

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r5w_xA7BNx0

1. The Sixties Scoop = Residential Schools by Another Name

Kathleen's framing is precise:

- Residential schools declined → **child removal continued**
- Provinces took over child welfare
- Indigenous children were:
 - removed en masse
 - adopted into non-Indigenous families
 - sent across Canada, the U.S., and overseas
- Parents had little or no say

This was:

- Racist
- Systemic
- Assimilationist
- A continuation, not a deviation

Estimated scale:

- **Tens of thousands of children**
- Some taken as early as the **1950s**
- Birthdays, names, identities altered to prevent reunification

2. The Intergenerational Cost

Survivor voices make this unmistakable:

- Loss of language
- Loss of family connection
- Identity fragmentation
- Cycles of foster care
- Shame engineered into appearance, names, bodies

And the counter-movement:

- Reclaiming names

- Reclaiming language
- Reclaiming pride
- “We are royalty on this land.”

Healing is not abstract — it is cultural, linguistic, embodied.

3. Why Governance Became the Battleground

Phil makes the trajectory clear:

- Child removal accelerated political consciousness
- Dependence → organization → resistance → governance

Early barriers:

- Federal government actively blocked national Indigenous organizing
- Leaders were defamed, undermined, surveilled

Breakthrough:

- **National Indian Brotherhood (NIB)** → later **Assembly of First Nations (AFN)**
- First durable national political voice for First Nations

Important distinction:

- AFN represents **First Nations**
- Métis and Inuit developed their own national bodies

4. Indigenous Governance ≠ Western Democracy

Kathleen clarifies the fault line:

Two imposed systems now coexist:

1. Indian Act governance

- Elected chief and council
- Jurisdiction limited to reserves
- Powers defined by federal law

2. Hereditary / traditional governance

- Authority rooted in Indigenous law
- Jurisdiction over traditional territory
- Often matriarchal
- Predates Canada by centuries

Conflict arises when:

- Canada recognizes only the Indian Act
 - Indigenous law is ignored
-

5. Wet'suwet'en: A Case Study in Colonial Blindness

What happened:

- Pipeline crossed **traditional territory**
- Elected band councils (reserve-based) consented
- Hereditary chiefs (territory-based) refused
- Canada recognized only elected councils
- Courts enforced injunctions
- Police violence followed

Key truth:

Consent was sought from the wrong authority.

This violated:

- Indigenous law
 - UNDRIP
 - Canada's own reconciliation commitments
-

6. This Is Not an Isolated Problem

Other flashpoints share the same root:

- Six Nations / Confederacy vs imposed council
- Oka / Kanesatake
- Caledonia
- Ipperwash (Dudley George)
- Idle No More

Common thread: sovereignty.

Not secession.

Not chaos.

Self-rule within Canada.

7. The Courts: Recognition Without Power

Phil's critique is sharp and accurate:

- Section 35 (1982) recognizes Aboriginal rights

- But **does not define them**
- Courts move incrementally
- Governments resist implementation

Examples:

- Fishing rights recognized → limited to “moderate livelihood”
- Title recognized → Crown still holds “underlying title”
- Rights acknowledged → authority withheld

Result:

Legal wins without real control.

8. Elijah Harper: Quiet Resistance, National Impact

This is the moral centerpiece of the session.

1990 — Meech Lake Accord:

- Quebec’s “distinct society” to be entrenched
- Indigenous peoples excluded (again)
- Told: “We’ll deal with you later”

Response:

- Elijah Harper, Cree MLA
- Eagle feather in hand
- Said “**No**” — eight times
- Stopped constitutional amendment

Impact:

- Meech Lake collapsed
- Canada learned Indigenous consent matters
- Indigenous peoples became permanent participants in constitutional dialogue

Power without violence.

Sovereignty without secession.

9. What Changed After Meech Lake

Concrete outcomes:

- Indigenous leaders now invited to federal-provincial meetings
- Inuit, Métis, First Nations at the table

- Recognition that exclusion has consequences

Not full self-government — but a shift in balance.

10. The Real Barrier: Power, Money, Control

Phil names it plainly:

- Land = money
- Money = power
- Power = control

Governments:

- Don't trust Indigenous decision-making
- Don't want to relinquish authority
- Fear precedent
- Fear loss of economic control

Result:

- Delays
 - Court fights
 - Injunctions
 - Criminalization of protest instead of diplomacy
-

11. What Sovereignty Actually Means

Phil is explicit:

- Indigenous self-determination ≠ secession
- Indigenous peoples want:
 - control over their affairs
 - respect for their laws
 - a fair share of prosperity
 - dignity

“We love this country too.
We just want to be respected within it.”

12. Where This Leads Next

This session sets up the **foundational question**:

If Canada refuses to recognize Indigenous law,
how can true self-government ever exist?

That is where the next conversation goes.

Coming Next: Indigenous Law

- Law before Canada
- Law outside colonial courts
- Law as relationship, responsibility, balance
- The missing pillar of reconciliation