

Listening for More (Hi)Stories from the Arctic's Dispersed and Diverse Educational Past

Heather E. McGregor

ABSTRACT

As the widespread and deep impressions left on the Canadian North by the residential school system come to light, it is also important to continue examining educational policies alongside the experiences of students throughout a range of schooling sites and forms. Such research on Inuit schooling has been insufficient. I argue that more detailed educational histories of the federal and early territorial school systems should feature local and regional variability in implementation of policy and in student experience. Illuminating the inconsistent and multifaceted ways education affected communities in the past, particularly for teachers new to the North, serves to illustrate the ways education in the present necessitates decolonizing.

RÉSUMÉ

Alors que les marques profondes laissées par le système d'écoles résiduelles du Nord canadien refont surface, il est important de poursuivre l'étude des politiques en matière d'éducation en parallèle avec les expériences vécues par les élèves dans des lieux et des contextes d'instruction variés. Dans le cas des Inuits, cette recherche fut incomplète. L'auteure avance qu'il faut approfondir les études sur l'implication du gouvernement fédéral dans les premiers systèmes d'éducation dans les Territoires. Ces travaux devraient prendre en compte les disparités locales et régionales ainsi que les expériences des élèves. En mettant l'accent sur les contradictions et les différents impacts causés par l'éducation dans ces communautés dans le passé, et notamment sur les enseignants sans expérience de la vie nordique, cela permettrait de trouver des manières pour décoloniser l'éducation de nos jours.

Bringing the Past into the Present

With the events, processes, and reports of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC), unprecedented public attention has been drawn to the history of Indigenous education in this country. Those involved within and around the TRC recommend that increased awareness of this issue be sustained in Canada's public schools by teaching about histories and memories of residential schools.¹ In fact, prior to this TRC recommendation for curriculum in all jurisdictions, the Departments of Education in Nunavut and the Northwest Territories (NWT) had arranged a partnership with the Legacy of Hope Foundation to develop a curriculum module focused

on the history of residential schools.² Including this topic in high school programs is more than just a gesture towards a difficult chapter in Canada's history. Canada's territories have the highest per capita rate of residential schools attendance.³ As well, in a national survey, Northerners were found to be most likely to strongly believe that individual Canadians have a role to play in reconciliation.⁴ Focusing on northern stories about the educational past, and connecting them with the Canadian history of colonization and contemporary movement towards reconciliation and decolonization, is intended to help students better understand their families, communities, and country.

The result is a grade 10 social studies module entitled *The Residential School System in Canada: Understanding the Past—Seeking Reconciliation—Building Hope for Tomorrow*.⁵ It represents northern perspectives on residential schools for northern audiences; compares the context of Canadian policy to implementation of that policy in the Arctic; features Inuit and First Nations experiences and cultural references; develops social studies thinking skills in students; and engages them in contemporary discourse and actions tied to the legacies of residential schooling.⁶ It also aims to make instruction of this difficult topic more accessible for northern teachers.

In this article, I link the development of this residential schools history education module in the NWT and Nunavut with two lines of inquiry. The first is the history itself: the unusual history of education, including, but not limited to, residential schools in the NWT and what is now Nunavut. The second—albeit brief—line of inquiry links residential schools history education with contemporary educational goals in Nunavut, goals that have been shaped and conditioned by this very history. The NWT and Nunavut were one jurisdiction during most of this history (until 1999),⁷ and collaborated closely on development of the residential schools history education module (2010–2012). However, the emphasis in this article is on Inuit students and communities in what is now Nunavut. This is partially because of my own expertise and partially because the TRC designated Inuit residential schools experiences as a separate sub-commission, “[i]n recognition of the unique cultures of the Inuit, and the experiences and impacts of residential schools on them...”⁸

I was directly involved in this curriculum development project as a writer and facilitator on contract with the Nunavut Department of Education, collaborating with a team of colleagues from the NWT and Nunavut governments. Elsewhere I have contributed to documenting the history of Inuit education in the Eastern Arctic using evidence from a variety of Inuit and non-Inuit sources and perspectives.⁹ In that work and at that time I did not feel I was prepared, nor well suited, to enter into detailed documentation of residential schools. This article, and the contributions I made to the curriculum development project, reflect the steps I am taking to address that gap, according to the strengths and perspective I bring to research and education. However, my role in the curriculum development project was not *primarily* as an historical researcher. Rather, as tends to happen in northern work, my other useful skills were exercised as much, if not more, than my academic perspective. I helped the team to consider historical thinking in designing activities, to draft the background information and pedagogical considerations for teachers, and to copy edit the work. I also helped to organize and facilitate the teacher-training workshop on the module,

delivered in Yellowknife for all grade 10 social studies educators in both territories.¹⁰

Whatever role I take—as historian, educator, or copyeditor—I am interested in sharing not only the stories of schooling in the past, but also stories of the important history and memory work occurring in the Arctic now, such as through this curriculum development project. As Marie Wilson, TRC Commissioner and Northerner from Yellowknife, has commented, “I am so very proud that it is our northern elected leadership and our northern schools who are taking steps to make this residential school content become mandatory learning for all high school students. We can all be hopeful that the rest of the country will be inspired to do the same.”¹¹ By contributing to documenting the past and conditions that have shaped schools as they are today, I try to acknowledge my responsibility for participating in decolonizing in accordance with the steps called for by Indigenous Northerners.¹²

There are northern stories about the educational past that do not fit into the categories, narratives, and generalizations increasingly familiar to Canadians about residential schools policies and experiences in southern Canada.¹³ As Jennifer Hunt-Poitras, responsible for conducting the TRC Inuit sub-commission, told me, “We came across many stories that don’t fit into the definition of residential school experiences according to the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement.”¹⁴ This raises important questions: which histories are of most worth for northern Indigenous communities in teaching about the educational past? Might some histories be left out when we use the organizing category “residential schools”?

Facing the paucity of sources available, the curriculum development team working on providing northern students with histories of residential schools decided to collect several additional narratives from former students and survivors. The need to conduct original research to supplement what can be found in published sources is typical of the process of developing locally and culturally responsive education resources in northern Canada. It also provided an important opportunity to engage in conversations with Northerners about what they would like students to learn about residential schools. Many former students and survivors emphasized that they would like the greatest breadth of stories to be included, that all stories—positive, negative, or anything in between—should be available to the students. For example, Edna Elias, a former student of Sir Alexander Mackenzie school in Inuvik, and present Commissioner of Nunavut, notes that,

I think we need to make sure that the stories the students learn are well-balanced and from all perspectives, like, the church’s perspective, the government’s perspective, parents perspective, parents that went and parents that didn’t send, or refused to send their kids to school, from students themselves, children that had parents that went to residential school.¹⁵

Not *all* stories or perspectives could be included in the curriculum module on the history of residential schools, but that was a guiding intention. The work of creating more representative narratives about the educational past is not complete and ideally should continue with the participation of Northerners.¹⁶ I also hope to illuminate the

inconsistent and multifaceted ways education affected individuals and communities in the past, in alignment with the recent initiative to reach an audience of contemporary teachers and students. It is important for scholars, teachers, and students to consider that just as Nunavut's dispersed communities are significantly distinct from one another and characterized by local particularities that can seldom be generalized, so too were the histories of education in each of these places. This, I argue, also illustrates the multifaceted ways education in the present necessitates decolonizing. I understand decolonizing in the context of the Nunavut school system as deliberately, inclusively and continuously reflecting on stories from the past that have shaped Nunavut schools as we find them today, and using those stories to inform new decisions about shaping schools to better fit with their communities, attending in particular to Indigenous knowledge, language and self-determination.

Existing Literature

The existing literature on Inuit experiences at residential schools is scarce. Following a brief introduction to what are, for the most part, secondary sources, I show how this literature might be put to use, and combined with other primary and secondary sources that are forthcoming.

In 1964 the anthropologist Diamond Jenness published the second volume of his Eskimo Administration series. It focused on education and seriously criticized the Canadian federal government for its ongoing neglect towards Inuit.¹⁷ John Milloy devotes a short chapter to northern residential schools in his book *A National Crime*; however, it focuses on archival sources, the government perspective, and non-Indigenous commentators, without much attention to Inuit views.¹⁸ David Paul King's masters research, later partially published in a report for the Aboriginal Healing Foundation, constitutes the most detailed history of Inuit experience at residential schools.¹⁹ King points out that even the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples did not pursue a detailed analysis of Inuit residential school experiences.²⁰ Anthony Di Mascio and Leigh Hortop-Di Mascio provide a brief historical case study of residential schooling in Aklavik, NWT, referring to All Saints' Residential School (Anglican) and Immaculate Conception Residential School (Catholic), which were attended by Inuit students.²¹ They focus on the intentions of school authorities and processes of acculturation. The authors recognize that the "voices of the masses of children cycled through the school is conspicuously absent" from archival records and their own work, and they note that an oral history would "help rectify this imbalance."²² Some Inuit oral histories are available through the Legacy of Hope Foundation production *We Were So Far Away*, an educational exhibition and accompanying book that feature testimony of eight survivors from each of the four Inuit regions of Canada, combined with archival and recent photographs.²³ For the history of early day schools under federal and territorial administration, there is my own work,²⁴ as well as Macpherson's *Dreams & Visions*, which provides a collection of reprinted archives, documents, letters, and journal entries regarding formal education in the NWT from the earliest schools to the 1980s.²⁵

There are two collections of Inuit residential school testimonies that will soon become available to potential researchers. Putting these memories to use in historical narratives will raise many complex ethical and logistical considerations. The first new collection of sources comes from the TRC Inuit Sub-commission, which holds approximately 1,000 statements from northern survivors of residential schools and their families. Much of the testimony has not yet been translated or transcribed in English. As soon as the report of the Inuit sub-commission and testimony collected by the TRC is available, the research I have begun here could most certainly be expanded and improved upon.

The other collection comes from the Qikiqtani Truth Commission (QTC), a regional truth and reconciliation initiative conducted in Nunavut from 2008 to 2010 and focused on many experiences of colonization between 1950 and 1975.²⁶ The mandate of the QTC was not specifically the collection of residential school histories because of overlap with the TRC process.²⁷ However, schools do come up in the proceedings, particularly in the chapter “Illinniarniq: Schooling in Qikiqtaaluk” in the final thematic report of the QTC. While I utilize the secondary reports by QTC in this paper, much more could likely be written with greater access to the testimonials. According to the QTC, they have “developed a database to catalogue all the archival and oral history information collected.”²⁸ The database includes transcripts, translations, and audio/video materials. A final repository and format are still being determined.

With more evidence available, especially memoirs contributed by survivors, former students, and those affected intergenerationally, more detailed educational histories of the federal and early territorial school systems will be possible. The consultation that would be necessary to go about this work in ways that reflect the imperatives and desires of Northerners cannot be underestimated. Also, such work should consider local and regional variability in implementation of policy, and in variability of student experiences. This article provides a high-level overview of the context within which more specific studies may be based.

Inuit Histories with Federal Schools

Whereas the Indian residential school system began in the mid-19th century, Inuit over the age of 70 living today did not participate in the formal education system, nor did they have the opportunity should they have wanted it. In the early decades of the 20th century traditional Inuit childrearing and education took place much as it had in the Arctic for centuries.

After World War II, concern for Canadian sovereignty and interest in northern resource development, together with secondary consideration for Inuit welfare, led the federal government—reluctantly—to begin to intervene in the lives of Inuit through provision of social services, including education.²⁹ Frank Tester and Peter Irniq³⁰ have asserted: “There is likely no other group of indigenous people in the world that has made such a transition—from scattered hunting camps to settlements steeped in the organizational logic and material realities of high modernism—in

such a short time (from ca. 1955 to 1965).³¹ The comparatively short colonial period, fast pace of change, and the era in which this change was experienced sets Inuit history apart from First Nations and Métis peoples. However, this did not spare Inuit from the cultural and social disruption, and appropriation of their lands, imposed through colonization on Indigenous peoples in Canada.

According to King, in 1949, 111 Inuit students were enrolled in residential schools.³² Most of those students were from the western NWT, attending school in Aklavik at Immaculate Conception (opened in 1925) or, more likely given their religious affiliation, All Saints' (as of 1936). Di Mascio and Hortop-Di Mascio argue that these schools were, not surprisingly, "saturated with Euro-Canadian values."³³ A few missionary-run seasonal schools existed in the Eastern Arctic in the early 1950s, in Kugluktuk (formerly Coppermine), Cape Dorset, Coral Harbour, Apex.³⁴ King has documented that prior to 1955 less than 15% of school-aged Inuit were enrolled in schools.³⁵ In that year, the federal government belatedly announced policy to oversee the education of Inuit children. Ottawa developed schooling through a matrix of different sites and forms, amidst infrastructure challenges, limited budgets, and other variables characterizing emergent Arctic communities (including the advocacy of local individuals). These forms included public schools, schools run by mining companies, church-run schools, and removal of students to attend schools in southern Canada.

This was, notably, after the 1948 federal transition towards integration and steps towards ending the residential school system for Indigenous students in southern Canada. Milloy emphasizes that in the northern context, the *intent* of the government was not to replicate the southern system. The Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources "was under no illusion about either the physical condition or the efficacy of the existing residential schools."³⁶ Instead, it was expected that a "multicultural" school system serving all residents of the Arctic, in which some students would reside in hostels, would be erected under appropriate government supervision and standards. Indeed the schools were considered "federal day schools" even though most students who attended were separated from their families and required to live in hostels.³⁷ However, Milloy argues, "within the northern system, in its classrooms and residence halls, assimilation was the norm. The rhetoric of cultural sensitivity and preservation was not in the end matched by the reality of the system."³⁸ The clearest case of inconsistency in implementation of this supposedly new educational policy was at Chesterfield Inlet, where operating funds for the day school came from the federal government, but the Roman Catholic church and grey nuns oversaw schooling and accommodations under conditions hardly distinguishable from the southern residential school model.³⁹ This was the school from which the greatest number of accusations, and convictions, of abuse emerged.

During this time, Inuit were primarily placed in four federal schools. The Catholic missionary school in Chesterfield Inlet—Joseph Bernier Federal Day School with its hostel, Turquetil Hall—had already been operating for a few years. It was transferred to federal authority in 1954. Within a year of opening the school had enrolled 100 students from around the Kivalliq and north Qikiqtani regions; overcrowding was a

perpetual problem in the school and hostel for the duration of its operation.⁴⁰ The conditions of education and school policy at Joseph Bernier were largely determined by the Catholic missionary organization and underfunding by the government.⁴¹

Sir John Franklin School in Yellowknife opened in 1958 with the only federally run (non-denominational) hostel at the time.⁴² At the Sir Alexander Mackenzie school in Inuvik, opened in 1959, there were two hostels: Grollier Hall (Catholic), and Stringer Hall (Anglican). Lastly, Churchill Vocational Centre, a non-denominational training centre and hostel, opened in 1964. Twenty-two community day schools for the elementary grades were built in what is now Nunavut during the late 1950s and 1960s, ending with Repulse Bay in 1968 and Nanisivik (a mining settlement) in 1976.⁴³ While schools were being built, students from outlying areas might be flown into nearby communities or regional centres. QTC's archival research shows that only four communities in the eastern region (Qikiqtani) were offering schooling beyond grade 6 in 1970.⁴⁴

Inuit parents' views on whether or not their children should attend school—residential or day school—and what their education should entail, were generally not taken into consideration.⁴⁵ Inuit parents were often reluctant to be away from their children, and would move into communities (instead of staying on the land) if it meant they could be together with children attending day schools.⁴⁶ Whether or not this motivation for prolonged settlement was an *intended* outcome of the federal policy-makers is of some debate, but that it was a “major catalyst” resulting in settlement is clear.⁴⁷ Thomas Kublu of Igloodik describes being ordered to settle in Pond Inlet, so that his children could attend school in the new community, in 1962:

When the authorities like the police and Social and Family Services officials ordered us to move to Pond Inlet, we had no say and we had to comply with the orders from the authorities. We feared going against their orders and were scared of the authorities. This was the case with all Qallunaat who held the power and positions in the new settlement life.⁴⁸

Peter Hyde was involved in picking students up by plane from Inuit camps to attend school in Cambridge Bay. He wrote, in retrospect, about the intimidation involved in this process: “While it was never mentioned at the time, having the nurse and the RCMP on the same plane must have been intimidating for the parents, and certainly no parent refused to hand their children over.”⁴⁹ The level of intimidation and fear felt by Inuit in interactions with non-Inuit bureaucrats has been well documented. According to the QTC, “Both the written and Inuit testimony show that most Inuit had reason to believe that they would lose family allowances if they did not send their children to school. This was a very serious threat indeed, since family allowances had become essential to the survival of many families.”⁵⁰

The experiences of many Inuit students who attended federal schools were similar to those of students in southern Canada: separation from families for extended periods, against the wishes of parents; shaming and penalties associated with using Inuit language; poor living conditions including overcrowding and malnutrition; and

many other forms of abuse and cultural assimilation.⁵¹ The outcomes are also similar: missed opportunities to learn subsistence skills necessary for life on the land; inter-generational effects of emotional, physical and sexual abuse; and damage to family relationships and lack of knowledge about parenting skills.⁵² Reflecting on testimony at the QTC, James Igloliorte asserts, “Many parents felt guilty that they had made the wrong decision by sending their children to school, since the education they received left them ill-prepared for a life of self-reliance and self-determination in either the modern wage economy or the traditional economy.”⁵³ As I have shown, many parents felt they had little choice in sending the children to school, and yet still carried the weight of responsibility for their children’s wellbeing and future. Few characteristics or activities of traditional Inuit education were employed by non-Indigenous educators at the early federal schools. Very little about school was familiar or culturally affirming for Inuit students, and the harsh imposition of English could be very difficult. Marius Tungalik remembers:

We were told that we were Eskimos. We did not amount to anything. The only way we could succeed was to learn the English way of life. So in that sense it was psychologically degrading as well. We were made to hate our own people, basically, our own kind. We looked down on them because they did not know how to count in English, speak English or read or any of those things that we were now able to do. That’s sick.⁵⁴

Some students left as survivors of various forms of neglect, abuse, and trauma. Piita Irniq, a survivor of Joseph Bernier School, has said:

Even if we had someone to run to, no one would have believed us at that time. We were so far away from our homes and families. Some of our teachers and caregivers at the schools abused us in every way they could. This abuse was physical, mental and sexual. Those who did not participate in the abuse appeared not to know anything was wrong. Instead of protecting us, they protected each other.⁵⁵

Eighty-six investigations of sexual assault allegations at Joseph Bernier School resulted in 13 charges against three priests and 41 charges against one civilian.⁵⁶ While I have not pursued extensive evidence regarding the differences between residency at Catholic and Anglican institutions, it does seem that student reports of Grollier Hall in Inuvik and Joseph Bernier school are worse than Anglican student reports. Edna Elias, who was assigned to an Anglican hostel, speculates:

I think the big difference that made it a much more positive experience is because I was in the Anglican system. We hear so much of the horror stories happened in the Catholic system. You know, all the abuse, sexual abuse and those types of stories, although I witnessed and heard stories of mistreatment and punishment in the Anglican system by supervisors.⁵⁷

Exceptional Aspects of School Histories

Despite the foregoing evidence of similarities with difficult experiences in residential schools elsewhere in Canada, there are great variations in Arctic histories of education. The following are examples that do not neatly fit into generalizations usually attached to the constructs of residential schooling, and that might be left out without greater consideration for the inconsistency of policy and experience.

Small Hostels and Territorial Hostels

Some Inuit families in the Western Arctic may include two generations of attendees, but for the most part only one generation attended federal schools and federal hostels. Apart from the large hostels at Chesterfield Inlet, Inuvik, Yellowknife, and Churchill, there were small hostels that accommodated up to 24 students each, in at least 12 other communities.⁵⁸ Small hostels were appealing to the federal government because of their relatively low cost and capital investment, and they could be closed for a year if only a few students enrolled. There was a perception that Inuit parents would prefer to see children housed under supervision by local Inuit hostel managers, to whom they might be related.⁵⁹ According to Mosesee Qappik, who testified at the QTC, he and his wife hosted eight children for a three-year period and loved them as though they were their own.⁶⁰

Many federal day schools were built to accommodate students up to grade 6, so to pursue further schooling it was necessary to go to Yellowknife, Churchill (1964–74), or after 1971, the Gordon Roberson Education Centre in Iqaluit. Some students who had been at Churchill Vocational Centre immediately before it was closed were offered the opportunity to go to school in Ottawa and billet with a family to complete their last years of high school.⁶¹ In 1969–1970, administration of schools was formally transferred to the government of the NWT from the federal government. Due to several factors, students were required to continue attending high schools located in regional centres and live in hostels administered by the territory. These reasons included: lack of school infrastructure; challenges hiring high school teachers; low or inconsistent numbers of high school students in each community; the transitions and supports required by students moving into academic high school courses (many with Alberta exams); and, the perceptions of educational administrators that students would benefit from vocational education and a greater range of course options than could be offered in smaller locations. Peter Hyde, principal of the school in Taloyoak, remembers:

The raising of the available grades [in smaller communities] was not welcomed with warmth by the Department or by the high schools. Questions were raised regarding educational standards, inadequately trained/qualified teachers, inability to offer specialist subjects, lack of sports facilities, the need for students to 'experience the real world' etc. Then there was the question of accreditation; the NWT high school program at that time followed the Alberta curriculum and it was thought that a settlement school would never be able to meet Alberta accreditation criteria.⁶²

Peter Hyde also comments that where students were sent away to school on a year-to-year basis, and where they were housed, was inconsistent and not based on clear policy: "In some years we didn't know where the students would be going until the last minute, and in one year we had students in Yellowknife, Inuvik and Fort Simpson, although it was never clear who made that decision, or why."⁶³

The first territorial hostel in the Qikiqtani region opened in Iqaluit in 1971. It was affiliated with the Gordon Robertson Education Centre—a junior and senior high school and vocational education centre (later called Inuksuk High School). As with CVC, the government again made use of old military facilities, placing students in Ukkivik residence, far from town and the school. The education centre offered some progressive programming and was relatively closer than Churchill, Ottawa, or Yellowknife for Eastern Arctic families. In other ways it was of concern to parents: "Iqaluit had a poor reputation among Inuit as a disorderly community, with problems with violence, drugs, alcohol, and other abuses."⁶⁴ Students frequently left school before graduation during this era. This territorial hostel system had far fewer reported incidents of student mistreatment, although through personal communications I have heard many students remember it as difficult to be away from parents, family, and their home community.

In the 1980s a few larger communities introduced their own high school programs. For example, the school in Pangnirtung offered its first grade 10 in 1979 and then graduated its first grade 12 students in 1988.⁶⁵ It was not until 1995 that the government directed every community to implement high school. For example, students from Taloyoak did not have the opportunity to finish grade 12 at home until 1997.⁶⁶ It took until 2005 for all Nunavut communities to have grades 10–12 in their school, and the smallest communities were the last to achieve this mandate. Again, it can be seen that policy, educational opportunities, and experiences in different Nunavut communities have been inconsistent and were significantly affected by local factors.

Integration and Non-Indigenous Student Experiences

One significant difference from many southern residential schools was that northern schools and hostels were theoretically integrated, accepting Indigenous and non-Indigenous students, although the non-Indigenous student population was smaller. Recognition of non-Indigenous student attendance at residential schools appears to be virtually non-existent within the residential schools literature and public discourse in Canada. It is important to note that the reasons for non-Indigenous students attending northern residential schools, and their experiences there, vary considerably. Some may have been the children of the schoolteachers, others were the children of staff working at oil rigs (for example in Norman Wells), or whose parents worked in remote communities without grades 7–12 education available. According to Milloy, in 1964 there were 957 Indian and Inuit children accommodated in large hostels, as well as 195 white and Métis children.⁶⁷

I have found one residential school narrative by Janet Tamalik McGrath. She has non-Inuit heritage and parents, but was raised in Inuit culture and speaks Inuktitut

fluently. In 1972 she was sent from Taloyoak with her sister to attend school in Inuvik and live at Stringer Hall, an 1800-mile journey from home. At the time, grades 7 through 12 could not be completed in the Taloyoak day school. According to McGrath, they witnessed and endured the same poor conditions, abuse, and lack of communication with their parents typical of residential schools.⁶⁸ She explains that when the mail she sent to her parents began arriving already opened, and her father inquired into this with the education authorities, his job security as an economic and community development officer was threatened.⁶⁹ However, after only one semester at Stringer Hall the children from Taloyoak were allowed to return home, through the advocacy of parents and a combination of circumstances that McGrath does not entirely know. After that, Peter Hyde, the principal of the day school, instructed the older students in a classroom they created in the RCMP's dog harness shed, extending the available grades to 9. Later, McGrath also resided at Akaitcho Hall in Yellowknife while attending Sir John Franklin High School.

In retrospect, McGrath says, reading her letters from the time of attending residential schools, "I could see the great resilience of children along with the confusion and despair. I could also see that this is where my passion for words on a page developed. Writing bears witness."⁷⁰ McGrath says that even as a child she knew she was lucky to have not been sent to Inuvik at a younger age, or for a five-year stretch, as happened to other children. Now, however, McGrath continues to be caught in the complexity and constraints of identity politics. She told me that she has struggled with using her own voice in making sense of this experience of assimilation, which is not easily explained or understood along conventional ethnic, or even cultural, lines:

As a "non-native" residential school survivor, I can say that it was a good education in power abuses over native communities, families and psyches—(and devastating to my own family)—but it doesn't help that there is a native/non-native dichotomy that on some level prohibits me from having a voice at all, resents I would have a voice, or I become a rare spectacle—telling my story (or trying to) has left me more disconnected than connected, and reconnection is what is sought in telling the story.⁷¹

This is evidence that the narrative of exclusively white settlers perpetrating violence on exclusively Indigenous peoples through required attendance at residential schools cannot simply be transplanted to the Arctic, and cannot entirely account for the stories of education held by Arctic students and survivors. Rather, it is a story of relations of power in education that is exceedingly more nuanced and requires substantially more consideration than it has received.

Tent Schools and Hostels

There were several experiments with itinerant teaching and tent facilities across the Arctic before, and in some cases even after, permanent school infrastructure was established. What the QTC calls the "Cape Dorset Experiment" was pursued by a teacher named Margery Hinds, apparently on her own accord.⁷² Opposed to hostels

that separated families, Hinds decided not to expect children to come to the school, but rather undertook to visit Inuit families on the land with her own supplies and set up school wherever she was. Then, the QTC report explains, “When she returned to the settlement, she welcomed eager students who came with their parents to have work corrected and new assignments sent out.”⁷³ In similar fashion, Eva Aariak, former minister of education and premier of Nunavut, shared her memory of “a very dedicated teacher” named Lorne Smith, who travelled on weekends to visit and teach children in camps outside Arctic Bay, and then taught in the school during the week.⁷⁴

In Kugluktuk in 1955, a tent hostel was opened as an experiment to increase the accessibility of education through co-operation between the Anglican church and federal government. Tents housed youth from the region between April and August. Traditional foods were prepared whenever possible and some classes were held on traditional skills and in the Inuit language.⁷⁵ The Anglican Church of Canada describes the arrangement as follows:

The hostel complex had capacity for 30 children (28 actually registered) and they were billeted in 8 tents, erected in a semi-permanent fashion with wood floors and wood half walls and warmed by oil heaters. Each tent accommodated four children, who slept on camp cots. Preparation of meals (in large separate tent) and supervision of children were the responsibility of the Anglican Church, through its associated organization, the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada (MSCC). However, formal responsibility for the Coppermine Hostel rested with the Diocese of the Arctic. The Indian School Administration, an agency of MSCC, managed this facility and most of the other Church-run hostels and residential schools throughout Canada. The missionary-in-charge at Coppermine, Rev. J.R. Sperry, selected eligible students. During his absence in 1956, the Day School principal carried out this task. Among the criteria for admittance, children were to be preferably Inuit and between the ages of 9 and 13; live outside Coppermine but not more than 80 km from the settlement (expanded in later years); be in good health; and be of the Anglican or other Protestant faith.⁷⁶

Following staff complaints about their own lodgings and working conditions, under-enrolment of students, lack of supplies, fire hazards, and equipment failures, as well as concern that a 5-month school year was inadequate for properly educating students, the tent hostel was closed by the federal government in 1959. Students were then boarded out in the community to attend the local federal day school, or sent to the new Stringer Hall Anglican hostel at Inuvik.

To get a sense of how education changed and developed in one community, it is interesting to consider the case of Kugluktuk. Following the tent hostel experiment, the federal day school employed two teachers who delivered grades 1 through 5 to 49 students.⁷⁷ By 1970 the student population had grown to 216 in grades 1 through 8, and 10 teachers were employed. In 1973 a school extension was built to

provide library, gymnasium, industrial arts, and home economics facilities. Students who wanted to attend high school went to Sir John Franklin and stayed at Akaitcho Hall. The first two students to graduate from high school at home in Kugluktuk did so in 1990–91.⁷⁸

Positive Experiences

Some former students of federal schools and residences felt their education was a positive skill-building and social experience, and were clear that such stories should be shared publicly in Nunavut. Piita Irniq, for example, has spoken of the benefit of receiving an education, even under the conditions at Joseph Bernier school in Chesterfield Inlet:

One of the things that I would like to state clearly, and I would like to be understood clearly, is that my generation of Inuit who went to Turquetil Hall at Sir Joseph Bernier Federal Day School have never said anything negative about the education system that we got. If anything, we have said the school that we attended, the education system that we got in English was a top-notch education system. We all became leaders in the end. We endured a lot. We had a commitment. As much as that particular teacher used to call us bloody dodos and no good for nothing, a bunch of hounds of iniquity, he taught us pretty good in terms of English. But those were the pretty good things that happened to us in terms of getting our education...⁷⁹

For some students, their education became an advantage in pursuing their own vision for life in the Arctic, including pursuing the Nunavut land claim and self-government. Such testimonies are most frequently associated with attending Churchill Vocational Centre (CVC). After locations in the NWT were considered, the school was placed in Churchill because the Canadian military decided to pull out of its existing base at Fort Churchill and the facilities were available.⁸⁰ CVC was attended by Inuit of the Eastern Arctic (including students from Nunavik) who stayed in school through their senior years during the late 1960s. Sheila Watt-Cloutier explains that, “the three years I spent there were good. It is true that the CVC was part of the federal government’s plan to culturally deprogram and reprogram Inuit children of the Arctic, but that particular school was run by good people.”⁸¹ She elaborates by describing the school program as oriented towards “improving ourselves: our confidence, our stature, and how we spoke and acted and portrayed ourselves.”⁸² Eva Aariak remembers with fondness being taught Inuktitut at CVC by Jose Kusugak, and she attributes skills she has used in her career to the positive experiences and education she received at CVC.⁸³

In my view, it is not coincidental that those who attended CVC are many of the same individuals who began the movement for political autonomy, leadership positions in Inuit advocacy organizations, and the Nunavut land claim. Sheila Watt-Cloutier notes that while “political discussion at the school” was not common, “many of today’s Inuit leaders went to Churchill” and “it was a blessing to be with

two hundred other fellow Inuit students from all over Nunavik and Nunavut.”⁸⁴ According to another former Nunavut leader, John Amagoalik, being together at CVC offered Inuit students the opportunity to envision a different future, and the path toward change: “We spent a lot of time discussing how we were going to change the Arctic.”⁸⁵ Rhoda Innuksuk, another former CVC student, explains why this was important in that particular era:

It helped to prepare us for the changes coming to the North. That was important because it was difficult for our parents to foresee a future without Inuit guiding us; they didn't know where we were heading. After a while, it was hard for our parents to guide us at all, because we had become a different breed. We were like a different tribe altogether, speaking a different language and thinking differently.⁸⁶

The social, cultural, and linguistic changes initiated by schools in the Arctic, and their impact on Indigenous families, are evident in Innuksuk's description. Whether or not former CVC students speak of learning to “change the Arctic” at CVC, most who have shared their stories remember positive experiences, development of useful life skills that led to employment, and opportunities to meet friends, formerly distant relations, and future partners. Their comments seem to convey pragmatism about learning to navigate the intense change underway in the Arctic, some sense of finding their own way between the past and the future to which they were being called. Memories of CVC as a place where hope and strategies for reclaiming Inuit self-determination were born provides an important perspective on residential schools, one that adds complexity to the sometimes simplified equation between the residential nature of a school and inherent damage to students. Rather, it was more often the lack of choice to attend residential school, as well as the assimilationist and abusive policies and practices in those schools, that profoundly affected students and their parents.

“Experimental Eskimos”

The documentary film *The Experimental Eskimos* tells the story of three Inuit youth—Peter Ittinuar, Zebedee Nungak (from Nunavik), and Eric Tagoona—who were removed from the Arctic in 1962 to live with southern Christian families and attend school in Ottawa as part of a federal initiative to educate the North's “best and brightest” “on par” with other Canadian children.⁸⁷ Peter Ittinuar's experience is also recounted in his biography.⁸⁸ The film clearly demonstrates this was an intentionally experimental policy facilitated and monitored by the federal government and that the children's parents were “not really asked about this. They were just told.”⁸⁹ Ittinuar explains that initially he was excited about going to Ottawa, but the longer-term results for the three individuals featured in the film were mixed. These included significant loneliness, cultural displacement and loss of social acceptance within their families and communities during the experience, as well as anger, substance abuse, failed relationships, or periods of unemployment as adults. With the education they

received, however, all three individuals took up leadership roles in Inuit organizations and government at different times of their careers.

Itinuar, Nungak and Tagoona were not the only students sent out of the Arctic to live with families in southern Canada. For example, Sheila Watt-Cloutier recounts being sent with Lizzie Saunders to Nova Scotia when they were 10 years old. Watt-Cloutier says that:

we cried non-stop for two weeks because of our homesickness. We were told that our letters home would be screened and censored, which was very inhibiting. Later on in my life, there were times when I had to get past that old fear of expressing my real views about things. It was the kind of experience that affects you for a long time, but it taught me to be courageous and to overcome trauma.⁹⁰

This educational experiment is the starkest illustration of the exceptional circumstances some Inuit experienced in the course of their schooling at the hands of a government still in pursuit of assimilation.

Educational Histories and Decolonizing Arctic Schools

Children from Canada's northern-most territories had experiences with schools that show a variety and complexity that cannot, nor should be, easily generalized or encapsulated by increasingly common notions associated with the term "residential schools" in southern Canada. In the Arctic, the federal school system was implemented later than elsewhere in Canada, included day schools and residential schools with a range of hostel sizes and types, and offered diverse educational experiences that are remembered as sometimes extremely dislocating for students and at other times offering positive outcomes. Student enrolment and educational trajectory was not consistent, some students were removed to southern schools, and some non-Indigenous students were placed in residential schools. Looking deeper into the educational past we would find further inconsistencies in influences from the churches, and parent or community leadership and advocacy, producing different local conditions for schooling. No less important to study are the experimental federal programs, differing types of abuse perpetrated on children and youth, assimilative intentions, and the intergenerational impacts of these painful experiences. Engaging with local histories must also extend beyond the period of federal administration of schooling. Taking a closer and longer view of these early experiments, unevenness and dispersal in school implementation may show ongoing inconsistencies under territorial school administration.⁹¹

Arctic peoples were widely dispersed over a huge area, so it is interesting to note the way schools brought youth together from across the Arctic at an important time in the history of colonization. This networking, community building, and the solidarity it produced in political movements towards land claims is perhaps one of the most significant northern legacies of residential schooling. Another important

implication of this history is expressed poignantly by the QTC:

In the 1950 to 1975 period, public schools in Qikiqtaaluk [Baffin Island] gave the luckiest students, including many Inuit leaders, access to new knowledge and skills, while also retaining Inuktitut language skills and remaining fully in touch with Inuit knowledge and practices. When this happened, however, the school system played no part—it was due to the efforts of Elders, parents, and individual teachers, or to exceptional personal strengths.⁹²

Historical inquiry must support research into education that continued to occur outside of schools, in families and communities, and in resistance to the imposition of Eurocentric, settler colonial imperatives. Those efforts—the preservation and promotion of language, knowledge and culture by Indigenous peoples and their allies—made possible the alternatives that are now called for, and advanced, in northern schools.⁹³

In the development of the grade 10 curriculum module, the governments in Nunavut and NWT have worked towards taking some responsibility for the legacy of federally- and territorially-administered residential school policies and hostel experiences for northern students, by making more stories of the educational past accessible through grade 10 history education. The writing team working on this project undertook original research: they collected, edited, and shared 17 stories of former students, at the same time consulting with these “Northern wise people” about what they thought students should learn about residential schools.⁹⁴ This history education initiative is in alignment with interim recommendations of the TRC, as well as the Nunavut-based QTC.⁹⁵ Former students and survivors from the NWT and Nunavut advocate for teaching these histories, despite some reluctance in the past to share difficult stories with youth, lest such stories become a burden on them.⁹⁶ As John Amagoalik articulates clearly, the purpose of teaching such histories is not only to blame or grieve, but to appreciate the steps taken by Indigenous leaders and communities towards decolonizing and revitalizing the Arctic:

...our children must learn of this dark period in Canada's history. It must be part of our national school curriculum. They should also learn of our recent history of constitutional and land claims negotiations with our governments and the agreements we have signed which future generations can use as our people recover from the colonial past.⁹⁷

This work is crucial, but it would benefit from increased community mobilization in documenting other school histories that are distinct from the “residential schools” narrative as it has been defined elsewhere in Canada or through the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement. While the curriculum development project has led the way in offering source material on which to base history education, more research will be made possible as the testimony of Northerners through the TRC and QTC become available. This research must reflect the conditions of Arctic

educational history, which differ from those elsewhere in Canada.

Increasing the educational histories available to the public, and particularly to teachers working in the Nunavut school system, is not primarily about ensuring students know their history, consisting of dates, school names, and numbers of affected individuals.⁹⁸ More importantly, it enhances awareness of how the past informs society—and schooling—in the present and future, to “help our young people move forward into a healthier and more positive future,” according to the ministers of education in Nunavut and the NWT.⁹⁹ That is, studying the educational past helps those involved in schools now to consider how and why decolonizing processes re-centre Indigenous knowledge, language, and culture through new conceptions of curriculum, pedagogy, and educational policy.

The vast majority of students in the Nunavut school system are Inuit. In 2008, the Nunavut government legislated that public school education should be based in foundations of Inuit culture, language, and worldview.¹⁰⁰ To realize such change takes a huge investment in made-in-Nunavut teaching resources and learning materials. The history of education as a colonizing force in the NWT and Nunavut helps to justify why this investment is warranted. To facilitate culturally responsive schooling, all educators—regardless of their ethnicity or where they grew up—require orientation, mentoring, professional development, and support to move away from reproducing the education practices they themselves likely experienced as students or teacher candidates, particularly those that emerge from colonizing and assimilative educational traditions. They also need support to learn and practice what it may mean to teach and learn differently in Nunavut, recognizing the conditions of education that have arisen from the difficult policies and experiences during colonization, as well as the resilience and change enacted through accelerated processes of decolonization. Initiatives such as in-service training associated with implementation of the residential schools history curriculum module can help.¹⁰¹ This work takes time; and it is worth taking the time for it.

To this end, educators’ engagement with educational history cannot be limited to an exposure to academic literature. Local histories, histories that are informed by multiple perspectives, or histories that offer insight into Indigenous worldview must be made more accessible to educators. Elsewhere I have recommended that teachers explore the local history of education as a vehicle and starting point to provide information about what has happened in their community.¹⁰² This would facilitate opportunities for them to meet, listen to, and build relationships with people who have seen education rapidly changing in Nunavut first-hand over the last sixty-five years. Perhaps this article, with the complexity it illustrates, provides another resource. It cannot, however, provide insight as valuable as listening closely to the stories of Northerners—who expect the best education possible for their children, education that allows, and encourages, the next generation to be Northerners themselves.

Notes

- 1 Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada [TRC], *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Interim Report* (Winnipeg: Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2012), 7.
- 2 Some approaches in the Nunavut/NWT module were based on the Legacy of Hope Foundation's, *100 Years of Loss*; however in the development and revision process most components were substantially changed. For more information see Legacy of Hope Foundation, 22 Nov. 2014, <http://www.legacyofhope.ca>.
- 3 TRC, *Interim Report*, 7.
- 4 Environics Research Group, *Final Report: 2008 National Benchmark Survey* (Prepared for Indian Residential Schools Resolution Canada and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2008).
- 5 Nunavut Department of Education and Northwest Territories Department of Education, Culture and Employment [NDE and NWTECE], *The Residential School System in Canada: Understanding the Past—Seeking Reconciliation—Building Hope for Tomorrow*, second ed. (Ottawa: Legacy of Hope Foundation, 2013), 22 Nov. 2014, http://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/files/Early-Childhood/ns_-_residential_schools_resource_-_second_edition.pdf.
- 6 Sarah Daitch, "An Ethical Space for Dialogue about Difficult History: Program Evaluation of a Residential School Education Pilot in Canada's Northwest Territories and Nunavut" (Master of Arts in Dispute Resolution, University of Victoria, School of Public Administration, 2013); Sarah Daitch, "An Ethical Space for Dialogue about Difficult History: Fostering Critical Thinking Amongst Students in Canada's Northwest Territories and Nunavut," *Arctic Yearbook 2014*, ed. L. Heininen, H. Exner-Pirot and J. Plouffe (Akureyri, Iceland: Northern Research Forum, 2014), 44-68, 22 November 2014, www.arcticyearbook.com.
- 7 For more information on the context of territorial division between NWT and Nunavut, particularly regarding education, and Inuit goals for schooling, see Heather E. McGregor, *Inuit Education and Schools in the Eastern Arctic* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 150-72.
- 8 TRC, *Interim Report*, 3.
- 9 McGregor, *Inuit Education and Schools*.
- 10 For more information on this event see Daitch, "An Ethical Space for Dialogue about Difficult History" (2013).
- 11 Message from Marie Wilson in NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*.
- 12 Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010).
- 13 Having reviewed many scholarly articles, reports and documents disseminated to the public and watched a great deal of news coverage, a generalized narrative in plain language goes something like this: Starting a long time ago (and for over 100 years) all Indigenous children were required to attend church-run, government-funded residential schools in Canada. The federal government did not pay attention to what was occurring in the schools, expecting that they could school the Indian out of the child. Children were forcibly taken from their parents and then more often than not subjected to multiple forms of abuse and neglect, and emerged as survivors with a second-class education. They lost their language and culture and perpetuated this loss amongst the following generations.
- 14 Jennifer Hunt Poitras, Personal communication, 24 May 2013.
- 15 NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*, 119.
- 16 This is not to suggest that no community initiatives have been undertaken with respect to educational histories. However, these activities have not produced sustainable or accessible documentation for future teachers, parents and community members.

- 17 Diamond Jenness, *Eskimo Administration: II Canada* (Arctic Institute of North America Technical Paper no. 14, 1964).
- 18 John S. Milloy, *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879 to 1986*, Vol. 11 (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2006; 1999).
- 19 David Paul King, "The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit Located in Chesterfield Inlet, Yellowknife, Inuvik and Churchill, 1955–1970" (MA thesis in Canadian Heritage and Development Studies, Trent University, 1998); David Paul King, *A Brief Report of the Federal Government of Canada's Residential School System for Inuit* (Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2006).
- 20 King, *A Brief Report*, 8.
- 21 Anthony Di Mascio and Leigh Hortop-Di Mascio, "Residential Schooling in the Arctic: A Historical Case Study and Perspective," *Native Studies Review* 20, 2 (2011): 31-49.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 34.
- 23 Legacy of Hope Foundation, *We were so Far Away: The Inuit Experience of Residential Schools* (Ottawa: Legacy of Hope Foundation, 2010).
- 24 McGregor, *Inuit Education and Schools*.
- 25 N. J. Macpherson, *Dreams & Visions: Education in the Northwest Territories from Early Days to 1984* (Yellowknife: Government of the Northwest Territories, 1991).
- 26 Qikiqtani Truth Commission [QTC], *QTC Final Report: Achieving Saimaqatigiingniq* (Iqaluit: Qikiqtani Inuit Association, 2010); Qikiqtani Truth Commission [QTC], *Qikiqtani Truth Commission: Thematic Reports and Special Studies, 1950–1975* (Iqaluit: Inhabit Media, 2013).
- 27 QTC, *Achieving Saimaqatigiingniq*, 6-7.
- 28 QTC, *Thematic Reports and Special Studies*, 390.
- 29 King, *A Brief Report*; Milloy, *A National Crime*.
- 30 Piita Irniq was Commissioner of Nunavut from 2000–2005 and has a national reputation as a speaker and advocate for Nunavut in a number of realms including the history of residential schooling and the promotion of Inuit culture. He changed the spelling of his name from Peter to Piita (more consistent with Inuktitut pronunciation).
- 31 Frank J. Tester and Peter Irniq, "Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit: Social History, Politics and the Practice of Resistance," *Arctic* 61, 4 (2008): 57.
- 32 King, *A Brief Report*, 5.
- 33 Di Mascio and Hortop-Di Mascio, "Residential Schooling in the Arctic," 48.
- 34 Macpherson, *Dreams & Visions*.
- 35 King, *A Brief Report*, 10.
- 36 Milloy, *A National Crime*, 248.
- 37 King, *A Brief Report*, 7.
- 38 Milloy, *A National Crime*, 251.
- 39 King, "The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit"; Peter Irniq, "Mending the Past: Memory and the Politics of Forgiveness," *Naniiliqpita: A Publication of Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.* (2011), 47.
- 40 King, "The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit," 87.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 67-68.
- 42 See W.P.J. Millar, "An Exceedingly Complex Institution," this issue.
- 43 King suggests that by 1964, 75% of the Inuit population between the ages of 6 and 15 were enrolled in schools. This figure seems inconceivably high, and not consistent with the variability in student attendance from year to year, infrastructure development at that time, and the challenges of access to education beyond grade 6 at the time.
- 44 QTC, *Thematic Reports and Special Studies*, 110.
- 45 King, "The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit," 64-65.
- 46 QTC, *Thematic Reports and Special Studies*, 11.
- 47 *Ibid.*, 11.
- 48 QTC, *Achieving Saimaqatigiingniq*, 12.

- 49 Peter Hyde, "Memories, Observations and Thoughts on the Residential School Experience" (Provided by Janet Tamalik McGrath, n.d., accessed 22 May 2013).
- 50 QTC, *Achieving Saimaqtigiingniq*, 18. See also: Frank J. Tester and Peter Keith Kulchyski, *Tammarniit (Mistakes): Inuit Relocation in the Eastern Arctic, 1939–63* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1994).
- 51 Irniq, "Mending the Past"; King, "The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit."
- 52 Legacy of Hope Foundation, *We were so Far Away*.
- 53 Qikiqtani Truth Commission, *Achieving Saimaqtigiingniq*, 20.
- 54 Legacy of Hope Foundation, *We were so Far Away*, 149.
- 55 Irniq, "Mending the Past," 48.
- 56 King, *A Brief Report*, 15.
- 57 NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*, 119.
- 58 Milloy, *A National Crime*; King, "The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit."
- 59 Milloy, *A National Crime*.
- 60 QTC, *Thematic Reports and Special Studies*, 119.
- 61 NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*.
- 62 Hyde, "Memories, Observations and Thoughts."
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 QTC, *Thematic Reports and Special Studies*, 123.
- 65 Heather E. McGregor, *Inuit Qaujimaqtuqangit and the Transformation of High School Education in Nunavut: History, Context and Statistical Profiles of Attagoyuk and Quluqaq Schools* (Iqaluit: ArcticNet, Nunavut Department of Education and Coalition of District Education Authorities, 2011), 20.
- 66 Janet Tamalik McGrath, "Isumaksaqsuurutigijakka: Conversations with Aupilaarjuk Towards a Theory of Inuktitut Knowledge Renewal" (PhD diss., Canadian Studies, Carleton University, 2011).
- 67 Jens Dahl, Jack Hicks and Peter Jull, eds., *Nunavut: Inuit Regain Control of their Lands and their Lives*, Vol. no. 102 (Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 2000), 250.
- 68 McGrath, "Isumaksaqsuurutigijakka," 154.
- 69 Ibid., 155.
- 70 Ibid., 155.
- 71 Personal communication, Janet Tamalik McGrath, 22 May 2013.
- 72 QTC, *Thematic Reports and Special Studies*, 117.
- 73 Ibid.
- 74 NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*, 165.
- 75 Macpherson, *Dreams & Visions*, 37.
- 76 Anglican Church of Canada, "Coppermine Tent Hostel – Nunavut, Compiled by General Synod Archives 23," available from: <http://www.anglican.ca/relationships/trc/histories/coppermine> (accessed November 14, 2014).
- 77 Macpherson, *Dreams & Visions*, 207.
- 78 Heather E. McGregor, *Inuit Qaujimaqtuqangit*, 13.
- 79 Legacy of Hope Foundation, *We were so Far Away*, 111.
- 80 King, "The History of the Federal Residential Schools for the Inuit."
- 81 Sheila Watt-Cloutier in Louis McComber and Shannon Partridge, eds., *Arnait Nipingit: Voices of Inuit Women in Leadership and Governance* (Iqaluit: Nunavut Arctic College, 2010), 157. See also Nancy Anilniliak in the same volume, 31.
- 82 Sheila Watt-Cloutier in McComber and Partridge, *Arnait Nipingit*, 158.
- 83 Eva Aariak in NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*, 167.
- 84 McComber and Partridge, *Arnait Nipingit*, 158.

- 85 John Amagoalik, *Changing the Face of Canada*, ed. Louis McComber (Iqaluit: Nunavut Arctic College, 2007), 47.
- 86 Rhoda Innuksuk in McComber and Partridge, *Arnait Nipingit*, 73.
- 87 Barry Greenwald, *The Experimental Eskimos*, producer Peter Raymont (Ottawa: White Pine Pictures/Paunna Productions, 2009). I know from personal communications that there were other Inuit youth, not featured in the film, who were also removed to the south for schooling around the age of 11 or 12 and who had different experiences from those featured in the film.
- 88 Thierry Rodon, ed., *Teach an Eskimo how to Read... Conversations with Peter Freuchen Itinuar. Life Stories of Northern Leaders Serices* (Iqaluit: Nunavut Arctic College, 2008).
- 89 Freuchen quoted in *ibid.*, 60.
- 90 Sheila Watt-Cloutier in McComber and Partridge, *Arnait Nipingit*, 157.
- 91 For more analysis of regional variation see McGregor, *Inuit Education and Schools*, 85-115.
- 92 QTC, *Thematic Reports and Special Studies*, 139-140.
- 93 For more documentation of recent educational policy in Nunavut see Heather E. McGregor, "Nunavut's Education Act: Education, Legislation, and Change in the Arctic," *The Northern Review* 36 (Fall 2012): 27-52; Heather E. McGregor, "Curriculum Change in Nunavut: Towards Inuit Qaujimaqatuqangit," *McGill Journal of Education* 47, 3 (2012): 285-302.
- 94 NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*, 1.
- 95 QTC, *Achieving Saimaqatigiingniq*, 42.
- 96 *Ibid.*; NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*, 1.
- 97 John Amagoalik, quoted in NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*, 93.
- 98 Learning objectives for the module are outlined on page 10 and include, for example, understanding education prior to the introduction of schooling; scope and magnitude of residential schools issues in Canadian context; examine policies on which the school system was built; explore a variety of stories; examine the *Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement* and federal apology; express understandings of what reconciliation means; and understand efforts to reclaim Indigenous culture and identity.
- 99 Message from ministers of education in NDE and NWTECE, *The Residential School System in Canada*.
- 100 McGregor, "Nunavut's Education Act."
- 101 See evaluation of the training supports provided to teachers in Daitch, "An Ethical Space for Dialogue about Difficult History."
- 102 Heather E. McGregor, "Teacher Engagement with Histories of Education: Supporting Educational Change in Nunavut," *Canadian Issues/Themes Canadiens* (Winter 2013): 29-35.