edited for brevity and clarity.

---

<sup>14</sup> Dejected = sad

<sup>15</sup> Reconstituted = rebuilt

<sup>16</sup> Epitaph = statement about someone who died



## Handout: Chief Ahtahkakoop

Ahtahkakoop, also known as Tall Pine and Star Blanket, was born about 1816 on the prairies of what is now western Canada. He would become a respected chief and would lead his people during a time full of challenging circumstances and transitions. His life spanned a period of dramatic change for Indigenous Peoples on the plains, and much of his time as a leader was concerned with navigating these changes.

As a child, Ahtahkakoop was raised in a Cree nation that had not yet been significantly impacted by the arrival of European settlers. As historian Deanna Christensen, the only person to undertake a substantial study of Ahtahkakoop's life, writes:

Every year in early summer, his family and other members of the band moved their tipi camp to one of the sacred places on the plains. Here they joined a large encampment of Plains Cree for the annual Sun Dance and other religious ceremonies. After the ceremonies were over, they travelled the vast expanses of prairie grasslands hunting buffalo, and they gathered the roots, herbs, and berries that grew on Mother Earth.

As fall approached, the people separated into smaller family groups and moved into the wooded hills of the parklands—the Thickwood Hills, the Eagle Hills, and the valleys of the Eagle and Battle rivers. Winter came. Now, in addition to building pounds to entrap buffalo, the people killed moose, elk, and deer, and they hunted fur-bearing animals. This was the time for storytelling, the time when dry grass was stuffed between the tipi covers and their liners to insulate the tipis against the cold. Then, as the days grew longer and the air began to warm, sap started to run in the birch and maple trees. The sap was tapped and made into syrup or sugar. Ducks, geese, and other waterfowl returned from the south, providing a welcome change to the winter diet. Later, the eggs were collected.

It was a good life, the old people have always said. Their spiritual world centered on the Creator and his spirit helpers. In their physical world, life focused on the buffalo (Christensen 2000, 15).

Ahtahkakoop learned how to hunt buffalo, becoming a renowned hunter, and was taught the meaning and procedures of sacred ceremonies. An important part of many Cree ceremonies was the smoking of the pipe. His teacher taught him that:

The tobacco in the sacred stone pipe is also a spirit helper. The smoke of the tobacco mixes with the fire in the pipe and disappears into the heavens, to the spirit world. What we see as nothing in the air holds untold energy. This nothingness is full of energy. It is full of the energy that is part of the energy the Creator put in all of His creations. When the smoke mixes with what seems to be nothingness, it is actually communicating with the Creator and his spirit helpers. We were given the sweetgrass and the pipe so we could have a true



Image held by the Saskatchewan Archives

communication with our Creator. That is what we were given by the Creator (Christensen 2000, 18–19).

The seeds of change on the plains had been sown much earlier with the creation of the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) in 1670 and the construction of York Factory along the shores of Hudson's Bay. For the first century of its existence, though, the company had little impact on the Indigenous way of life. Things began to change more as French, and then British and Scottish, traders entered the area in the latter eighteenth century. Competition between the traders and the HBC grew intense, with each trying to reach new territories and sources of trade goods before the others. The HBC built Cumberland House in the Saskatchewan river delta in 1774 as a trading centre. Several other posts were built along the North and South branches of the Saskatchewan River in the last decades of the eighteenth century. In the early nineteenth century, the fur trade grew substantially and caused much change in the economic activities of all people on the plains. Nonetheless, Ahtahkakooop grew up in a nation that had not yet been substantially altered by these developments.

As Ahtahkakooop grew into adulthood, it became clear that he possessed the skills of a leader. He came to be called *misi-minahik*, or Tall Pine, by the late 1830s, as he had grown to six feet, three inches in height. As Christensen writes, "he was strong, extremely well proportioned, and had a deep voice that many years later reminded people of the "deep low sound of a grizzly-bear growl." He was also well known for his other attributes: "those who knew the young man realized that he was impressive intellectually and spiritually as well as physically. Calm and deliberate in both movement and speech, leadership came naturally to him. He had learned well from the sacred stories and teachings of his elders" (Christensen 2000, 63).

When Ahtahkakooop became a leader, the buffalo were still plentiful, with as many as 50 million thought to have lived on the plains. Plains Cree life was in many important ways structured around the buffalo, which provided the main source of food. Many social structures and customs were organized around the buffalo hunt and the movements of the herds. By the 1860s, the decline of the buffalo had begun and they appeared in much smaller numbers than any time in living memory. This decline was one of the major challenges facing Cree leaders in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Two others were waves of smallpox and the arrival of increasing numbers of European settlers. Chief Ahtahkakooop had to navigate these challenges to try to ensure the survival of his people.

In 1870, a smallpox epidemic also moved through the northwest, ravaging Indigenous communities. Westward settlement was continuing to increase, including settlement by Métis who had become unsatisfied with life at Red River following the Resistance of the previous year. Settlement was also driven by the passage in 1867 of the British North America Act, which brought together New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Upper and Lower Canada (Ontario and Quebec) as the Dominion of Canada. Buffalo shortages were becoming more acute, and it was becoming evident that the herds might not be a reliable food staple for much longer.

Recognizing the changing landscape, Ahtahkakooop sought to shift his people's way of life in response. He sought education for his people and instruction in agriculture. In 1874, he invited Anglican missionary John Hines to settle with his people at Sandy Lake, where they had already begun attempts at establishing gardens. He knew, however, that they would need assistance. As Christensen notes: "For 11 years the chief had been waiting for someone to come and teach his children and grandchildren. During this time he and his leading men had carefully observed the clergymen and other newcomers who passed through their country. Additionally, Ahtahkakooop had prayed to the Creator, asking that He send someone who could be trusted, a man who would live with them and be a helper in prayer, farming, and education" (Christensen 2000, 161).

In the wake of the disappearance of the buffalo, decimation from disease, and the incoming waves of settlement Ahtahkakooop believed that he needed to lead his people on a new path, one which would require assistance. Cree chiefs faced difficult deliberations in determining a course of action that would protect their people, but for these reasons Ahtahkakooop was in favour of the

signing of Treaty 6. As Christensen notes, “Ahtahkakoop, Mistawasis and their leading men talked about the upcoming treaty negotiations often during the winter of 1875–76 and the subsequent spring” (Christensen 2000, 217). They were concerned, in particular, about whether translations would accurately convey meaning. After seeking advice, they determined that Peter Erasmus was a capable and trustworthy interpreter and asked him to be the interpreter at the upcoming negotiations.

Ahtahkakoop chose a location for the treaty camp, and soon there were nearly 2000 people gathered there waiting for the treaty commissioners. The commissioners, including Alexander Morris and James McKay, arrived in late August. “The spiritual men, the chiefs, and their headmen began Friday, August 18 with a pipe ceremony” (Christensen 2000, 232).

Ahtahkakoop and Mistawasis sought unity among the Indigenous parties to the treaty negotiations, though it was difficult to find. Although many were opposed to the treaty on the terms being offered by the Crown representatives, Ahtahkakoop and Mistawasis supported the treaty owing to the challenges outlined above. They saw that life on the plains had changed and they were trying to secure a new way of life for their people. Both made speeches emphasizing the challenges that lay ahead and the need to secure help from the government in transitioning to a way of life not dependent on the buffalo. After days of negotiations, Treaty 6 was signed at Fort Pitt on 23 August 1876. Ahtahkakoop agreed to relocate his band to a 67 square miles ( $170 \text{ km}^2$ ) reserve at Sandy Lake. Christensen writes that:

Ahtahkakoop was relatively pleased with the negotiations. He had foreseen the demise of the buffalo and the increasingly large number of non-Indian<sup>1</sup> people moving onto the plains and into the parkland. His brother Napeskis had brought home stories about the large towns in eastern Canada. Ahtahkakoop and many of the other leaders could envision what lay ahead. Justifiably, they were concerned about the future, not so much for themselves but for their children and their children’s children. Men of action, they were willing to learn a new way of life and were confident that with adequate help during the transition period they could succeed. Negotiating Treaty Six had been a first step towards this end (Christensen 2000, 272).

They believed that the treaty could form the basis of a relationship of mutual reciprocity moving forward:

The chiefs and leading men at Fort Carlton believed that they had signed, on behalf of the Indian nations they represented, a treaty to share the land with the settlers and to keep peace with the government... in exchange, they had negotiated certain rights that would ‘continue as long as the sun shone and the river flowed...’ Ahtahkakoop, Mistawasis, and the other chiefs had bargained hard, extending the negotiations over several days to obtain as many of their demands as possible. Their understandings were clear. They called the land that would become their reserves *iskonikan*, or “that which is held back.” This land was not given to the Crown to be parceled back to them. It was theirs and would remain so (Christensen 2000, 273).

As Christensen notes, though, “the chiefs at no time considered relinquishing their authority to the Queen and to her governments. Nor was it the intent of the chiefs and headmen to give up their rights to govern for the common good of their people. That would have been unthinkable” (Christensen 2000, 274).

After signing the Treaty, Ahtahkakoop’s focus turned to the future. He sought to introduce agriculture on the reserve and, with the assistance of John Hines, his people had some successful years, though never enough to support the community. Ahtahkakoop also emphasized education.

---

<sup>1</sup> Indian = an archaic term for First Nations.

Hines established a school for the children and taught their parents how to farm. The children did well in school. Two of Hines's first students, Ahtahkakoop's nephews, became qualified teachers, and two great-nephews were ordained as Anglican priests. Hines prepared the adults for baptism; gradually most families converted to Christianity. Meanwhile, the families were increasing the number of acres cultivated and sown, raising herds of cattle, and building substantial homes. Unfortunately, the crops were often destroyed by frost, hail, and drought. Hunting was poor, and the people sometimes starved despite their hard work.

Ahtahkakoop and his people remained neutral during the uprising of 1885, determined to honour the treaty signed nine years earlier. The government, however, increasingly ignored its treaty commitments, introducing many restrictive policies that undermined the development of Ahtahkakoop's community. The pass system, for example, made it difficult to trade with the settler community. As the *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* noted:

In 1885, the Department of Indian Affairs instituted a pass system. No outsider could come onto a reserve to do business with an Aboriginal resident without permission from the Indian agent. In many places, the directives were interpreted to mean that no Aboriginal person could leave the reserve without permission from the Indian agent. Reserves were beginning to resemble prisons.

Further restrictions prevented indigenous peoples from trading surplus agricultural produce without permission from an Indian Agent. Ahtahkakoop continued to support education. As Christensen writes:

Although Ahtahkakoop was still supporting the concept of a well-run industrial school in the early 1890's, various aspects of the government's policies of control and assimilation were beginning to press upon his people. The restrictions were not as evident on the Ahtahkakoop Reserve as elsewhere, but they were still there. For instance, while other parents had complained to officials about the school passes, Ahtahkakoop said that he and his people 'had never been refused permission to visit their own children, but had been allowed and assisted to go anytime when their work was done.' ...The chief evidently had said that 'distance was no obstacle' in visiting the industrial school in Battleford. This was likely not true since Ahtahkakoop and others in his band had been working hard to have a school built in Prince Albert. Regardless, for a people who had traditionally travelled freely over a vast country, it was degrading and humiliating to have to request permission to visit their own children (Christensen 2000, 643).

Thus, while Ahtahkakoop held out hope that a treaty relationship, a shift to an agricultural mode of living, and an emphasis on education could make a viable future for his people, government policies undermined much of the promise that this approach may have held.

Ahtahkakoop died on 4 December 1896 of a heart attack, and was buried on the reserve that was named after him.

## SOURCES

Christensen, Deanna. *Ahtahkakoop: The Epic Account of a Plains Cree Head Chief, His People, and Their Vision for Survival, 1816-1896*. Shell Lake, Sask.: Ahtahkakoop Pub, 2000.

Christensen, Deanna. "Ahtahkakoop (C. 1816-96)." *The Encyclopedia of Saskatchewan*. [http://esask.uregina.ca/entry/ahtahkakoop\\_c\\_1816-96.html](http://esask.uregina.ca/entry/ahtahkakoop_c_1816-96.html).

Canada. "Highlights from the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples." Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100014597/1100100014637>.



## Handout: Chief Mistahimaskwa (Big Bear)

Mistahimaskwa (Big Bear, known in French as Gros Ours) was a Plains Cree chief born around 1825, probably near Fort Carlton (Sask.). He died 17 Jan. 1888 on the Poundmaker Reserve (Saskatchewan). Over the course of his life he had several wives and at least four sons.

Big Bear's parents are unknown but may have been Saulteaux; he seems to have grown up with the Plains Cree bands that usually wintered along the North Saskatchewan River and hunted south every summer for buffalo. He received his power bundle, song, and probably his name as a result of a vision of the Bear Spirit, the most powerful spirit venerated<sup>1</sup> by the Crees. The power bundle, never opened unless to be worn ritually in war or in dance, contained a skinned-out bear's paw, complete with claws, sewn on a scarlet flannel. At appropriate times, Big Bear wore the paw around his neck; he believed that when the weight of it rested against his soul that nothing then could hurt him.

In November 1862 Big Bear was reported by Charles Alston Messiter to be "the head chief" of a "large camp of Crees" near Fort Carlton. However, Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) trader John Sinclair later reported that about 1865 Big Bear "removed from Carlton to Pitt, and became the head man of a small band of his relatives who resided at Pitt, numbering about twelve tents, or perhaps twenty men."

The traditional activities of hunting and warfare occupied Big Bear until the 1870s brought the police, the treaties, and the end of the buffalo. He and his band are known to have taken part in the hostilities between the Plains Cree and the Blackfeet which culminated<sup>2</sup> in the battle at Belly River (near Lethbridge, Alta) in October 1870. Jerry Potts later reported that between 200 and 300 Crees and 40 Blackfeet were killed; if these estimates are correct, Belly River was the largest Indigenous battle known to have been fought on the Canadian plains. It was certainly the last.

As the number of whites on the plains increased, Big Bear's independent spirit showed itself. In 1873 he clashed with Gabriel Dumont when the Métis leader tried to dictate how the buffalo should be run on the summer hunt. In the summer of 1874 HBC trader William McKay was commissioned by the Canadian government to visit the Indigenous peoples of the Plains with presents of tea and tobacco and to explain carefully why the North-West Mounted Police were coming. McKay reported that the Plains Cree "all received the presents in a friendly manner," but that "two families of Big Bear's band . . . objected to receive any, stating they were given them as a bribe to facilitate a future treaty." McKay also records that Big Bear's camp consisted of 65 lodges (about 520 people), while that of Sweet Grass [Wikaskokiseyin], who as early as 1871 had been



Image held by Library and Archives Canada

<sup>1</sup> Venerated = respected

<sup>2</sup> Culminated = resulted

named “The Chief of the Country” by the HBC and who had been baptized Abraham by Father Albert Lacombe, had only 56.

Big Bear proved even more problematic to the Reverend George Millward McDougall, commissioned in 1875 to “tranquillize” the Indigenous peoples of the Plains regarding the treaty Canada planned for them. The Methodist missionary found most of the “principal men . . . moderate in their demands,” but thought Big Bear a mischief-maker because he was “trying to take the lead in their council.” Big Bear had declared: “when we set a fox-trap we scatter pieces of meat all round, but when the fox gets into the trap we knock him on the head; We want no bait; let your chiefs come like men and talk to us.”

Lieutenant Governor Alexander Morris came in August 1876 to negotiate Treaty no. 6, which dealt with the rights to 120,000 square miles of land. Big Bear did not come to Fort Carlton, and he only appeared at Fort Pitt on 13 September, the day after all official ceremonies were completed. Sweet Grass and the other Cree and Chipewyan chiefs urged him to sign, as they had, but Big Bear, who said he had been sent to speak for all Crees and Assiniboines still hunting on the plains, replied, “Stop, my friends... I will request [the governor] to save me from what I most dread—hanging; it was not given to us to have the rope about our necks.” Morris concluded that Big Bear was simply a coward; however, there are different interpretations of what Big Bear may have meant. Since the Crees believed their souls to reside along the nape of their necks, the statement might also be seen as a powerfully prophetic metaphor of what would happen within a decade to all the Indigenous peoples of the Plains]. It has also been explained that Big Bear meant he did not wish to be led around as a horse is. In any case, Big Bear did not sign, the first major chief on the Canadian prairies not to do so.

Big Bear refused to take treaty for the next six years, which was as long as the buffalo lasted. His defiance drew more and more independent warriors to his camp. He met the new lieutenant governor of the North-West Territories, David Laird, at Sounding Lake (Alta) in August 1878, but he would neither sign nor accept presents, and so there could be no question of his designating a reserve. In October the band led by Little Pine [Minahikosis] discovered surveyors near the present site of Medicine Hat (Alta); the chief claimed they had no right to survey and sent for Big Bear who was at the Red Deer Forks (Sask.), while the surveyors sent for the police at Fort Walsh (Sask.). Colonel Acheson Gosford Irvine agreed with Big Bear that the surveyors should stop their work until the matter was settled between Big Bear and the lieutenant governor “when the leaves come out.”

In the winter of 1878–79 Big Bear was at the height of his influence; the buffalo had not come north that winter (they never would again in numbers) and the plains people now understood that their tiny reserves and \$5 annual payments would mean nothing if the hunting, which Morris had assured them would continue as before, were destroyed. In March 1879 Father Jean-Marie-Joseph Lestanc, who was wintering with the Métis at Red Deer Forks, reported: “All the tribes – that is the Sioux, Blackfoot, Bloods, Sarcees, Assiniboines, Stoney, Crees and Saulteaux – now form but one party... Big Bear, up to this time, cannot be accused of uttering a single objectionable word, but the fact of his being the head and soul of all our Canadian plains Indians<sup>3</sup> leaves room for conjecture... All are in great want... [They] consider the treaties . . . are of no value ...” Superintendent Lief Newry Fitzroy Crozier of the NWMP rode to the forks to investigate and reported that nothing had come of the gathering. However, several thousand Indigenous peoples and Métis did spend a hard winter there and it is possible that Sitting Bull [Ta-tanka I-yotank], Crowfoot [Isapo-muxika], and perhaps even Gabriel Dumont consulted with Big Bear and the disillusioned warriors who were continually joining his band; if cooperation between these traditional enemies had resulted, it would have been an unprecedented event.

Edgar Dewdney, Sir John A. Macdonald’s new commissioner for Indigenous peoples, arrived at Fort Walsh in June 1879. Big Bear could not confront him with a united front but did speak with

---

<sup>3</sup> Indians = an archaic term for First Nations.

him for several days about the vanishing buffalo and the inadequate treaties. Because of their destitution, however, Little Pine signed the treaty on behalf of 472 people on 2 July and was immediately paid treaty money and given rations; Big Bear still refused. He moved south into Montana where most of Canada's treaty Indigenous peoples], with Dewdney's encouragement, soon joined him, and where along with the Indigenous peoples of America they hunted the last of the buffalo. By 1882 these too were gone and the treaty Indigenous peoples began returning north to petition the government for food. Big Bear's band tried fishing at Cypress Lake (Sask.) and eating gophers, but it was hopeless. On 8 Dec. 1882 Big Bear signed Treaty no. 6 at Fort Walsh so that the police would give his people food.

Big Bear said his people wanted their reservation near Fort Pitt, and in July 1883 his band moved north. He spent that summer visiting his old friends on their small reserves along the North Saskatchewan. All were destitute: agriculture, their only activity, was either non-existent or providing very poor returns. That fall Big Bear began to harass the government in a new way by changing his mind about where he wanted his reserve. A series of visits, by Indian Department officials Hayter Reed and Dewdney, and by the deputy superintendent general of Indian affairs, Lawrence Vankoughnet, from Ottawa, simply confirmed him in his stubbornness, and when his rations were cut off because of it the band freighted for the HBC while he sent messages to all the Cree chiefs to join him in a united Indigenous council to work for one large Indigenous reserve on the North Saskatchewan. To accomplish this, the Saskatchewan Herald reported that Big Bear "has made up his mind to go to Ottawa . . . if there is a head to the [Indian] Department he is bound to find him, for he will deal with no one else." By April 1884 Big Bear and his band, swollen to about 500, began moving toward Battleford and by 16 June well over 2,000 Indigenous peoples from the Saskatchewan reserves were gathered at the reserve of Poundmaker [Pitikwahanapiwiyin] for a Thirst Dance given by Big Bear; it was the largest united effort ever made by the Plains Cree.

Thirst Dances were expressly forbidden by the government; in any case the government did not allow rations to Indigenous people off their reserves. However, Big Bear's dance proceeded and during the celebration Kāwīcitwemot, a young warrior, beat John Craig, the farm instructor of the Little Pine reserve, when the latter abused him and refused to give him food. Craig called the police and Crozier arrived from Battleford with about 90 men. Crozier was incensed at Craig's "indiscretion," but since the police had been called, it was necessary that they arrest the culprit. When the police and some 400 armed, furious warriors faced each other, a single shot would have plunged the northwest into an Indigenous war. The police managed to haul Kāwīcitwemot from among his fellows while Big Bear, Little Pine, and Poundmaker prevented violence by shouting, "Peace, Peace!"; later the police placated the warriors to an extent by handing out large food supplies. Face had been saved all around, but as Crozier reported to Dewdney, "it is yet incomprehensible to me how some one did not fire ..." Unless the department could "keep their confidence . . . there is only one other [policy] – and that is to fight them."

Big Bear did not want to fight Canada; he knew that in such a battle, as Crozier wrote with heavy irony, "the country no doubt would get rid of the Indians and all troublesome questions in connection with them in a comparatively short time ..." Big Bear's demands are clearly presented in the rough English notes made of two speeches he gave to chiefs at Duck Lake (Sask.) and at Carlton in August 1884. First, he argued that the treaty they signed had been changed by Ottawa: "half the sweet things were taken out and lots of sour things left in." A new treaty with a new reserve concept was necessary. Secondly, the Indigenous peoples needed one representative from all the tribes to speak for them. "The choice of our representative ought to be given to us every four years." He concluded: "Crowfoot is working for the same thing as I am."

All summer Big Bear carried this message for a united stand against the government; on 17 August he met Louis Riel in Prince Albert (Sask.). They had met in Montana earlier apparently without result, but this meeting disturbed Dewdney more than any gathering of Indigenous people]. Hayter Reed was ordered to investigate the Indigenous peoples' complaints and when his

incredibly complacent<sup>4</sup> report was at last forwarded to Vankoughnet in Ottawa the latter reminded Dewdney on 4 Feb. 1885 that the Indigenous people “have really received very much more than the Govt. was under the Treaty bound to give them.”

This federal inaction destroyed Big Bear’s last attempts at negotiated change: during that winter, 1884–85, the warrior society gradually separated themselves from the old chief. The band was camped with the Wood Crees at Frog Lake (Alta), 50 miles north of Fort Pitt, when the news arrived that the Métis had routed Crozier at Duck Lake on 26 March. On 2 April Big Bear’s men, led by his son Āyimisīs (Little Bad Man) and the war chief Wandering Spirit [Kapapamahchakwew] burst into the Maundy Thursday service in the Frog Lake Catholic church and forced all the unarmed whites of the settlement outside. Wandering Spirit began by shooting Indian agent Thomas Trueman Quinn; Big Bear rushed forward shouting, “Stop, stop!” But there was no stopping the men, warriors once again. Nine men, including the two Oblate priests were killed; only two white women and William Bleasdell Cameron, the HBC clerk who was protected by the Cree wife of trader James Kay Simpson, escaped. When Simpson returned that evening from a trading trip to Pitt, he found the settlement destroyed and the warriors dancing the Scalp Dance. Later, at Big Bear’s trial, Simpson reported the conversation he had had with his friend of 40 years: “now this affair . . . will be all on you, carried on your back.” The old chief answered: “it is not my doings, and the young men won’t listen, and I am very sorry for what has been done.”

When news of Frog Lake spread, the name Big Bear became synonymous with “bloodthirsty killer,” but in fact Āyimisīs and Wandering Spirit were now the band leaders. On 13 April they surrounded Fort Pitt with 250 warriors, and sent an ultimatum to NWMP Inspector Francis Jeffrey Dickens that, unless the civilians surrendered and the police left, they would attack. Big Bear wrote a note to an old acquaintance, Sergeant J. A. Martin: “Try and get away before the afternoon, as the young men are all wild and hard to keep in hand.” On 14 April, hopelessly outnumbered, Dickens and his 25 men retreated by river to Battleford while the 28 civilians led by HBC trader William John McLean and his family surrendered to the Indigenous people. The warriors then pillaged and burned the empty fort.

From testimony given by McLean at Big Bear’s trial, it is clear that the old chief did his best to protect the captives in camp; later, when asked how Āyimisīs had treated Big Bear, McLean replied, “With utter contempt.” Without him, however, the warriors demonstrated no wider strategy than simply local pillage; they made no attempt to join Poundmaker in his attack on Battleford or Riel at Batoche. Finally, Major-General Thomas Bland Strange and his Canadian troops arrived at Fort Pitt and on 28 May they attacked Wandering Spirit’s strong position on a hill north of Frenchman Butte. Strange was repulsed but the Indigenous peoples retreated as well; during the battle Big Bear remained in the rear with the captives and women. However, a story current to this day on the Poundmaker Reserve recounts that when Samuel Benfield Steele’s scouts attacked and routed Big Bear’s followers at Loon Lake Narrows on 3 June, Big Bear walked between the attacking police and the fleeing Cree with his “bear’s claw [that] rested in the hollow of his throat. As long as he wore that claw there, nothing could hurt him... It was as if he placed an invisible wall between his people and the soldiers.”

After Loon Lake the band further scattered before General Frederick Dobson Middleton’s advancing soldiers, victorious over the Métis at Batoche on 12 May. Kāwīcítwemot had been killed at Frenchman Butte; Āyimisīs fled to Montana; Wandering Spirit surrendered and in November 1885 he and five others of Big Bear’s band were hanged for their part in the Frog Lake killings. Big Bear slipped past all the soldiers looking for him and gave himself up to a startled policeman at Fort Carlton on 2 July 1885.

Big Bear and 14 of his band were transported to Regina, and his trial before Judge Hugh Richardson and a jury of six on a charge of treason began on 11 Sept. 1885. Poundmaker had already been convicted of the same charge but Richardson made it clear to the jury that a claim

---

<sup>4</sup> Complacent = smug disinterest

for innocence could only be made if Big Bear had actually left his band when it “rose in insurrection.” Since there was no question of that, within 15 minutes the jury brought in a sentence of “Guilty with a recommendation to mercy.” On 25 September, Richardson sentenced him to three years in Stony Mountain Penitentiary. Just before the sentencing, Big Bear made one last speech for his people: “Many of my band are hiding in the woods, paralyzed with terror... I plead again,’ he cried, stretching forth his hands, ‘to you, the chiefs of the white men’s laws, for pity and help to the outcasts of my band!” The court record of the speech cannot be located; only Cameron, a witness at the trial, mentions it.

Big Bear was a traditional chief, chosen and followed by the Plains Cree because of his wisdom rather than because he was acknowledged by trader or missionary or government official for his cooperation. For him the land, the water, the air, and the buffalo were gifts from the Great Spirit to all mankind; everyone might use them, but in no sense could one person own them or forbid their use to others. He saw white civilization as humiliatingly destructive of Indigenous civilization, but he resisted whites with ideas, not useless guns. He was the last of the great chiefs to try to unite the North American peoples against European invasion, and to that end he wanted a new treaty: one huge reserve for all Indigenous peoples of the Plains]. If his young men had not followed Riel’s example, perhaps he could have persuaded other Plains chiefs that his way was their only hope.

The penitentiary records list Big Bear as 5' 5 1/4" tall; photographs reveal him to be stocky, with a strong, craggy face. John George Donkin in his book *Trooper and redskin* . . . described him as “a little shrivelled-up piece of humanity . . . his cunning face seamed and wrinkled like crumpled parchment.” Yet Cameron, when referring to Big Bear, corroborated<sup>5</sup> Dewdney’s evaluation of his independent personality and wrote: “Big Bear had great natural gifts... Had [he] been a white man and educated, he would have made a great lawyer or a great statesman... [He was] imperious, outspoken, fearless.” He was indeed a great statesman.

Reproduced from Wiebe, Rudy. “Mistahimaskwa.” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, [http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mistahimaskwa\\_11E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mistahimaskwa_11E.html), and edited for brevity and clarity.

---

<sup>5</sup> Corroborated = confirmed



## Handout: George McDougall

McDOUGALL, GEORGE MILLWARD, Methodist clergyman and missionary, b. 9 Sept. 1821 at Kingston, U.C.; d. 25 Jan. 1876 near Fort Calgary.

George Millward McDougall's parents were Highland Scots. His father was stationed in Kingston as a non-commissioned officer in the Royal Navy during the War of 1812, and he himself, when a youth, served during the rebellion of 1837 in a militia unit, the Royal Foresters. Later he migrated with his parents to a farm near Barrie, Upper Canada. Though his elementary education was slight, he early learned the many pioneer skills needed in his future mission in the far west. On 10 Jan. 1842 he married Elizabeth Chantler, an English-born woman of Quaker parents. They had eight children, including John Chantler, who became his father's assistant in missionary work, and David, a trader and rancher supplying the missions.

After religious conversion in meetings held by a Methodist lay preacher, Peter White, McDougall became a lay preacher also and offered himself for the ministry. He attended Victoria College, Cobourg, C.W., during the winter term of 1849–50, and then went to Alderville where he became assistant "on trial" to the veteran educator of Indigenous peoples], the Reverend William Case. McDougall's early service as missionary was at Garden River and at Rama, near Orillia. He was ordained by the Methodist conference at Belleville, C.W., in June 1854.

In 1860 McDougall was appointed to the Rossville mission, near Norway House, Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) territory, and made chairman of the Methodist district extending from Oxford House and Rainy Lake (Lac La Pluie) to the Rocky Mountains. After visits to the missions in the Norway House area, he undertook an exploratory trip into the Saskatchewan valley in 1862. He conferred<sup>1</sup> with fellow missionaries and with the Crees, and promised to become resident there the following year. In 1863 he and his family did indeed travel in HBC York boats up the Saskatchewan River, perhaps the first family in the vanguard of Ontario pioneers who settled in Alberta in the 1860s.

McDougall established a mission, Victoria (Pakan), on the North Saskatchewan River about 80 miles east of Edmonton House. His immediate task was to reinforce the religious work begun by the English Wesleyan missionary Robert Terrill Rundle in 1840–48 and being continued by Henry Bird Steinhauer and Thomas Woolsey, and to demonstrate to the Indigenous peoples a way of life based on settlement and agriculture. On a fertile river bench, McDougall constructed the mission as the nucleus of a model pioneer settlement. Soon Cree and Métis (some of the latter from the Red River Settlement) took river lots on either side of the mission. With meagre equipment, seed grain and garden seeds were sown and agriculture taught, and homes and auxiliary<sup>2</sup> buildings, a




Image held by the Glenbow Museum

<sup>1</sup> Conferred = discussed

<sup>2</sup> Auxiliary = extra

school and a church, were constructed. McDougall made numerous missionary journeys to his nomadic people in remote areas.

His son John was pressed into service to reopen a mission which they named Woodville, at the northwest end of Pigeon Lake. This mission was on an overland trail midway between Edmonton and Rocky Mountain Houses, accessible to both Stoney and Blackfoot tribes from the south.

The period from the transfer of the HBC territory in 1869 to the purported acquisition of the land by treaties with the Indigenous peoples and the entry of the North-West Mounted Police in 1874, was one of distress and uncertainty in the North West. The buffalo migrated beyond the usual hunting ranges, crops failed, and game animals were visibly diminishing. The long-established authority of the HBC was set aside for a civil government previously unknown. The Red River Resistance of 1869–70 made the procurement of food, goods, and mail service difficult for the missionaries. Then followed the smallpox epidemic of 1870. McDougall did his best with the remedies and medical knowledge he had. All his household were affected except his wife, and three of his daughters died. McDougall was appointed to a board of health, which reported that 3,512 persons died in the epidemic, approximately one-third of the native population. About this time McDougall built at the Victoria mission possibly the earliest hospital in present-day Alberta.

McDougall's administrative duties had been made lighter in 1868, when a Red River District was established to the east, centring in Upper Fort Garry (Winnipeg), with its own chairman, the Reverend George Young. McDougall's western area was named the Saskatchewan District, and more missionaries were found to expand the work. Financial support then and later was largely supplied by the Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada.

Because of the growing importance of Edmonton House as a transportation and trading centre, McDougall moved there to establish a permanent mission in 1871. He no doubt wished this mission to be a counterfoil<sup>3</sup> to those of the Roman Catholics, by then well established at Lake Ste. Anne and at St. Albert under Father Albert Lacombe, and at Edmonton with a church within the palisade. In 1873, authorized to begin a mission among the Blackfeet, McDougall and his son John located a site in the valley of the Bow River (Morley). This mission would be protected by the Mountain Stonies and within easy reach of the Blackfoot tribes on the prairies. Since the time of Rundle, the Stonies had remained staunch allies of the Wesleyans. The Blackfeet were the most independent of the western tribes, and little missionary work had been done among them except when they had come to trade at the northern posts. McDougall appointed John to Morley as missionary in late October 1873, and his brother David went with him.

McDougall was involved in two pressing social problems, the illegal liquor traffic among the Indigenous peoples and the demands of the Indigenous tribes for treaties with the Canadian government. Feeling compassion for the many Indigenous peoples], especially widows and orphans, made destitute by unrestrained tribal warfare, debauchery, and violence, often traceable to the rapacity of free traders, McDougall led the Indigenous peoples to request the total prohibition of the sale of liquor in the territory. He voluntarily supported the new dominion government in persuading the native peoples to remain at peace and not to join the rebellious elements led by Louis Riel in the Red River area. He was a "middleman" in communicating to the Indigenous peoples the government's intention to treat with them fairly; he also encouraged the Indigenous peoples to address their own petitions to the government urging that their rights be settled by formal treaty.

When McDougall returned from furlough in 1875, he was requested by Alexander Morris, lieutenant governor of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, to assure the western Indigenous peoples that commissioners would be sent to negotiate treaties. McDougall undertook to visit every Indigenous camp from Carlton House (near present-day Prince Albert) west to the Rocky Mountains bearing this message and listening to the Indigenous peoples' addresses and

---

<sup>3</sup> Counterfoil = opposing presence

requests. He carried this exacting assignment out satisfactorily, preparing the Indigenous Peoples for Treaties No. 6 and 7.

As the earliest Wesleyan clergyman to settle permanently on the prairies, McDougall advanced the cause of the Protestant church beyond the itinerancy of his predecessors. A man of his times, he was strongly sectarian in his church loyalties, but worked without stint to “christianize and civilize” his charges. His promotion of elementary education, agriculture, and health was outstanding, for the period and for the west. At his death he was planning a new mission station and an Indigenous orphanage on the Playground River (Oldman River). A strong stabilizing influence among the Indigenous peoples and Métis, he was also a believer in confederation as a solution of the British North American problem and essentially nationalist in his sympathies. He warned church and state against separatist tendencies which he felt were supported by the Roman Catholic clergy, or which might be caused by the encroachments of the American free traders.

McDougall died of exertion while hunting buffalo. His body was found after a search and was buried in the Wesley Band cemetery (on the property of McDougall Memorial Church), near Morley. “Few men have passed away more deeply regretted by the Indian<sup>4</sup> or white man, than this large hearted, courageous, laborious, and self-denying minister of Christ.”

Reproduced from Nix, James Ernest. “McDougall, George Millward.” *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, [http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mcdougall\\_george\\_millward\\_10E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/mcdougall_george_millward_10E.html), and edited for brevity and clarity.

---

<sup>4</sup> Indian: an archaic term for First Nations.



## Handout: Ceremonial Pipe

The ceremonial pipe was and is an important part of many Indigenous cultures and pipe ceremonies were a significant diplomatic protocol. The pipe ceremony played an important role in the Treaty 6 negotiations. Before the negotiations began, Indigenous People gathered for a pipe ceremony. The ceremony at the Fort Carleton gathering in August 1876 was a one-pipe ceremony. This ceremony was more than a formality; it bore great significance to the First Nations who practiced it. In performing the pipe ceremony, the First Nations presented the work they were about to undertake at the feet of the Creator or Great Spirit. Through the pipe ceremony, the negotiating process became sacred. As the Indian Association of Alberta explained:

In our field research, we have found that much significance is attached to the pipe ceremony conducted prior to the meeting with the treaty commission. In fact, we have found that, according to Indian<sup>1</sup> tradition, religious formalities are as important and as significant as the subject of the matter at hand, whatever that subject may be. It is an Indian custom to conduct those formalities before undertaking any matters of importance. The purpose of this tradition is that the Indians have utmost and absolute belief in the sacredness of the pipe. In the presence of the pipe, only the truth must be used and any commitment made in its presence must be kept. In that sense, then, the only means used by the Indians to finalize an agreement or to ensure a final commitment was by use of the pipe. The pipe, of course, being an absolutely vital element of the Indian's spiritual beliefs, has many other purposes. We have concluded, after discussions with some elders, that the pipe ceremony conducted prior to the meetings at Fort Carlton and Fort Pitt was one that was held only in preparation for matters of extreme importance. The importance of the meeting is evident by the number of Indians in attendance at a time when the people should have been out hunting for their winter supply of food. (Lee, 111)

The commissioners also took part in the ceremony. Alexander Morris addressed the gathering at Fort Carleton:

My Indian brothers, Indians of the plains, I have shaken hands with a few of you, I shake hands with all of you in my heart. God has given us a good day, I trust his eye is upon us, and that what we do will be for the benefit of his children. What I say and what you say, and what we do, is done openly before the whole people. You are, like me and my friends who are with me, children of the Queen. We are of the same blood, the same God made us and the same Queen rules over us. (Morris, 199).

The language used here is very significant. For many Indigenous signatories, the treaties were a sacred matter. The references to God were therefore important. As John Borrows explains, the Indigenous “interpretation was that the treaties were made with the creator as well as with the Crown. First Nations felt encouraged in their view by the presence of Christian missionaries during negotiations, and the Crown’s invocation of God throughout their meetings” (Borrows 2010). The references to family relations are also important. As Harold Johnson explains, it was through the extension of kinship (or extended family) relations that Indigenous nations creating political relationships and defined the rights, obligations and responsibilities of the parties. The parent-child relationship was not one of submission and obedience, but one that contained many

---

<sup>1</sup> Indian = an archaic term for First Nations Peoples.

mutual obligations. As John Taylor writes, "The Indians and the commissioners had now placed the proceedings within a religious and symbolic context, each from their own cultural perspective."

The pipe ceremony that preceded the Fort Pitt signing in September 1876 was a four-pipe ceremony. Again, Morris addressed those gathered. He said:

...I see the Queen's Councillors taking the Indian by the hand saying we are brothers, we will lift you up, we will teach you, if you will learn, the cunning of the white man... I see gardens growing and houses building; I see them receiving money from the Queen's Commissioners to purchase clothing for their children, at the same time I see them enjoying their hunting and fishing as before, I see them retaining their old mode of living with the Queen's gift in addition. (Morris, 231).

The language of kinship is again very important. The notion of brotherhood sets up the commissioners and the Indigenous signatories as equals. The Queen as parent places the monarch in the position of mediating disputes between the settlers and Indigenous Peoples.

**SOURCES:**

Borrows, John. *Canada's Indigenous Constitution*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Lee, Gordon "The Importance of the Sacred Pipe Ceremony," 111-112 in *The Spirit of the Alberta Indian Treaties*, Richard Price, ed. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1979.

Morris, Alexander. *The Treaties of Canada with the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories Including the Negotiations on Which They Are Based, and Other Information Relating Thereto*. Toronto: Willing & Williamson, 1880.

Taylor, John Leonard. "Treaty Research Report - Treaty Six (1876)." *Indian and Northern Affairs Canada*, 1985. <http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028706/1100100028708>.


## THE CONFEDERATION DEBATES EDUCATION TEAM



**Jennifer Thiverge** led *The Confederation Debates* education committee. She is a PhD candidate in History at the University of Ottawa and has a Masters of Education and a Bachelor of Education in Voice, Drama, and History. Her research interests are interdisciplinary, ranging from using drama to teach about World War One, Dark Heritage and Collective Memory in the Museums, to how gender plays a role in the History of Computer Science. As an active historian and educator, Jennifer has extensive experience in both fields.



**Daniel Heidt**, PhD is *The Confederation Debates* project manager. His doctoral research on Canadian politics and Ontario federalism during the nineteenth century demonstrated that asymmetrical political influence does not necessarily destabilize national unity. He also has a strong background in digital humanities and co-owns Waterloo Innovations, a company dedicated to working with researchers to improve digital workflows.



**Bobby Cole** is an MA student in Canadian and Indigenous Commemorative History at the University of Ottawa. His research focuses on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada's representation of Indigenous history in the 30 years following the Second World War.



**Robert Hamilton** is a PhD student at the University of Victoria Faculty of Law. His research focuses on Aboriginal law in Canada, with a specific focus on Aboriginal and Treaty rights in Canada's Maritime Provinces. Robert holds a B.A. (Hons) in Philosophy from St. Thomas University, a J.D. from University of New Brunswick Law School, and an LL.M. from Osgoode Hall Law School. He has published in the area of Aboriginal land rights in the Maritime Provinces and has presented his research at numerous academic conferences.



**Elisa Sance** is a PhD student in Canadian-American history at the University of Maine. Her doctoral research focuses on language, citizenship and identity in teacher training in Maine and New Brunswick during the twentieth century. As part of her training, Sance studied the teaching of modern languages, the teaching of children with learning and behavior problems in the regular classroom, and feminist pedagogy. She regularly attends professional development events on related topics and participates in outreach programs benefitting high schools and middle schools in Maine.

Adam Blacklock, Jonah Ellens, Chelsey Lush, and Kira Smith, composed biographical briefs for several of the historical figures included in this package.

In addition to the quotes identified by volunteer transcribers, Victoria McGowan canvassed the records for many of the quotes found in the primary document handouts. Beth Graham kindly reviewed the entire lesson plan for typos and various inconsistencies.

# THE CONFEDERATION DEBATES IS SUPPORTED BY:

Crabtree Foundation



Social Sciences and  
Humanities Research  
Council of Canada  
Canada

**CANADA150@YORK**



**CANADA RESEARCH CHAIR  
IN INDIGENOUS LAW**



**AVIE BENNETT CHAIR  
IN CANADIAN HISTORY**



Dictionnaire biographique du Canada  
Dictionary of Canadian Biography

