

Wulustuk Times

Wulustuk - Indigenous name for St John River

This publication produced monthly at Tobique, NB, Canada E7H 5K3

HUMAN RIGHTS?

FACT



Aboriginal Institution

Wounded and forgotten.

Rights ignored.

FICTION



Canadian Museum for Human Rights

\$300 Million to build

\$22 Million/year to operate

.... a Federal entity.

.... Board of Directors appointed by Government.

.... a Liberal shrine to Pierre Trudeau?

.... sponsored by government and affluent institutions.

.... no First Nations representatives.

.... built on First Nations land.

TABLE OF CONTENTS AUGUST 2008

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS MUSEUM, A LIE, ENIGMA OR WORTHY CREATION - Ask the FN's

HUMAN RIGHTS MUSEUM OF CANADA NAMES NEW ADVISORY BOARD -(MAY '08)

LAND CLAIMS, WHY IS PROTEST HAPPENING NOW? -(Six nations)

AAJ CONDEMNS CANADA BORDER FOR EXCESSIVE FORCE USED AGAINST NATIVE GRANDMOTHERS

QUE. ALGONQUIN COMMUNITY OPENS OWN SCHOOL OVER LANGUAGE FEARS

ONTARIO CHIEF (TREATY 3) WELCOMES TALKS WITH PROVINCE

MALISEET AUTONOMY GIVEN SUPPORT IN MAINE

FIRST NATIONS ADDED TO LIST OF DEFINING CANADIAN ICONS

PM PROMISES FALL SUMMIT FOR DEALING WITH NATIVE ISSUES

PREMIERS WANT TO BUILD ON APOLOGY

DAN'S CORNER - - HAVE CANADIAN NATIVES BEEN FORGOTTEN?

DEAN'S DEN - More Than Pretend

Wulustuk Times:Each month we try to gather and publish the latest, most current and relevant native information for our readership. Proceeding with this concept, we feel that a well informed person is better able to see, relate with, and assess a situation more accurately when equipped with the right tools. That is our policy and commitment.

Contact:

You can reach us by postal mail at P.O. Box 3226, Perth-Andover, NB. Canada E7H 5K3, or at our US postal address, P.O. Box 603, Fort Fairfield, ME 04742. By telephone we're at 506-273-6737 in NB, Canada, and via Internet at pesun@nbnet.nb.ca

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS MUSEUM, A LIE, ENIGMA OR WORTHY CREATION - Ask the FN's

p.paul

TOBIQUE FN. (Special) - Since 2002-03 when the city of Winnipeg announced plans to build Canada's National Human Rights Museum, a flurry of haunting doubts and questions arose in Indian country about the propriety, rationale and validity behind investing into such an exclusive and expensive proposition for whose interests and benefit? The National Museum opens 2012.

Who do you suppose would gain or be properly represented in these venerable halls of honor? The 'winners' of course. They, (non-natives), would absolutely get top billing without a doubt and aboriginals would be relegated to occupy the remote corners or left-over spaces in the rear.

Funds & sources to date, Feds \$100M; Man. \$60M; Wpg. \$20M; Private \$95M Total =\$275M. Still to go \$10 M from private sector.

All indications show that huge sums of money have already been committed to this museum project to date. With all due respect, monies and resources may just be too dear and scarce at this time (due to the energy crisis) for folks to devote assets and valuable resources into a single project of such magnitude as the National HR Museum.

This is the particular time also when so many other worthy causes are appealing for funding, like, a.) making post-secondary education monies available to the needy and disadvantaged students; b.) providing adequate services like housing, residential care, safety and shelter for the elderly; c.) addressing social and economic needs and assistance for single and unwed mothers; and d.) responding to many other worthwhile causes and urgencies that stand hoping and praying for that cheque to come. The challenges are great and becoming even more critical.

One has to wonder if the country is ready to stand united when and if these very sensitive issues come to the forefront? And are we, as a nation, ready to respond and willing to do our part in fulfilling the wishes of the needy and less fortunate while at the same time faced with the burden of financing a national museum?

These questions may one day pop up when the needy and less fortunate see such icons as the Human Rights Museum rising in their midst and taking priority over their own basic needs. There too will come more challenges.

Canada's profile:

This country's human rights record and treatment of its native people is not especially shining with bright lights and lustre. Indeed, that very fact was demonstrated last fall on September 13, 2007, in New York City, when Canada turned against its own native people and refused to sign the U.N. Declaration of Indigenous Peoples Rights following the U.S., New Zealand and Australian lead. A total of 143 nations voted favoring the adoption of the Declaration, 4 said 'no', and 11 abstained.

Canada's dismal record in supporting human rights underscores centuries of mistreatment and abuse committed upon its aboriginal peoples. In fact the creation of a national museum on human rights in Winnipeg would not enhance a positive cord, but would instead, magnify the nation's history of abuse, denial and hostilities heaped on natives since the arrival of Europeans.

Natives see very little reason for Canada to unnecessarily build such a monstrosity just to thump its chest in public and to the world, when adversely, she has denied and ignored the rights of the first nations throughout all its history. The rights in social, cultural, political and economical arenas in Indian country have essentially been non-existent. Indeed, the archaic administrative system for managing native communities designed during the colonial period (re: the 1874 Indian Act) reflects no more than putting chains and shackles on native persons to keep them in line and away from public view. This same hard-line administrative procedure is generally still applied in most of Canada's 600-plus Indian reserves.

Largely, this colonial methodology is kept in practice to this day by the Department of Indian Affairs to assure constancy of rigid and uncompromising grip over first nations lives, affairs and policies which,

by its harshness, essentially breeds chaos, havoc, social unrest and despair in communities rather than promoting upbeat progressive energy and prosperity for people.

Furthermore, natives have questioned "why" and "how" could such a 'monumental lie and deceit' be enshrined by an uncaring nation whose past reveals just the opposite, neglect and inhumane treatment. And secondly, "why" and "how" could Canada ever consider or justify going ahead with this project in good faith having so much chaos, instability and confirmed evidence of neglect and disregard for human rights in her relations with native people?

A calendar of abuse, fraud, deceit and top level cover-up, in all probability, is subtly hidden away in this country's log of early dealings with its aboriginal peoples, all of which can be unlocked through an investigation of the tactics used in the land takeover, treaty by treaty. Such research could shed light on so-called facts and sly innuendos used by government to underhandedly overtake all 3,745, 574 sq. mi. of aboriginal land from coast to coast, which in a comprehensive research, would uncover volumes of lies, deceit and betrayal that prevailed.

Additionally the notion that compares native life to the Fourth World conditions may also be held valid. This proposition can be borne out by witnessing the despair and morally-depressing conditions present in many native communities today. This horrendous societal gap is especially evident among the reserves located in remote areas where housing, health and living standards and life-support systems are in complete disarray or have all but collapsed. These below-standard conditions stand in evidence on reserves across Canada if anyone cares to see the proof before their eyes. This is Canada now and likely the future.

To first nations, the completion of Canada's Human Rights Museum would amount to an outrage and would be seen as a total fallacy depicting twisted, fabricated history of the country's real story.

Historical Aspects:

Since Europeans arrived here in 1500's, most have shown very little concern or total disregard of the conditions and disparities that exist among natives in comparison to those of the general public and these differences continue to build to this day as evidenced by the following observations :

- Native homes, families and territories were forcefully ripped apart and destroyed and overtaken by white settlers as they began arriving, migrating and building inland across Canada.
- From the 'whiteman's' inland rush to overtake Indian lands, native people were forced to retreat deeper into 'bush territories' and found themselves as the forgotten nomads of the country and became the continent's first "homeless".
- The white rush into Indian territories where fertile lands were once occupied and inhabited by thriving native populations, were swept away and stolen outright.
- Euro-Canadians arrogantly established their government(s) without due process or prior consultation with aboriginal native owners, forthwith, they created a Confederation and overtook the Atlantic region which they named Lower Canada in 1867.
- From the 1867 Confederation, the march proceeded westward and forced the removal of thousands of Indians from their homes and territories as the westward push progressed.

- As this march continued, it caused devastating losses to native hunting, fishing, trapping and economically-secure territories and a huge decline in Indian population as the non-natives moved westward from the Atlantic region to Quebec and Ontario territories.

- Finally, with reckless abandon, Quebec and Ontario joined Lower Canada and formed the region called Upper Canada and the country quickly tripled in size overnight, thereby forcefully seizing and monopolizing all Indian lands and resources therein.

- From this white invasion, Indians became a moot race of listless wanderers and faceless vagabonds in their own land as a direct result of white push westward. The destruction of traditional Indian-built wealth and infrastructure was completed, and finally the whites overtook Indian lands that ran from the east coast through to the St. Lawrence river valley's fertile areas.

Somehow, through some strange twist of fate, or possibly from a rising sense of guilt and social responsibility, plus the sight of complete destruction of Indian societies, the federal government decided to form the Department of Indian Affairs in 1874 where the everyday affairs and lives of Indians would forever change to be managed by a solitary arm of the federal government, reserve by reserve, under the eye of an 'Indian Agent'. Following this one particular move resulted the idea of establishing the "Indian Act". The Indian Act is a federal legislation designed to 'bureaucratically manage Indians' and place them on tiny desolate Indian Reserves across the country, away and separate from the rest of Canadian society.

The government's intention was to keep Indians in line and in relative seclusion among themselves, a safe distance from white neighbors, and also to deter roaming thieves and looters from causing bodily harm and/or total annihilation of Indians, and lastly to formally instal the administrative 'boss' for almost every reserve, the Indian Agent. Some natives have described these Indian Agents as 'power or control fanatics' with federal authority to back their actions. And the 'Indian reserves' as prisons because free movement beyond reserve was only possible with the permission of the Indian Agent.

Through this master plan the government was able to seize, control, hold and/or dispense with any person, land or territory at will in complete freedom and impunity thereby taking away every vestige of human right and dignity from native people.

Examples of human rights abuse committed on native people throughout, or most of Canada's history:

1. Denial of citizenship to native people until 1967 when the right to vote was extended.
2. Forced to live on Indian Reserves with minimal to nil opportunities to self-determination.
3. Denial of democratic and human rights and freedoms, plus devoid of due representation.
4. Forced incarceration of children in Indian Residential Schools between ages 2-15.
5. Denial of services in education, housing, jobs, fire protection, economic opportunities, social and medical services, etc.
6. Forced to live in minute and desolate land bases where growth and expansion are nil.
7. Denial of freedom to grow and prosper independently under the rule of the Indian Agent.
8. Inability to access Crown (Indian) Lands for pursuing economic development or engaging into traditional native livelihoods such as hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering of resources.

9. Outright theft of vast Indian lands by federal and provincial officials, entailing all of Canada.
10. Denial of self-expression and/or freely engaging into spiritual rights and freedoms.
11. Denial of equal access to legal protection and to the country's Justice system.
12. Denial of civil, cultural, traditional and human rights on Indian Reserves. -Plus more.

Note:

Somewhere and somehow, Canada has to reconcile and face the realities for the horrendous damage done to native people since Europeans landed on this land. To accomplish this would entail a mass reviewing of the human rights abuses and the terrible relations that resulted between aboriginal people and the rest of society. As it is today, the ancient 'colonial' system that government used to deal with the 'Indian problem' over the years has proven useless, destructive and unworkable for native people that, in effect, puts Canada in a bad place along with four other U.N. countries, including U.S., New Zealand and Australia who failed to sign an Indigenous Rights Declaration for their aboriginal people in 2007.

In proceeding with the museum for human rights in Winnipeg, native people are again deliberately ignored and given second billing. The apparent aim of the national museum is to positively represent the affluent and upper-class society in a better light while generally casting an uncomplimentary role for aboriginal peoples. In short, the museum is on a path of serious error by misleading the public of this country's true history with false, factitious scenarios.

The very nature of misrepresenting real and honest facts could possibly invite technical difficulties in public relations and promotional initiatives for the museum which in the end could be costly and unproductive.

But to reiterate the main issue at hand, in no way should anyone, including outside countries, pay respect, support or cater to this institution until ample dignity, fair play and due recognition is bestowed to native people in all areas. Aboriginal people are a vital part of Canada's history and the museum rightfully cannot overlook this reality.

In conclusion native participation needs to be included in every phase and part of the overall operation which means natives must be visible in the Museum's staff, roles and its entire corporate system. -pp

HUMAN RIGHTS MUSEUM OF CANADA, NAMES NEW ADVISORY BOARD, (May '08)

REAL Women of Canada

March 5, 2008 (LifeSiteNews.com) - REAL Women was immensely relieved to learn that the controversial Museum for Human Rights in Winnipeg, the inspiration of former business and media mogul Izzy Asper, has a new Advisory Board. The former Advisory Board, selected by the former Liberal government, consisted mainly of feminist, homosexual and also old Liberal stand-bys, such as a former Liberal Prime Minister John Turner, former Liberal MPs, Cabinet Ministers and some Senators. The museum was intended to be a monument to former Liberal Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and his Charter of Rights.

In April, 2007, the Conservative government designated the museum as a "national museum" and agreed to provide the museum with \$1 million to assist the start-up costs and approximately \$22 million annually to cover its operating costs. REAL Women was deeply concerned that the museum with its left-wing Advisory Board would be used as a powerful tool to champion the Liberal government's interpretation of human rights, such as abortion rights, feminism, homosexuality, etc. with only some legitimate exhibits sprinkled here and there to give the museum the appearance of legitimacy.

The Conservative government replaced the Liberal dominated Advisory Board in October 2007 and these appointments have modified our concerns somewhat. The new Advisory Board consists mainly of experienced businessmen and women with no known bias on human rights issues. The Board members also include a professor of Canadian history and culture. One of the female appointments is former Chief Justice of the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal, Constance Glube who had the courage to testify before the House of Commons Justice Committee in November 2005 that political appointments to the judiciary under the Liberals were based on political considerations rather than merit.

Another female Advisory Board member is Mary Gusella, a senior public servant and a former chief commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission who was called in to re-organize it in 2002 after the debacle it had become under former Chief Commissioner Michelle Falardeau Ramsay. Ms. Gusella has been Senior Advisor in the Privy Council office since 2002. She has also held many senior appointments in Crown corporations and was federal land claims registrar.

Public Consultation

It is reassuring that the new Advisory Board has now launched public consultations to help determine which human rights issues should be featured in the museum and how they should be presented. We should be aware, however, that the museum also proposes to call in "academic experts" to help determine which human rights should be featured. One such academic expert is Constantine Passaris, a professor at the University of New Brunswick who was a former chairman of the New Brunswick Human Rights Commission. Need we say more?

Therefore, REAL Women is urging Canadians to provide input into the museum as soon as possible in order to offset any bias that may be included in it.

AAJ CONDEMNS CANADA BORDER FOR EXCESSIVE FORCE USED AGAINST NATIVE GRANDMOTHERS

The American Association of Jurists (AAJ), a non-governmental organisation with consultative status at the United Nations Social and Economic Council (ECOSOC), condemns the use of excessive force by the Canadian Border Services Agency against two Indigenous grandmothers.

On June 14th, 2008, two outspoken Kanion'ke:haka (Mohawk) women were attacked by Canadian Border Service Agency (CBSA) guards at Akwesasne. Kahentenetha Horn aged 68 and Katenies (Janet Davis) aged 43 are grandmothers and the principal editors and managers of MNN (Mohawk Nation News, www.mohawknationnews.com) a popular internet site known for its critique of Canada's treatment of Indigenous peoples.

MNN was forced to stop normal operations after Kahentinetha was assaulted and suffered a trauma induced heart attack at the Akwesasne port of entry. The incident began when violent procedures

were used to arrest Katenies on questionable warrants arising from a charge in 2003 when she was accused of running that same border after she thought she had been waved through. Katenies questioned the jurisdiction of the Canadian court over her and her people, and since then has faced a procedural morass. It is important to note that both the 2003 and the June 14th, 2008 incident occurred inside Akwesasne territory.

Katenies lives in Akwesasne, a Mohawk settlement established in the 1740's straddling the 1000 Islands section of the St. Lawrence River, an area occupied by her ancestors since time immemorial. Both Canada and the United States routinely violate the territorial integrity of Akwesasne. Because of the borders imposed on them, the people of Akwesasne are forced to deal with the jurisdictional claims of both United States, as well as the sub jurisdictions claimed by Ontario, Quebec and New York State. As a result, Katenies must travel from Akwesasne (Quebec), where she lives, via Akwesasne (N.Y.) and through Canadian border controls to visit her daughter and grandchildren who live a few minutes drive away in Akwesasne (Ontario). Katenies' daughter, Teiohontateh, had to abort a child because she was forced by CBSA to pass under a dangerous x-ray machine for trucks, when pregnant.

In the 1920's the Haudenosaunee Six Nations Confederacy (including Kanion'ke:haka/Mohawks) petitioned the League of Nations to protect their right to jurisdiction over their own land and people, but this issue has always been denied a hearing both within Canada and internationally.

They never consented to become part of Canada or the United States or to the border later drawn through their community by the 1794 Jay Treaty between Great Britain and the United States. The Jay Treaty guaranteed the right of Indigenous peoples to travel and trade between Canada and the United States.

As a successor state to Britain, Canadian law includes the well established doctrine of the "Honour of the Crown" reflected in such instruments as the Royal Proclamation, 1763. This imposes fiduciary obligations on the state to protect Indigenous peoples. Section 35 of Canada's Constitution Act, 1982 also recognizes and affirms "existing aboriginal and treaty rights".

Border charges against Akwesasne residents have escalated since 2001, when Canada's Supreme Court decided in *Mitchell v. the Minister of National Revenue* that the people of Akwesasne do not have a right to trade freely within their community across the Canada-U.S. border.

Canadian courts have consistently refused to prove their jurisdiction when Indigenous people question their authority. In December, 2007 Lester Howse, aged 64, was hospitalized because he was brutalized by three Brantford Ontario policemen after he was expelled from a courtroom where he had questioned the jurisdiction of a Justice of the Peace to try a Six Nations man. He raised arguments similar to those advanced by Katenies.

These incidents suggest a pattern of violence to intimidate Indigenous people and avoid legal consideration of the jurisdictional issues they raise.

The wilful repression of Indigenous cultures and the use of violence against elders to prevent formal consideration of serious legal issues will only heighten the conflict and hamper resolution. Such use of force violates Canada's obligations under the United Nations Charter and other international Human Rights instruments including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Canada's shameful refusal to sign the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People reflects its refusal to recognize and respect the Indigenous Nations, contrary to the recommendations of both the United Nations and Canada's own 1996 Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.

FOR THIS REASON, THE AAJ CALLS ON THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT:

1. To uphold its commitments under international law to:

- i) refrain from using force to resolve legal issues; and
- ii) to respect the human rights guaranteed by the international treaties and accords that it has signed.

2. To uphold the Honour of the Crown and its obligations as a successor state to Britain by respecting:

- i) the terms of the Jay Treaty;
- ii) its common law obligation to protect Indigenous peoples; and
- iii) s.35 of its Constitution Act, 1982.

IN PARTICULAR, THE AAJ CALLS ON THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT

3. To conduct a full and immediate investigation into the assaults by the Canadian Border Services Agents on Kahentinetha, Katenies and Teiohontateh and by the Brantford police on Lester Howse.

4. To ensure that human rights are respected at all border posts and in all courts so that police, security and military forces like the Canadian Border Control Agency and the Brantford police stop conducting life-threatening procedures that risk the arbitrary deprivation of the right to life.

5. To ensure that Canadian courts address jurisdictional issues and respect appeal procedures before trying substantive allegations.

6. To negotiate with the people of Akwesasne to re-establish an alternative to current border controls that interfere with normal rights to privacy, home, family and community life.

7. To ensure the safety and physical integrity of all Indigenous people, including elders, grandmothers, women and children, born and yet to come.

In keeping with the principles and purposes of the United Nations, we hope that future negotiations will lead to a just and lasting resolution of all issues that arise concerning Canada's relations with the Indigenous nations.

American Association of Jurists - Canada

Me William Sloan, pres., Prof. Geo Lebel, Grace Woo, LL.D., Me Stewart Isvanffy

Info 514-289-9877, 514-931-8651

william.sloan@qc.aira.com

LAND CLAIMS, - WHY IS PROTEST HAPPENING NOW? -(Six Nations)

The Expositor July 18, 08

Shelley Clark asked "Why is protest happening now?"

The attempts to seek grievance resolution through diplomacy began in 1786 when, upon the complaints of Six Nations, the first of a series of many royal instructions was posted from the Crown ordering Squatters off Six Nations' Land in obedience to the Royal Proclamation of 1763. It was ignored each time by the squatters.

The next official grievance registered with the government was over the theft of land and money from the Six Nations Trust Fund dated June 16, and again June 24, 1803, four years before Joseph Brant's death.

A public notice was distributed throughout the Haldimand Tract in April 1805 that ordered squatters without legitimate leases, licenses or title to vacate Haldimand Tract immediately or be removed by force by the government.

Another order in council recorded Jan. 14, 1812, ordered Upper Canada to strictly enforce the 1805 public notice. That was followed up by another proclamation to the same effect, dated February 1812.

1830 -- The Brantford town plot of 807 acres was surrendered to the Crown for sale or lease as a place to harbour squatters removed from Six Nations' land.

In 1835, squatters were offered a chance to stay on the land if they entered into an official lease agreement. If they refused, they were to be forcibly removed.

Jan. 31, 1839, Lord Durham's report was released. It was a scathing report on the neglect and violations of the Crown's trust to Six Nations. Durham used the royal instructions of 1763, 1775, and 1786 as the "law of the land" or "rule of law" to base his report on.

May 1839 -- Act-commissioners were to be appointed to take action against squatters still refusing to obey the Rule of Law.

1867 -- The British North America Act transferred responsibilities of the Crown regarding Indians and reserve lands to the Dominion of Canada. All responsibilities, previous Royal Instructions, and Treaties were to be respected and enforced by the Dominion.

1927 -- Canada makes it illegal for Indians to raise money for legal fees to defend themselves against land thefts and trust fund thefts. An Indian could be arrested and jailed for launching such a defence and the lawyer who took the case could be debarred by the Law Society of Upper Canada for taking it on. This act of Parliament stayed in

existence until it was quietly revoked in 1951. It took another eight or nine years to work its way into language of the courtroom, however.

In 1982, Section 35 of the Constitution Act, which is the rule of law in Canada, recognizes and affirms all existing treaties or other rights and freedoms afforded to natives, including all of the above.

In 1995 Six Nations launched suit against Canada in an attempt to have its grievances dealt with. Canada responded by closing all 28 remaining registered claims files and, despite direct order from the Supreme Court of Canada, still has not dealt with these claims.

So, the present land claims disputes didn't just start. Since neither diplomacy nor the Canadian judicial system have worked for Six Nations, the only other course left to them is demonstration and protest which is what is taking place today in a desperate attempt to find resolution to 200 years of grievances.

Marilyn Vegso Branford

QUE. ALGONQUIN COMMUNITY OPENS OWN SCHOOL OVER LANGUAGE FEARS

CBC News

Parents and elders in the last Algonquin-speaking community in Canada have pulled most of their reserve's young children from an official government-run elementary school over what some in the community say is a continuing attempt to erase their language and culture.

Some of the 650 Algonquins of Barrière Lake living in the remote village of Rapid Lake, or Kitiganik, have set up their own school on the reserve on the shore of Quebec's Cabonga reservoir, about 300 kilometres north of Ottawa.

A few weeks ago, Canada formally apologized for trying to assimilate native children through the residential school system in the 20th century. But some members said the reserve's government-run school has been engaging in similar practices.

The Barrière Lake Algonquins are the last of 10 Algonquin communities in Canada to still speak the language known as Anishnaabe at home. The parents and elders have previously pushed to have more of their language included in the curriculum of Algonquins of Barrière Lake School, where instruction is given primarily in English.

But the band members' main objection is over their claim that the principal and more than one teacher at the government-run school have told the students not to express themselves in their own language in the presence of the non-Anishnaabe-speaking teaching staff, because the staff - most of whom are non-aboriginal - don't understand it.

The parents said the children who spoke their language have had treats withheld and were denied recess.

Grade 2 student Marie Nottaway said her teacher at the government-run school would react quickly to hearing the Algonquin language in class.

"She would tell the principal and then we would all go to the principal's office," Nottaway said. "She said, 'Don't speak Algonquin when your teacher's here.' "

Marylynn Poucachiche, who has five children living on the reserve, told CBC News that the stories people have heard about the government-run institution made many in the community recall the dark legacy of residential schools.

"When our children were told to speak English, it brought back memories for our parents when they went to residential school," she said. "That's why we pulled out the students."

Pierre Nepton, the Indian Affairs Department's second-ranking official in Quebec, denies any policy to assimilate children or punish the use of their traditional language.

Nepton told CBC News that school officials have assured him the charges are not true. He added the school's aim is to prepare the children for secondary schools that are mostly in Maniwaki and Val D'Or, where Algonquin is not spoken.

Leadership dispute:

The dispute over the rival schools has been at the centre of a continuing division in the community.

Former Barrière Lake chief Jean-Maurice Matchewan closed Algonquins of Barrière Lake School last November, but the current band council under chief Casey Ratt, which does not recognize the alternative school, reopened the government-run facility in March.

Ratt is recognized as chief by the Indian Affairs Department, but is facing a leadership challenge from rival Benjamin Nottaway. Nottaway is a proponent of the alternative school whose supporters in the community are demanding Indian Affairs recognize him as the rightly chosen successor to Matchewan, who stepped down after being charged for allegedly having marijuana and a handgun in his car.

In January, band members and elders opened the unofficial school - known as Kitchi Migwam or "great wigwam" in their language - which two-thirds of the community's elementary school children now attend. The children remaining at the government-run school now barely outnumber the staff.

Community elder Basil Anichi-Napeo told CBC News he volunteered to teach at the alternative school because the children at the official school were losing their language.

The alternative school is staffed by six volunteers and has 46 students who receive instruction heavily focused on language, while the curriculum also includes traditional learning and bushcraft.

Both schools are closed for the summer, but where the children will be in the fall remains a mystery.

"Right now, we've got a school open, and we just hope that the parents will send their kids to school," Indian Affairs' Nepton said. "Otherwise, I don't know what will be the future of those kids, but I guess those parents are taking care of that."

ONTARIO CHIEF (TREATY 3) WELCOMES TALKS WITH PROVINCE

Miner and News

Treaty 3 Grand Chief Diane Kelly is looking forward to upcoming talks with Queen's Park over resource development, as well as reconciliation for harms of the past.

Kelly noted it was an opportunity for overturning a landmark court case, which altered treaty relationships by cutting First Nations out of revenue sharing agreements with the province.

History is important and past practices have resulted not only in devastating economic impacts to the Anishinaabeg, but also for the regions that have been harvested and left in ruins by such legislation as Ontario's antiquated Mining Act, she said.

Earlier this week, Premier Dalton McGuinty announced a plan to safeguard lands north of the 51st parallel, as part of an initiative to include First Nations in land-use planning for the Far North.

Talks between Treaty 3, the city, private investors and provincial ministries have been ongoing, as the region tries to recover from heavy job losses during the ongoing forestry crisis.

Foresters sign national deal

Earlier in the day, the Forest Products Association of Canada announced they had signed an agreement with the Assembly of First Nations. The accord called for economic development initiatives and business investments, strong environmental stewardship and the creation of skill development opportunities, particularly targeted to First Nations youth.

The forest industry is the largest industrial employer of aboriginal peoples with 17,000 staff, and it depends upon 1,400 aboriginal businesses for its day-to-day operations, noted Avrim Lazar, spokesman for the association.

First Nations have a vital role to play in shaping the future of a healthy forest industry. The fate of the industry is tied up with the fate of hundreds of rural communities across this land as the forest sector has been the main source of business investment, employment and educational opportunities for First Nations people, said National Chief Phil Fontaine.

MALISEET AUTONOMY GIVEN SUPPORT IN MAINE

Bangor Daily News

LITTLETON, Maine - Although there will be no immediate changes, officials with the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians praised a recent announcement from the Town Council that recognizes and supports the band's desire to achieve greater governmental autonomy.

The seven councilors sent news of their decision in a letter to Brenda Commander, chief of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians. Commander touted it as "an important political development."

The council's letter is in support of the Maliseets as they work with state government for greater governmental autonomy.

A copy of the letter has been sent to Gov. John Baldacci and members of the Legislature's Judiciary Committee, as well as to Rep. Richard Cleary, D-Houlton, and Sen. Roger Sherman, R-Houlton.

The Legislature will take up the issue in its next session beginning in January.

During a news conference at the Maliseet Administration Building in Littleton, Commander highlighted portions of the letter and expressed gratitude to town officials for offering the tribe their support.

In the letter, Houlton councilors say the town would consent to the release of jurisdiction over the 177 acres of Houlton Band land on the Foxcroft Road in Houlton. Thus, this "Houlton Band Territorial Land" would be separate and distinct from the town. The land contains the band's housing development and other community facilities.

The letter also said the town would claim no jurisdiction or authority over the band's territorial land and would not levy taxes or request payment in lieu of taxes on the land. In turn, the town would not provide municipal services on this land unless contractually agreed to by the Houlton Band.

The letter pointed out that the band would be responsible for such things as ownership and maintenance of all roads located on territorial land, code enforcement, SAD 29 cost allocations for residents of territorial land, and other matters. The Houlton Police Department would have no jurisdiction over Houlton Band territorial land.

"I think it is really great that the town has supported our efforts to be a sovereign nation," Commander said Friday. "There are still some obstacles, but this is a huge step forward.

"There is a lot of fear out there about tribes and what they want," she said. "We just want to govern ourselves and have a say over our trust lands."

Commander said the tribe has had a good relationship with the town, and credited Town Manager Douglas Hazlett for his support.

"We are tied to our land and we will be here forever," she said. "I think we are an economic force here and we want this area to thrive, and we want more jobs, not just for our tribal members but for everyone here."

Hazlett told councilors earlier this week that the town values its relationship with the Maliseets and that they have a good working relationship with the band.

"The letter that we are offering . is the consent of the town as the Maliseets address the issue with Augusta," Hazlett said. "This is something Augusta would have to decide; it isn't something the council can vote to do."

He said he felt it would be a good idea to have the town's decision on record with the Legislature when lawmakers begin their deliberations in January.

FIRST NATIONS ADDED TO THE LIST OF DEFINING CANADIAN ICONS

The Canadian Press

Aboriginal people have been granted the 102nd spot on a government-sponsored list of 101 things that most define Canada after online respondents pointed out that First Nations people, culture and symbols weren't included in the original tally. The oversight and late addition reflects how the historic marginalization of First Nations people has pushed them to the fringes of Canadian consciousness, an aboriginal studies instructor said.

Still, at least one aboriginal chief said it was a positive sign that, upon reflection, Canadians recognized the error.

The list, commissioned by Citizenship and Immigration Canada and the Dominion Institute, was compiled from the responses of more than 3,000 Canadians who were asked to identify those people, places, events, accomplishments and symbols that best define Canada.

"The top symbols were the Maple Leaf, the beaver, the Canadian flag," said Marc Chalifoux, executive director of the Dominion Institute.

"Aboriginal culture, in my view - it was a really surprising element that was missing from the list. The survey was quite exhaustive."

After the original list was finalized, the project's website posed the question: Tell us what's missing?

"What's nice is to see that, when Canadians were asked what was missing from the list of 101, that's what came in as the first choice, the most glaring omission," Chalifoux said.

As a result, the institute announced Tuesday that aboriginals would take the 102nd spot. They will also be included in 101 Things Canadians Should Know About Canada, a book scheduled for release in the fall.

Ontario Regional Chief Angus Toulouse called it "disappointing" that aboriginals didn't make the original list. A lack of proper education in Canadian schools about the role First Nations played in building the country could be to blame, Toulouse said.

For many Canadians, aboriginals remain "out of sight, out of mind," he said.

A fundamental part of Canada

Still, Toulouse said it was heartening to see that, upon reflection, Canadians identified aboriginals as the most glaring omission.

Cynthia Wesley-Esquimaux, an assistant professor of aboriginal studies at the University of Toronto, called the omission and late addition "an interesting situation."

"Aboriginal people were marginalized for so very long that they just aren't seen as part of Canada," she said. "We have the dancing, we have all of that stuff, but we don't actually have the understanding the aboriginal people are part of Canada in a very fundamental way.

"That's some of things that should be talked about on a regular basis and taught in schools."

Among the other top five omissions noted by online respondents - the Canadian penchant for uttering "eh", the phrase "strong and free", the Group of Seven and the Snowbirds.

"It was nice to see that people, when they looked at the list and thought what was missing, that they voted for things like the Group of Seven and aboriginal Canadians," Chalifoux said.

PM PROMISES FALL SUMMIT TO TACKLE NATIVE ISSUES

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Premiers demanded meeting as PM faced fire for election pledge

BILL CURRY AND BRIAN LAGHI -July 19, 2008

OTTAWA and QUEBEC -- Prime Minister Stephen Harper will hold a first ministers meeting this fall with the provinces and territories and has agreed to place aboriginal issues on the agenda.

The news follows this week's demand from provincial and territorial premiers for a meeting with the Prime Minister to discuss the poor social conditions faced by Canada's young aboriginals, especially in education.

"We are looking at sitting down with the premiers this fall. There'll be a number of items on the agenda at that time and aboriginal issues are likely to be one of those," Kory Teneycke, Mr. Harper's director of communications, told The Globe and Mail yesterday.

Mr. Teneycke's comments also followed two days of questions from The Globe about a written pledge Mr. Harper made during the 2006 election campaign to hold a meeting with first ministers and national aboriginal leaders within three years of a Conservative government to update progress on the 2005 Kelowna Accord.

When asked whether Mr. Harper will consider this fall's meeting as having met that commitment, the Prime Minister's spokesman said: "That will be for others to determine."

Mr. Teneycke noted Mr. Harper usually meets with the premiers as a group once a year, in addition to one-on-one meetings. Details about the fall first-ministers meeting, which will be Mr. Harper's third, will be outlined as plans take shape, he said. Other topics on the agenda would likely include the economy and climate change.

Speaking on behalf of all the provinces this week, Quebec Premier Jean Charest urged Mr. Harper to build on his June 11 residential schools apology by tackling aboriginal education and social conditions.

Mr. Harper faced criticism from native leaders and opposition parties for dismissing the 2005 Kelowna Accord, in which then-prime-minister Paul Martin pledged \$5-billion over five years to work with provinces to bring aboriginal living standards up to the national average within 10 years.

Phil Fontaine, the Assembly of First Nations leader who played a key role in negotiating the accord, lobbied premiers by phone in recent weeks, urging them to call for a first ministers meeting.

The AFN ensured that premiers were made aware of the campaign pledge that Mr. Harper made in a letter to Mr. Fontaine.

"The Conservative Party of Canada is also committed to holding another meeting with First Ministers and National Aboriginal Leaders within the next two or three years to measure the progress made on the Kelowna commitments," Mr. Harper pledged in the Jan. 6, 2006, letter.

Minority Parliaments are usually short-lived, but the Harper government's three-year anniversary is just six months away.

The pledge is at odds with what would come to be the Harper government's public stand on the Kelowna Accord, which has been to dismiss the deal as poorly thought out.

Mr. Fontaine said Mr. Harper's written pledge was clear and national aboriginal leaders should be invited to this fall's meeting.

"I see it as good news," Mr. Fontaine said yesterday. "But that first ministers meeting must include us....We're talking about Canada's biggest challenge, first nations poverty, the single most important social justice issue in this country."

Prior to this week's premiers meeting in Quebec City, sources say Mr. Charest discussed Mr. Fontaine's push for a first ministers meeting with Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty.

The two premiers came to the view, later supported by the other premiers, that it would be better to ask for a narrowly defined meeting with the Prime Minister on native education and social conditions. It was decided that a more specific request would reduce the odds that the Prime Minister would reject the meeting.

Patrick Brazeau, the national chief of the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples who has been skeptical of the Kelowna Accord, said the premiers were not as unanimous as it appeared when it came to their willingness to pay more for aboriginal education. He said Ottawa and the provinces must still work out the thorny issue of who is responsible for the conditions of aboriginals living off reserves.

"It's time to move on and actually provide results for aboriginal peoples as opposed to continuing talking about the problems," he said.

PREMIERS WANT TO BUILD ON APOLOGY

The Canadian Press

Canada's provincial and territorial leaders are calling for a meeting with Prime Minister Stephen Harper to deal with native issues.

Quebec Premier Jean Charest said he and his counterparts hope to build on the momentum from Ottawa's residential school apology and address concerns over the future of aboriginal children.

"The apology presented by the prime minister of Canada is extremely powerful," Charest said Wednesday after the Council of the Federation met with native leaders in Quebec City.

"I think a very important number of Canadians have stood up and taken notice. All of a sudden we're conscious that the relationship we have with our native people, with the Inuit and Metis is important, and it needs to be addressed."

Charest, host of the three-day premiers summit, said the 13 provincial and territorial leaders want the meeting with the prime minister to focus on youth issues, such as education.

But he pointed out that everything would be on the table.

"We want a private meeting where we can sit down with Mr. Harper and have a discussion about the way forward," said the Quebec premier, who was flanked by aboriginal leaders for the announcement.

Assembly of First Nations national chief Phil Fontaine said he hopes Harper will accept the invitation.

"We're now entering the post-apology era and we see the Council of the Federation as an important participant," he said.

"It's important that the federal government be at the table. Their absence, of course, would cause any future work that we do together to fail."

Fontaine said targets on the \$5-billion Kelowna Accord are still valid, and he hopes it's part of any discussions with the prime minister.

The Kelowna Accord, which calls for spending on programs to improve aboriginal quality of life, received support from all provinces and territories.

The plan focuses on issues such as health care, education, housing and social services.

A private member's bill put forward by then-prime minister Paul Martin received royal assent last year, but the Conservative government has yet to spend money on the program.

Fontaine said aboriginal groups are still committed to the Kelowna Accord.

"That represents a lot of hard work," he said of the plan. "Eighteen months of planning, it engaged about 1,000 people, and it was focused on closing the gap on the quality of life."

Asked if he would be putting Ottawa in a difficult position by bringing up the Kelowna Accord, Charest said the federal government does not have anything to be embarrassed about.

"The Kelowna Accord is there, it happened ... it reflects the sum total of efforts of native leaders and ourselves in addressing the issues that are relevant to the communities," he said.

DAN'S CORNER - - HAVE CANADIAN NATIVES BEEN FORGOTTEN?

In a recent print editorial it is stated that we all have reasons to get involved in the St. Croix anniversary (the commemoration of French explorer Jacques Cartier's arrival in Canada) and by extension Canada Day celebrations, that there have been winners and losers, and that this anniversary is a time of celebration, for others an occasion for somber commemoration, and that it is a milestone by which we can judge where we stand today.

Even though Indians are mentioned in the piece, I cannot help but think the opinion was written with only non-Indians in mind. Given the fact that Indian people have been deliberately and callously overlooked (not seen) for the past 500 years, my thinking should not come as a surprise to anyone.

In my musings after having read the opinion, I thought, as an Indian person, how do I celebrate or commemorate this transplanted European anniversary? An anniversary that, if not for the kindness of Indian people, probably would not have been necessary to observe. And if Indian people had been more like the Europeans and had inflicted upon those first Europeans the same fate as what

Europeans inflicted upon the Beothuk - an Indian tribe of Newfoundland - only a few decades later, the need for this debate would have been rendered moot.

How do I, as an Indian person, celebrate or commemorate the genocide of the Beothuk, Huron, Saco, Abanaki and on and on right across this country? It is like Germans asking Jews to help celebrate the Dachau, Auschwitz, Majdanek and Treblinka death camps. As a so-called "loser" how do I celebrate the loss of my identity as a human being, as a Wulustukyeg (a tribe native to the province of New Brunswick)? How do I celebrate the loss of my homeland? How do I commemorate the loss of my traditional spiritual ways and the traditional spiritual teachings? How do I commemorate the loss of my language? How do I commemorate the loss of my ability to pass on our traditional teachings, language, etcetera, to the Seventh Generation? How do I celebrate the loss of my culture?

How do I celebrate the loss of the sacred burial site of my Ancestors? How do I commemorate the loss of my milestones which reach back thousands and thousands of years and generations?

I ask these questions from my heart. Painful but necessary questions in my ongoing effort to get our European brothers to honestly face the legacy of the past and to honestly and truthfully address injustices in the present.

Our Elders teach that in order for people to move to an equal, healthy, peaceful and just future, that those people must first take four steps in order to reach the starting point.

First step: to recognize the truth of their past actions, no matter how ugly.

Second: to acknowledge the truth, no matter how painful.

Third: to accept that truth, no matter the cost.

Fourth and final step: an honest, equal, healing and peaceful reconciliation can now begin.

Failing this, all of the words of our Euro-Canadian brothers on honestly facing the legacy of the past and addressing injustice in the present will continue to ring very hollow to me, the Ancestors, the People and the Seventh Generation.

I end with the words of Chief Seattle, Duwamish:

"To us, the ashes of our ancestors are sacred, and their sacred resting place is hallowed ground. We know that the white man does not understand our ways. One portion of the land is the same to him as the next, for he is a stranger who comes in the night and takes from the land whatever he needs. The Earth is not his brother, but his enemy... and when he has conquered it he moves on.

"He leaves his father's graves, and his children's birthright is forgotten. And when the last redman shall have perished, and the memory of my people has become a myth among the white man, these shores will swarm with the invisible dead of my people. The white man will never be alone in my People's homeland."

I humbly and respectfully ask anyone who cares to respond to help me in my question on how I as an Indian person should celebrate or commemorate my losses.

But before anyone responds, I would ask that they first weigh their response from a reversed perspective. Meaning that the 500-year scenario be reversed. That my people had invaded Europe and my people had inflicted similar diseases and losses upon Europeans which could be comparable to what occurred here on our beloved Turtle Island.

These words from my heart are from the Ancestors.

All My Relations, Dan Ennis

DEAN'S DEN - More Than Pretend

More Than Pretend

The path I'm on I'm finding

Both burdensome and binding

So full of curves, and winding

And I wonder where the music went,

Am I now 'before' or 'after'

Are we talking sill or rafter

Is that a scream, or laughter

And why are all the people

Fractured and hell-bent,

In that better day to come

Will I be among the "some"

To be "summoned by the drum"

Will I see "forever", or will this be the end,

Will my love of life pervade

And can I make the grade

As I march through time's parade

For I know that this short journey

Is more than just pretend!

D.C. Butterfield