

The Canadian Experiment with Social Engineering, A Historical Case: The Mohawk Institute

WENDY FLETCHER

Education is always a hegemonic discourse. Through education, dominant culture in every society seeks not only to transmit a body of knowledge, but also values a “normative” hermeneutic. However, if all education is hegemonic discourse, residential schools have been uniquely so.

Residential school education for Canada’s First Nations’s children was a whole child experiment. It undertook not only the intellectual, but also cultural, linguistic, spiritual and practical renovation of the indigenous child. This social engineering experiment, which was undertaken as a nation, was a failure. The horrific parameters of its failure might offer a new and critical eye with which to consider the underlying hegemonic discourse of all efforts that have been named as education.

With this paper I invite a consideration of the paradox of failure which the residential school experiment represents, through a consideration of the development of what I am naming an “assimilationist monologue” (government policy) and its meaning. As one drawn to social history, I am inclined to make meaning through particulars. As such, after offering some comment on the movement by the Canadian government and some to an assimilationist praxis, I will offer some particulars drawn from a historical case study--the Mohawk Institute on the Six Nations Reserve near Brantford, Ontario.

The paradoxical failure of the residential school experiment lies in the fact that its outcomes were the opposite of its intent. It was aimed at humanizing, at contributing to the building of a new Canadian democracy, but it ultimately dehumanized and undercut the very fabric of a democratic

Historical Papers 2004: Canadian Society of Church History

nation, which lies at least partly in the protection of human beings, of human rights. This Canadian social engineering experiment became a human rights nightmare.

It can be argued that the foundational bi-cultural, historical discourse in this country has been the dialogue between British dominant culture and First Nations voice. Naming this discourse as dialogue, however, misrepresents the fundamental framework of the conversation. Although with the Imperial Proclamation of 1763 an attitude of friendship and respect for tribal self-government was announced by the British, in less than half a century that climate of respect and toleration had deteriorated into a government policy aimed at civilization (the attempt to encourage First Nations people to become like other Canadian). Ultimately, commitment to civilization metamorphosed into a policy of assimilation, whereby the frame of the discourse had shifted into a one-sided assumption of British superiority and the silencing of aboriginal voice through the legalized de-humanization of First Nations peoples. And here one encounters the paradox—the very attempt as a nation to frame a democracy through increased enfranchisement meant the diminishment of everyone through actualized and systematic dehumanization of this land’s earliest peoples.

By 1890-1891 the government of Canada had signed agreements with a number of church partners and a per-capita funded residential school system was up and running. This does not mean that there were no residential schools in Canada prior to the government’s decision to institute them. The residential school, which is the subject of my case study, began in 1827 and was well established by 1834. The Mohawk Institute was initiated on the Six Nations Reserve, Brantford, Ontario through the auspices of the New England Company. The New England Company (hereafter NEC) began in England in 1649 as a Protestant mission society aimed at the promotion of the gospel among North American Indians. Its North American mission was first to indigenous people of New England (hence its name), mainly in Massachusetts, but also in Connecticut and Rhode Island. However, after the American Revolution the Company transferred its work to Indians in what was then British North America, specifically those who had migrated north of the border.

The Six Nations had sided with the British in the American revolution and after the British loss in 1776 followed their leader, Mohawk Joseph Brant (Tyendinaga) across the border to settle in the fertile Grand

River area of what is now southwestern Ontario, with land deeded to them by the British government in appreciation for their loyalty. Brant asked the New England Company to provide a missionary, a church and education for the people of Six Nations and the NEC responded to this request by beginning a mission with the Six Nations people in their new settlement.

From 1834 a fully established residential mechanical school originally only for male children was operating. This school was known from close to the beginning of its history as the Mohawk Institute (hereafter MI). The MI existed as a place for the residential education of indigenous children from that point until the Canadian government moved to close its residential schools in 1969.

The history of the MI is a lengthy narrative. Between 1834 and 1891 the MI was run solely and exclusively by the NEC. The NEC set the rules, hired employees including principals who served as the on-site representatives of the NEC, monitored quality of care and education, paid all of the bills and made all administrative decisions. In 1891, the NEC applied to the Canadian government to become one of its schools, and thereby eligible for the receipt of an annual per capita grant. Under this arrangement, the government forwarded quarterly cheques for the maintenance of pupils at the MI. The per-capita grant at that time was \$60 per child per year, while the assessed cost of caring for a child at the MI was \$79 per year. The NEC covered costs beyond the per capita grant for the care of children and the maintenance of the property.¹ Despite this transfer of money, the school and its management remained the exclusive preserve of the NEC, with the caveat that general Department of Indian Affairs (hereafter DIA) policies for the management of its schools were to be observed. However, very little monitoring of accountability for the money by the DIA took place in that period.

In 1911, the DIA introduced a series of new management agreements for the residential schools. With these agreements the government and a church managing partner became signatory partners. The terms of mutual responsibility were elaborated. Effectively it was agreed in these documents that the government set policy and paid the bills while church partners served as the on-site managers of the schools. In 1911, the MI was of course still run by the New England Company, which was an ecumenical but predominantly Church of England mission society. The usual Anglican partner for Canadian residential schools was the Mission Society of the Church of England in Canada. The MI, along with St. George's

residential school in Lytton were anomalous in that their church management partner was the NEC.

With the signing of this agreement, a system of inspection and reporting to the DIA were initiated. The form of this inspection and reporting will be explored further in a consideration of the latest two periods of management in the school's life. Very little at the MI changed, however, as the principalship of the school remained for the most part with the family which had held responsibility for its management for most of its history.²

It was not until 1921 that the picture of school management began to shift. Through the First World War, the NEC had difficulty maintaining its commitment to the MI. After the war it asked the DIA to consider purchasing the MI and assuming full control of it. After lengthy negotiations, it became clear that no agreement could be reached. As such, the DIA offered to enter into a lease agreement with the NEC for the management of the school. Under the terms of this lease, the DIA would assume all financial and management responsibilities for running and maintaining the school. The NEC in turn handed over all authority to the DIA, requiring an ongoing dimension of religious instruction in the faith of the Church of England, as part of an MI education. The NEC would also send the sum of 1,500 pounds sterling a year toward the cost of the principal's salary and the upkeep of the Mohawk Chapel.³

Although the DIA became its own defacto managing partner from 1922, the NEC still received regular reports on the school from the principal and on occasion from the DIA. In fact, the principal appointed by the NEC stayed in charge of the school until 1929. In 1929, the DIA acted without consultation with the NEC and removed Rogers as principal. He had been failing to provide adequate reporting, had mismanaged finances and was known as an alcoholic and a physically violent overseer at the MI.⁴

The action of removing the incumbent principal from the MI precipitated a small crisis. How would the new principal be chosen? The DIA assumed that the terms of its lease dictated that the principal should be an Anglican clergyman. This was an error in memory on the part of the DIA, as no such stipulation was made in the lease.⁵ However, the DIA did not consult the NEC, but did consult the Bishop of Huron and ask him for a recommendation regarding a priest for appointment as principal at the MI. The Bishop nominated the Reverend Horace Snell. Snell's appoint-

ment as principal ran from 1929 until 1944. He had the task of managing the school through the depression and the Second World War.

As Snell anticipated retirement, the lease between the NEC and the DIA ran its course. A new lease was required. However, it was the middle of the war and it was not until the war had concluded that the details of a new lease were finally negotiated. Once again, as the negotiations unfolded the NEC asked the DIA to purchase the MI. The Diocese of Huron also expressed interest in assuming full responsibility for the school, including ownership at that juncture. However, when it became clear that the NEC wanted to make money from the transference of ownership, both the Diocese and the NEC backed away from the deal. Finally a lease for another twenty-one years was signed between the DIA and the NEC in 1946. The Diocese of Huron was to have no part in the management of the school. The terms of the lease did not mention the diocese with regard to the management of the school.⁶

On the way to the completion of the lease the question again arose as to who should be appointed as principal of the MI. By this time, the DIA knew that it was not obliged to appoint an Anglican priest. Through its own internal discernment process, and upon the recommendation of the local Indian superintendent at Six Nations, the DIA wanted to appoint an indigenous man who lived at Six Nations and who had taught in the reserve day school for many years.⁷ Mr. Joseph Hill was well regarded by the Six Nations Band Council. The DIA felt strongly that he was the man who could give the leadership that the school required. The Bishop of Huron had another opinion. He argued that the terms of the lease (to which he did not have access) required the appointment of an Anglican priest. He nominated one of his diocesan clergy, the Reverend John Zimmerman. The Bishop and the DIA went back and forth over this issue. However, Snell ended his time and the Bishop of Huron sent John Zimmerman to assume this work. John Zimmerman began his work on 10 August 1945. The DIA decided not to take issue with this action and resigned itself to work with Zimmerman as the principal of the school. He remained in this work until it closed in 1970.

It is the latter two chapters of the MI's life as defined by principalships that will serve as a lens for my consideration of the outcome of this discourse of assimilation. The language of assimilation is by definition one-sided. The point of an assimilationist relationship is the sublimation or eradication of one culture by another. As such, the dominant culture speaks and the subject culture is forced to listen.

The social historian knows that narrative and its meaning are played out most deeply at the level of everyday experience. It was at the level of everyday experience that the meaning of this colonial discourse of dehumanization played itself out. What was the everyday experience of children who were raised over several generations at the MI? What does the content of the experience say about the lived meaning of an assimilationist monologue?

The economics of enforcing an assimilationist monologue through a residential school system led to the dehumanization of indigenous children. How money is spent reveals much about what people value, speaking louder than any text about the philosophy of life and values. Such was certainly the case at the MI. The financial story demonstrates that aboriginal children were not valued as fully human nor their dignity respected. I turn now to a consideration of the ways in which governance and economics shaped the everyday experience of indigenous children at the MI.

As noted above, from 1922 the DIA had sole authority to manage the MI and provided all financial resources for its administration. The documents suggest that the MI was chronically underfunded by the DIA. This underfunding created a chronic situation of lack, neglect, inadequate supervision, substandard education, and often of violence and violation. Allegations of mismanagement or mis-use of funds by both of the principals considered here does surface in DIA correspondence in several instances.⁸ The point is that both underfunding and apparent mismanagement combined to create a climate of suffering for children which is documented in government records. Both the principals of the school and successive Bishops of Huron made repeated entreaties to the DIA for increased funding that would allow an improvement in the quality of life and education at the MI. Until the very end of the school's history (the last decade), these requests failed to produce a significant amelioration in conditions at the school. What are the diverse ramifications of underfunding? Underfunding at the MI meant that the physical plant at the MI was poorly maintained and often in dismaying condition through most of its history.

When the DIA signed its first lease with the NEC it became responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of MI buildings and property. Despite the fact that it continued to spend what it understood to be considerable money on the building, it continued in a dismal state. An internal report between government officials Hoey and McGill, both of the

DIA, toward the end of the Snell era (1942) documents this concern. Noting that Snell had never been a good administrator and had always been poor with finances, Hoey documents that the buildings were dismal and in poor repair.⁹ When the Brantford League of Christian Women visited in 1946 they were shocked by many things, including the poor condition of the physical plant, which extended to inadequate sleeping and toilet facilities, named as “abysmal and below any standard suitable to human living.”¹⁰

Two years after the *Brantford Expositor* article, another internal DIA inspection report gave an account of the sub-human standard of accommodation in a more graphic way. Photographs and diagrams were included with this report to illustrate the gravity of the situation. Inspector Doucet wrote to Neary in Ottawa noting the sense of depression he felt when inspecting the dormitories and playroom. Children wandered aimlessly without any purpose with no resources to occupy their free time. In addition to being depressing, dormitories were also without adequate provision in case of fire. The toilet facilities in the boys’ dormitories were unhealthy, with toilets open and close to the beds. The girls’ dormitory toilets were in a similar situation, totally in the open with no privacy, no ventilation, no toilet seats and inadequately functioning plumbing. In the basement there were more toilets and showers for both boys and girls. These were found to be in similar disarray. In the girls washroom, there was some evidence of fragments of toilet tissue, none in the boys. Neither had privacy of any kind, although the facilities were separated by gender. Only one toilet had the remains of a seat fragment. Drainage in the floor was inadequate and attendant problems resulted. Doucet wrote that, “Conditions are not good enough for a school whose objective is to raise the cultural and moral level of children who have already had a lower than average start. Conditions in the washrooms would by ordinary white standards be called degrading.”¹¹

Despite the clarity of Doucet’s report little was done to ameliorate physical conditions at the MI. Doucet did not remain long as an inspector for the DIA.¹² In 1950, a Grand Jury was summoned to hold an inquest into conditions at the school. It found the condition of the dormitories and bathrooms in a “deplorable state.”¹³ At the time of the inquest, there were 153 children in residence at the school. The Grand Jury not only recommended that the conditions of the toilets and dormitories found to be in a deplorable state be rectified with the “least amount of delay,” but it was also so concerned about conditions that it recommended that the school

should be “watched exceedingly closely” for the next five to six years by succeeding grand juries.¹⁴ That recommendation did not come to pass. Only inspectors internal to the DIA monitored life at the school over the next number of years. In response to the Grand Jury report, the DIA and its representative, local Indian agent Colonel Randle were defensive stressing that things were not that bad, and that conditions had greatly improved from what had been the case in the Snell era.¹⁵

Physical conditions at the MI did not experience a period of significant amelioration until its last decade. By the end of the 1950s, plans were in the works for new classrooms, a new kitchen, and upgraded laundry facilities. By the time the renovations and additions were completed, students had only six years left to live in the building before it was finally closed at the end of the 1960's. In January of 1961 the local newspaper, the *Brantford Expositor* was able to print the headline, “The Mohawk Institute Boasts an Efficient Modern Kitchen.”¹⁶

Government underfunding meant that questions about the adequacy of food, clothing, medical and dental care continually surfaced. Throughout the periods under consideration here, issues repeatedly surfaced from a variety of quarters with regard to the physical care of the children.

As early as 1932, Dr. Landimore, the dentist employed to care for children's teeth at the MI, wrote to the DIA and notes that the condition of the children's teeth was improving thanks to the fact the Snell has provided the children with toothbrushes.¹⁷ From 1929, he had been asking the DIA to provide money for toothbrushes. The DIA insisted that the cost should come from the per-capita grant and would not authorize extra money. Eventually Snell just gave in and bought all of the children toothbrushes as a Christmas present with his own money.¹⁸ Throughout his time at the school, Snell wrangled with the DIA about the provision of adequate dental care. Letters moved back and forth consistently between the Secretary of the DIA, Snell and the dentist Dr. Landimore as they attempted to deal with the situation of the children's teeth. Only once in the Snell era is a five-day dental clinic held and this was to deal with accumulated problems. No preventative dental care was paid for--only emergencies such as infected tooth extractions. Although it appears that there was no more than one day of dental attention a year given to students at the MI, still the DIA objected that the MI was spending more money on dental care than other residential schools.¹⁹

The dental care issue highlights a consistent theme in the residential school narrative. The assimilationist monologue is to be carried on as

cheaply as possible. Children are not given an ordinary standard of care, relative even to the standard of the dominant culture of the day.

Medical care for children at the MI was provided through a combination of means. Urgent cases requiring hospitalization or hospital care were taken to the Lady Willingdon Hospital on the reserve. When a situation required removal to a Brantford hospital where a fee would be charged for care, the principal of the MI would have to seek written authorization from the DIA in Ottawa for that care. My review of the material available suggests that often times the condition of children significantly worsened, sometimes resulting in death before written permission was received. Permission was not always given. You have then a situation of a bureaucracy, which had the right to decide on a case by case basis, with an emphasis on predominantly financial considerations, which children would live and which would die when medical emergencies arose.

One narrative will illustrate the point. Wilhemina Hill was four or five years old (the school staff did not know for sure), and a student at the MI in 1934, when she contracted tuberculosis. Wilhemina's number was 01059. Because she had been assessed as being tubercular she could not stay at the MI. She could not go home because her mother had died and there was no other alternate supervision. Snell wanted to send her to the Sanitarium in Brantford, but could not do this without authorization from the DIA, as the cost for her to live at the Sanitarium was \$1 per day. The DIA Secretary in Ottawa, Mr. Mackenzie, did not agree to pay the \$1 per day. He asked the DIA-appointed physician, Dr. Davies, to assess the situation. Dr. Davies confirmed the diagnosis and recommendation. The government felt unable to authorize the extra money (considerably more than the per capita allowance they would have paid for her to live at the MI).²⁰ The correspondence went back and forth.²¹ Wilhemina died at the MI before any authorization was given for the transfer. Several other students contracted TB. False economy? Obviously, the value of an indigenous child's life was limited in the ethical system of the assimilationist monologue.

Students from several decades of life at the MI contend that they were not adequately fed while students in that institution.²² This concern was also raised by parents of children at the school and outside inspectors looking in at school life.²³ In 1950, an internal DIA report noted that between 1948 and 1950 thirteen children belonging to six different families had requested that their children be removed from the MI to the

Shingwauk school because conditions, including inadequate food at the MI were harming their children. These parents were willing to pay additional money to have their children moved to a school with better conditions. These transfers were allowed as parents were available to complain and willing to pay for a transfer.²⁴ Where parents or resources were not present conditions were usually unquestioned. The Brantford League of Christian Women found in 1946 that children were underfed and that inadequate food made it particularly concerning that there was no regular medical or dental care for the children at the MI.²⁵

The adequacy of children's clothing persisted as a constant refrain through the decades of our narrative. In 1939, an anonymous writer sent a letter to the DIA reporting that it was well known in Brantford that the children were not adequately clothed. The letter noted that it was then November and "the boys are still without underwear. They only received stockings one month ago. Light cotton clothes are worn summer and winter. Even the poor clothes they have are often dirty and ragged."²⁶ Colonel Randle, the Indian agent at Six Nations, in keeping with his usual perspective, insisted that there were no issues and that all was well at the school.²⁷ When the Brantford League of Christian Women exposed their concerns about conditions at the MI, lack of adequate clothing was on their list. Most notably they expressed concern that children were not provided with socks, winter coats or boots in the middle of southwestern Ontario winters.²⁸

Well into the 1950s, the question of providing adequate clothing with the limited DIA allowance for provision was still at issue. In 1955 with 165 students in residence at the MI, Zimmerman wrote to the Ottawa office of the DIA stressing that the only way he had been able to clothe the children at all adequately had been because of church donations. The Anglican Woman's Auxiliary had given a total assistance in clothing of over \$2,500. Zimmerman insisted that if the point of a residential school education is to prepare children to become part of dominant culture (Brantford society) then they must be dressed as white children are.²⁹ Davey responded with some sympathy.³⁰ However, his sympathy ultimately did not translate into the increase which Zimmerman requested.

The quality of education at the MI was often under critique. Under funding by the DIA affected education in many ways. It meant that for most of the MI's history, teachers who would work for less or who could not find work elsewhere were hired, and usually there was an inadequate number of available teachers. In 1930, shortly after Snell assumed the

principalship, he reported to the DIA that there were 134 pupils in residence between the ages of 6 and 18. At that juncture, most of the pupils were drawn from Six Nations. Students were divided into two groups. Two teachers were hired to teach all 134 students.³¹

The curriculum taught at that time was partly academic and partly industrial. Students spent half their day in the classroom and half engaged in manual labour designed to “train” them for service work employment. Boys worked on the MI farm and girls worked in the kitchen, laundry and as seamstresses and housekeepers. Girls were also sent off the property to work as servants in some wealthy Brantford homes for which the school received a stipend. This off-site work often ended in complications for young girls who returned to the MI pregnant at the hands of those in whose homes they worked.³²

The combined education/work model of education combined with the small number of teachers meant that an MI education in that period often left students barely literate. However, several did continue on to study at the local Brantford high school each year and some even went on to university. However, it may be that the exception proves the rule as most students did not matriculate from high school.³³

The theme of an inadequate number of teachers at the MI continued into the Zimmerman era. The *Brantford Expositor* article that told the story of local women’s concern in 1946 stressed the issue of education. The Brantford League of Christian Women had paid a visit to the MI while the principal was out of town. His wife kindly showed them around the school and they were astonished at the conditions they found. Of interest here are the comments on the teaching resources. The women found that there was no manual training instructors, or domestic science teachers despite the fact that the school retained its identity as an industrial training facility. The women compared the school to the public schools their children attended and were shocked that there was no music and arts teacher, no proper library, no quiet study space, no physical education facilities, and no proper classroom equipment of various kinds.³⁴

The public nature of these concerns caused considerable furor in Ottawa and the Bishop’s office of the Anglican Church. The local Indian agent, Colonel Randle who had primary oversight of the situation at Six Nations was quick to argue that things were fine and the ladies were exaggerating.³⁵ However, the concerns raised by that visit were echoed over the years by many different voices.

As late as the last years of the 1950s, Zimmerman and the DIA still went back and forth about the question of hiring adequate and sufficient teachers. It was not until 1960 that the MI came to be treated as a public school, with its teachers receiving the same salary and benefits as public school teachers. By 1961 the MI had five licensed teachers with a total student population of 140, with a few attending the local high school.³⁶ By that point the demography of the student population at the MI had changed. Most of the students were no longer from Six Nations. Increasingly they came from Quebec and northern Ontario as children who either were orphans, delinquent or disabled in a variety of ways. By the time the MI received the status of a public school it had in fact moved to become a predominantly special-needs school, which then required another complex kind of resourcing, which the government was again unable to address adequately.³⁷

Consistent underfunding by the DIA affected the quality of life that children enjoyed outside of the classroom. It meant that there was inadequate after-school and night-time supervision of children, including inadequate supervision of recreation, which led to peer oppression and on occasion accidental death.

Effie Smith is an example of such a situation. Effie was a thirteen year-old girl living at the MI when she died in 1936. The school lacked playground equipment. For many years there was a hand-made toy known as the May Pole. The May Pole was an automobile wheel on a shaft adapted to fit at the top of a pole. The device was used to swing around, as in the traditional May Pole dance. Children often used this device unsupervised. Over the years this May Pole was used variously, sometimes as a form of peer punishment. An unpopular child was strapped by the arms to the device and swung round and round until he or she vomited.³⁸ The day Effie died there were no adults supervising the play. Apparently the wood broke away on one side causing the pole to fall and Effie was crushed in the midriff. She died of internal hemorrhaging at the scene of the accident. There was an inquest and the finding was for accidental death. Proper playground equipment, maintenance and play supervision was recommended. The mother of the child did not blame the school, but in fact requested a spot for her younger son in her daughter's place.³⁹ Funding to increase supervision of the children was not forthcoming.

In 1947, Zimmerman reports to the DIA that he had caught some boys, "in the act of homo-sex," for which he wanted permission to use behaviour modification based on the "pleasure-pain" principle as

punishment, rather than the DIA proscribed hand strapping.⁴⁰ The DIA reiterated that their policy of strapping on the hands was sufficient.⁴¹ There is no record that Zimmerman ever again raised this question with Ottawa. However, there is significant oral history testimony that the pain–pleasure principle of behaviour modification was regularly used in violation of DIA policy.⁴²

The incident recorded in this letter is disturbing for the way it details, not an act of “homo-sex,” but of rape. “One lad was holding down a younger lad and the third caught in the act while stripped.”⁴³ Lack of supervision meant lack of protection for younger children in particular.

Sexual activity involving children at the MI was an issue, although it is difficult to find traces of that narrative. One such trace exists in a letter that Zimmerman sent to the DIA in Ottawa, again around money. He was requesting extra money to improve laundry facilities. Venereal disease was rampant at the MI and Zimmerman argued that it was being spread by towels. He wanted better laundry facilities to counteract the spread of the venereal disease.⁴⁴

Throughout the period under consideration here, the MI was inspected, monitored and assessed by the DIA and associated government offices. By 1960 besides the DIA and its usual plethora of accountabilities, several other bodies were involved in monitoring and supporting the work of the MI. These included the Children’s Aid Society, the local Mental Health Clinic, the National Health and Welfare Service, a Brant Public School inspector, Superintendent of Schools Regional Office, and Six Nations Inspectorate of schools.

What began as bi-lateral discourse in the context of friendship ended as an assimilationist monologue--the language of communication--a hegemonic discourse. The residential school experiment was designed to build the new nation of Canada, through re-creating indigenous persons in the image of the dominant euro-descent culture. Rather than promoting enfranchisement and nurturing democracy, Canadians saw the fabric of their basic convictions cut away as the experiment in social engineering became a human rights nightmare. Throughout, the basic assumption that indigenous children were somehow less than others was used to justify government underfunding and what amounted to callous disregard for human suffering. At the level of social history the meaning of opting into a model of confluence characterized by an assumption of racial superiority and justifiable dominance is clear--it did not work. Paradoxically in fact

it took Canadians away from the primary project named as democratic humanization, toward dehumanization and loss of national soul.

Endnotes

1. NEC Minute Book, March, 1893, Guildhall.
2. The principalship of the MI was passed by the NEC Board of Governors to various generations of an English family who had been involved in the MI from the early years. It was not stipulated at that juncture, nor in fact in any of the subsequent leases, that the principal be a clergyman of the Church of England in Canada. The NEC appointed a Chief Missioner to Six Nations who also oversaw the running of the school, although not necessarily at the level of daily contact. This system was replaced with the direct appointment of a principal when the per capita grant system of 1890 took effect. From 1890-91 Robert Ashton was appointed by the NEC as principal. He was followed briefly by his son Nelles Asthon, a military man not a priest. After the failure of that brief appointment the NEC appointed a Church of England priest by the name of Cyril Turnell who came from England to run the school. He was terminated after less than three years, however, as he was spending too much money to provide for the needs of the children. The NEC had historically underfunded the school meaning stark conditions for the children. He was replaced by the daughter of former principal Robert Ashton and her husband, also not clergy persons, Alice and Sydney Rogers.
3. NEC Minute Books, 1919-22, Guildhall. No requirement was made for the principal of the school to be a member of the Anglican clergy, as the then principal was the layman appointed by the NEC, Mr. Rogers. The Mohawk Chapel had been built by the NEC at Six Nations at the close of the eighteenth century. It has survived to this day as a duly constituted Anglican Church. When the diocese of Huron was formed in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the Bishop of Huron assumed an oversight responsibility for the chapel, issuing licenses for the clergy who served there. When the principal of the MI was a priest, he also served as incumbent of the Chapel and provided religious instruction for students at the MI. The principal was often paid by the NEC a small stipend in addition to his principal's salary for his work as incumbent of the Chapel. This money was funneled through the DIA prior to World War Two and through the Diocese of Huron after that time. Students at the MI attended Anglican services of worship at the Chapel only during warm weather. During other times of the year services were held in an MI classroom.

4. Letter from DIA to NEC Board of Governors, NEC Minute Books, 1929, Guildhall.
5. The terms of the lease which governed the NEC and DIA lease for the management of St. George's School, Lytton made this stipulation. Assuming this was the situation in the MI case opened a process for appointment which could have been otherwise. In other words, the DIA did not need to consult the Bishop of Huron regarding this appointment.
6. NEC Minute Books, 1944-1946, Guildhall, RG-10, Volume 8605, File 451/1-13, Part 1.
7. Letter from Colonel Randle to Hoey, DIA, 01 June 1945, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 4.
8. An instance of this surfaces with regard to Horace Snell. Questions were raised about his reporting. Principals were required to submit reports on all expenditures and use of government resources. In one instance he was caught lying about his use of wartime gas coupons. In a letter dated 10 November 1944 a Mr. MacKeighan of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board writes to Mr. McGill of the DIA and reports that Snell has claimed that he has used 150 gas coupons issued for arms work for the farm tractor and truck. The watchdog of the Prices and Trade board discovered that the vehicles for which the coupons had been issued had been in disrepair and unusable during the time that Snell made use of the coupons. Snell was not criminally prosecuted (as he could have been under wartime legislation), but he was reported to the DIA.
9. Letter from Hoey to McGill, 09 November 1942, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-23, part 1.
10. *Brantford Expositor*, 22 February 1946.
11. Report from Doucet to Neary, 23 November 1948, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 5.
12. A pattern can be observed in the reporting process over time. When a DIA inspector such as Doucet raised concerns about conditions at the MI he did not remain long as an inspector. A critical inspector was usually followed by an inspector who would remain for several years and whose reports indicated that things were fine. I
13. *Brantford Expositor*, 19 March 1950.
14. *Brantford Expositor*, 15 March 1950.
15. *Brantford Expositor*, 16 March 1950.

16. *Brantford Expositor*, 20 January 1961.
17. Letter from Landymore to the Secretary for the DIA, 15 April 1932, RG 10, Volume 6202, file 466-13, part 1.
18. RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 1.
19. RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 2.
20. The per-capita grant was approximately \$150 per annum per child.
21. Letters and telegrams from Snell to Mackenzie and also to and from Dr. Davies, 04 July 1934 to 30 July 1934, RG 10, Volume 6202, file 466-13, part 1.
22. See oral histories included in *The Mush Hole*, compiled by Elizabeth Graham, 1997.
23. Letter from Gauthier to IAB, DIA, 25 July 1950, RG 10, Volume 6202, file 466-10, part 6.
24. Letter from Neary to Gauthier, 31 July 1950, RG 10, Volume 6202, file 466-10, part 6.
25. *Brantford Expositor*, 27 February 1946.
26. Letter from Hoey to Colonel Randle, 06 November 1939. RG 10, Volume 8606, file 487/1-13-001.
27. Letter from Randle to DIA Secretary, 22 November 1939. RG 10, Volume 6202, file 466-10, part 6.
28. *Brantford Expositor*, 22 February 1946.
29. Letter from Zimmerman to Davey, 01 August 1955, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 4.
30. Letter from Davey to Zimmerman, 05 August 1955.
31. RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 4.
32. One of the two teachers who worked at the MI in 1930. Her name was Susan Hardie. She herself was the product of such a liason. Her mother had been a student at the MI who was sent to work in the home of a prominent Brantford legal mind, Judge Hardie. Her mother returned to the MI and gave birth to Susan. Susan's biological father paid the cost of her maintenance at the MI. Susan went to Normal School and returned to the MI to teach. In 1930 she had taught at the MI for forty-two years (RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 2).

33. Quarterly reports submitted by the principals to the DIA from 1929 to 1969 show that no more than five percent of MI students in any given year attended the local high school (RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-23, part 1; RG10, Volume 8605, file 451/1-13, part 1; and RG 10, Volume 8606, file 487/1-13-001).
34. *Brantford Expositor*, 22 February 1946.
35. Letter from Colonel Randle to Hoey, DIA, 23 February 1946, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 4.
36. Letter from Davey, DIA to Regional Education Supervisor, 24 April 1961, RG 10, Volume 8606, file 487/1-13-001.
37. Internal DIA letter from Morris to Davey, 24 July 1959, RG 10, Volume 7188, file 451/25-1-004.
38. Internal school memo. RG 10, Volume 8605, file 451/1-13, part 1.
39. *Brantford Expositor*, 16 May 1936; and Letter from Snell to Secretary of the DIA, 25 May 1936, RG10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 2.
40. Letter from Zimmerman to Neary, 06 December 1947, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 5.
41. Letter from Neary to Zimmerman, 15 December 1947, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 5.
42. OHI #6; 14; 11. Litigation currently in the court system alleges the use of physical violation and violence as a regular form of discipline.
43. Letter from Zimmerman to Neary, 06 December 1947, RG 10, Volume 6200, file 466-1, part 5.
44. Letter from Zimmerman to Neary, 1951, RG 10, Volume 8606, file 487/1-13-001.

