***"Lessons Learned: Reconciliation"***
**Remarks for a Keynote Address to the 12th North American Textile Conservation Conference, Ottawa, Sept. 25, 2019**

John Moses
Supervisor, Repatriation
Canadian Museum of History
Gatineau, Quebec, Canada

She:kon. Skennen kewaka. Sawatis Moses ionkiats. Kena iatse Onkwehonwe. Kena iatse Haudenosaunee: Kenienkehaka tannon Lenni Lenape.[1] Bonsoir. Je m'appelle John Moses. Je suis superviseur de rapatriement au musee Canadien de l'histoire. Good evening. My name is John Moses. I am a member of the Delaware and Upper Mohawk bands from the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory near Brantford, Ontario, which is where both my parents were born and raised, and where the majority of my extended family members continue to live and work. I am currently repatriation supervisor at the Canadian Museum of History. I want to acknowledge of course our Indigenous veterans and elders, and the traditional Indigenous territory of the Anishinabeg on which we are gathered.

I also want to thank the organizers of the North American Textile Conservation Conference for the privilege of providing this year's keynote address. Although no longer working as a conservator, I began my career in the museums and heritage field as an objects conservator specializing in the treatment of organic materials and Indigenous peoples' cultural properties, and I have always treasured – and I continue to treasure - the fellowship and camaraderie of the international community of conservators in all areas of specialization. So thank you - Nia:wen – for including me tonight. In my remarks this evening it is neither my place nor my intention to provide you an update concerning the

[1] Hello. How are you. My name is John Moses. I am proud to be Indigenous. I am proud to be Iroquois: Mohawk and Delaware.

latest technical advances in the field of textiles conservation. Rather, given that the conference theme overall is **Lessons Learned – Conservation Then & Now**, and that we are looking at important developments in the field generally since the 1980s, I have chosen to frame my own remarks this evening as **Lessons Learned: Reconciliation**. It is my intention to provide you a uniquely Canadian -and a uniquely Indigenous view – of significant developments within the museum field, and by extension within conservation practice, over the span of the past several decades. Amongst other things I want to address the personhood and agency of objects, the primacy of Indigenous languages, and I want to place museum conservation practice in context within Canada's overarching Indigenous truth and reconciliation agenda. I will do this by tracing the chronology of significant events and linking these with important international developments impacting the work of museums and heritage professionals in a global sense.

Conservation in all its various branches and specializations is no less a values-laden social practice than it is an evidence-based scientific and technical pursuit. To the extent that the theme of Conference 2019 is a retrospective concerning best practices and lessons learned from the decade of the 1980s to the present, I am asserting here that in no other realm have we witnessed such profound developments in conservation practice as within the field of conservation values and ethics. I further want to provide an overview of significant milestones in Indigenous rights discourse in Canada and internationally from roughly the late 1980s to 2019, which have each had significant filter-down effects in museum practices, including conservation. Within Canadian borders these developments include the 1992 Canadian Museums Association-Assembly of First Nations Joint Task Force Report on Museums and First Peoples; the 1996 Royal

Commission on Aboriginal Peoples; the emergence of the doctrine of the legal duty to consult and accommodate the holders of Aboriginal and treaty rights; and the 2015 Indian Residential Schools Truth and Reconciliation Commission calls-to-action. Internationally, the 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) is key. I would also note the 2016 name and mandate change of the former ICOM Conservation Committee "Working Group on Ethnographic Materials" to the more descriptive "Working Group on Indigenous and World Cultures". An overview of these milestones is deemed of importance to conservators internationally for comparative purposes, relative to the state of museum versus Indigenous and other minority relations in their respective countries. Permit me to quote UNDRIP Article 11 in setting the appropriate tone for my remarks:

> QUOTE "Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artifacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts, and literature. States shall provide redress through effective mechanisms, which may include restitution, developed in conjunction with Indigenous peoples, with respect to their cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free, prior and informed consent, or in violation of their laws and customs." END OF QUOTE

I would additionally quote from call-to-action number 43 of Canada's own Indian Residential Schools Truth & Reconciliation Commission final report, which reads: "We call upon federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments to fully adopt and

implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as the national framework for reconciliation."

Historical objects themselves exist not only in their materials of manufacture and in their physical dimensions of length, width, and depth; and in their chronologic dimension over time. They also possess social, political and cultural dimensions which are either easily overlooked, or too often taken for granted as unremarkable, including during the busy daily round of conservation treatment and care of collections practice. For example, what are the views and perspectives of modern-day Indigenous populations regarding sacred or ritual artifacts of their patrimony currently housed in museums? Thus Indigenous objects in museums do not exist in a vacuum; and as the son, grandson and great grandson of residential school survivors – more of which later - I can attest before all of you that beyond their physical attributes they equally possess intangible qualities such as these, of which we must likewise be aware.

Within such a paradigm the place of museums of ethnography in Western culture, the roots of which are so easily seen as embedded in the very fabric of earlier colonial practices, is clearly open to review. And as the role of the museum as a custodian of ethnographic collections comes under scrutiny, questions naturally arise as to the appropriate disposition of such collections; hence, the present trend toward the outright repatriation of contested objects and collections back to their Indigenous communities of origin at one end of the spectrum; to the imperative for Indigenous consultation and oversight – also called free, prior, and informed consent - as the minimum acceptable standard in preserving, researching, and exhibiting such collections, at the other.

Workers in the range of the museum and gallery-related disciplines and professions including conservation must not be left behind as these discussions receive further elaboration, and museums and other cultural workers must be prepared to consider difficult questions including who gets to speak on whose behalf concerning the representation and interpretation of Indigenous objects in public institutional settings like museums; whose values and assumptions form the basis of conservation decision-making, whether for individual artifacts and works of art, or for entire monuments, historic sites, and cultural landscapes; and how to incorporate both traditional and newly evolving Indigenous caregiving practices into mainstream collections care, conservation treatment, collections risk assessment, and exhibition practices, so as to give full expression in applied museum practice to relevant provisions of UNDRIP and domestically, Canada's legal duty to consult and the TRC calls-to-action?

Having considered these issues, collecting institutions should recognize the range of practical benefits arising from a greater degree of Indigenous involvement in their ordinary operating environment and routine practices. This includes access to the cultural expertise, political awareness, and traditional knowledge, of Indigenous staff and advisors; increased credibility among Indigenous constituencies generally, especially those within whose traditional territory the institution is located; and the presence of Indigenous staff who may serve as role models and mentors for Indigenous youth and graudates seeking entry to the heritage-related professions including conservation. These benefits far outweigh any perceived risks in terms of making collections – and institutions – more accessible to Indigenous peoples.

In short, Indigenous inclusion fosters social cohesion; civic participation & engagement; demonstrates an institutional commitment to democratic principles; and ultimately enables the institution to present itself as a credible voice within the equity and diversity debates that are central within contemporary museum practice worldwide. While conservators and other museum professionals need not become strident Indigenous rights activists, frankly stated it should be another measure of any museum worker's professional knowledge and competence that they are aware that these issues exist with respect to Indigenous collections in museums, and that when the opportunity arises they are equipped to provide their institutional leadership with sound advice as sensitive matters emerge.

In summary, a holistic museum approach that prioritizes Indigenous views and perspectives can be identified by a demonstrated awareness on the part of institutional staff, of principles based on an acceptance of the notion of the agency and personhood of objects, the primacy of Indigenous languages, and the determining voice of Indigenous experts on Indigenous issues in presenting and interpreting such materials in museums and related settings. In Canadian institutions, a working knowledge of Aboriginal and treaty right compliance (ATRC) factors is also required. These factors comprise a knowledge of UNDRIP compliance; TRC compliance; the Legal Duty to Consult and Accommodate the holders of Aboriginal and treaty rights; Aboriginal community engagement protocols; and modern treaty implementation obligations that may include provisions around access to collections.

Now if we can accept my earlier contention that artifact conservation and other aspects of heritage preservation are just as much ideology-driven social projects as they

are evidence-based technical pursuits, we can begin unpacking those complex tensions underlying collecting and curatorial practices within museums, the venue within which most conservation work continues to take place. Indigenous stakeholder groups, including communities of origin, are stepping forward and asserting the right to be heard, and many of these no longer passively accept conservation, and other museum practices, as unquestioned social goods or benefits. In any event, language retention and language revitalization are often the premiere cultural priority over artifacts, as a legacy of the negative impacts on Indigenous languages of residential schools and other colonial projects within communities. Objects remain especially valued to the extent they can still be associated with the correct bodies of ritual and ceremony, which are conveyed orally and through performance, via the correct Indigenous language(s).

For you as textiles conservators who may deal with artifacts of Indigenous material culture on either a regular or occasional basis depending on the nature of the collections for which you are responsible, I would suggest the following as one very practical but important step that you might take in meeting the spirit and intent of the UN Declaration as you go about your daily practice: Given the primacy of language retention and language revitalization efforts as a response to the legacy of the residential schools experience and other colonial impositions, I would urge each of you to do your utmost to retrieve and record the appropriate Indigenous-language names and terminology associated with the objects you are treating, and include within your treatment documentation even just a single paragraph describing the cultural setting within which the object was used. In time to come your own inclusion of Indigenous-language terminology within your treatment records may be another source of information for

future generations of researchers, and it will be evidence that you personally, as an informed heritage conservation professional, were concerned with such matters and tried to make a difference. **END OF PART I**

Now I want to shift ground now and provide you an intensely personal account concerning my own family's experience with the residential schools system. The residential school experience looms large in the history of my family, just as it does for so many other Indigenous families across the country. While my mother's family, the Montures, were for the most part raised at home in traditional Six Nations family settings, things were rather different on my father's side of the family. My late father Russ Moses, who passed away in 2013, and his brother & sister were raised at the Mohawk Institute Indian Residential School in Brantford, Ontario, in the 1940s; their father/my grandfather Ted Moses was there in the nineteen teens; and my great-grandfather Nelson Moses was raised there even earlier, in the 1880s. So that makes me the first generation after three that was not sent there, for which I am of course grateful, the Mohawk Institute having closed its doors as a Residential School in 1970, owing in part to the Memoir you are about to hear.

The following memoir was written by my father Russ upon his leaving the Canadian military in 1965 and starting new work that year as a civilian public servant, with the then-Indian Affairs Branch of the Department of Citizenship & Immigration. Written from the vantage point of December, 1965 when he was 33 years old, the memoir recounts Russ's childhood experiences at the Mohawk Institute, which he attended from 1942 until 1947. Each residential school was a unique sub-culture in its own right:

different schools met different perceived needs in different regions of the country during different decades, and different conditions applied.

When my great grandfather Nelson Moses was at the Mohawk Institute in the 1880s, it was run as a mission school where likely young men and women from the Six Nations community were sent to be trained as Indigenous Anglican clergy and teachers, to be sent out west as the process of signing the numbered treaties continued and as new Indian reserves were being set aside. When my grandfather Ted was there in the 1910s, it was essentially a military-themed boarding school during the era of global militarization that would culminate with the outbreak of the Great War. It degenerated throughout the decades of 1920s and 30s and the era of the Great Depression. My father and his siblings had the misfortune of being sent there during the 1940s at the height of the Second World War, by which time any pretense  toward providing education or training had been abandoned: the Indigenous children were there to provide the forced agricultural labour necessary to keep the large farm operation going, as a contribution to the civilian food production effort on the Canadian home front during wartime. The Mohawk Institute itself sat on 350 acres of prime southern Ontario farmland with varieties of crops, livestock and orchards under cultivation. Sadly, the children themselves derived no benefit from their own labour, and as you will hear were reduced to begging on the streets of Brantford to help sustain themselves.

This unique first-person account is an important primary source document for an Indigenous auto-ethnography of the Residential Schools experience in Canadian history, wherein as Indigenous peoples ourselves, we assert a leadership role in providing our own unfiltered testimonies and accounts, without re-presentation or validation or

mediation by others; and since the Memoir was produced in 1965 at the specific request of government officials, it obviously predates our current era of retrospection concerning the Schools, as the State maneuvers to contain its various liabilities. Thus Russ's memoir is not a mere representation or interpretation of an Indigenous experience by a second- or third-party narrator, it remains an actual first-hand, first-person Indigenous account that continues to speak to us despite the passage of many decades. Russ's memoir speaks the Truth that necessarily precedes the Reconciliation.

Notwithstanding the tragic circumstances of childhood abuse and neglect described in his memoir, as Russ's son it is important for me to convey to all of you that Russ refused to be defined by his residential school experience. Russ never hid his experience; neither did he dwell upon it. Beyond his upbringing, my father was a decorated naval veteran of the Korean War, an air force veteran of the Cold War, and an accomplished public servant whose many achievements included being Deputy Commissioner General of the ground breaking Indians of Canada Pavilion at Montreal's Expo 67. Most important, Russ was a loving husband, father, grandfather, father-in-law and uncle, with a tremendous sense of humour and irony, and an appreciation of the absurd, which I think is what helped him deal with so many things in life. As you listen to this memoir, I would ask you to reflect upon the following questions:

- In what ways was the childhood and educational experience described here different than your own, or what you might know of your own parents' or grandparents' experiences?

- What were some of the specific techniques used to sever bonds between siblings, and to disrupt the cross-generational transmission of Indigenous cultures, heritage and languages?
- Finally, how might some of the conditions described here, account for the social pathologies experienced in some Indigenous families and communities today?

INDIAN AFFAIRS BRANCH
DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

CANADA

DIRECTION DES AFFAIRES INDIENNES
MINISTÈRE DE LA CITOYENNETÉ ET DE L'IMMIGRATION

Ottawa 2, December 10, 1965.

OUR FILE NO. 1/25-20-1 (E.24)
Notre dossier nº.....

Mr. Russ Moses,
Information Section,
Room 425,
Bourque Building,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Mr. Moses:

During the week beginning with January 10, 1966, the Residential School Principals from all regions will be meeting at Elliot Lake, Ontario, to discuss various aspects of residential schools.

In order to bring as many view points as possible to these deliberations, a selected number of Indians have been invited to submit their views and you are one of the persons who has been selected.

We would be most grateful to you if you would put your thoughts regarding residential schools down on paper and send this to me by the end of December. Please feel free to express your views candidly. We want to benefit both from your experience and your insights and frankness will be appreciated.

All the best to you and yours during the Yuletide Season and I will very much appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

L. Jampolsky,
Chief Superintendent of
Vocational Training and
Special Services.

WILL SUBMIT VIEWS. R.M. 13/12/65 DONE 28/12/65

28/12/65

MOHAWK INSTITUTE - 1942-47

First, a bit of what it was like in the "good old days".

In August 1942, shortly before my 9th birthday a series of unfortunate family circumstances made it necessary that I along with my 7 year old sister and an older brother, be placed in the Mohawk Institute at Brantford, Ontario.

Our home life prior to going to the "Mohawk" was considerably better than many of the other Indian children who were to be my friends in the following five years. At the "mushole" (this was the name applied to the school by the Indians for many years) I found to my surprise that one of the main tasks for a new arrival was to engage in physical combat with a series of opponents, this was done by the students, so that you knew exactly where you stood in the social structure that existed.

The food at the Institute was disgraceful. The normal diet was as follows:

Breakfast - two slices of bread with either jam or honey as the dressing, oatmeal with worms or corn meal porridge which was minimal in quantity and appalling in quality. The beverage consisted of skim milk and when one stops to consider that we were milking from twenty to thirty head of pure bred Aolstein cattle, it seems odd that we did not ever receive whole milk and in my five years at the Institute we never received butter once.

This is very strange, for on entering the Institute our ration books for sugar and butter were turned in to the management - we never received sugar other than Christmas morning when we had a yearly feast of one shreaded wheat with a sprinkling of brown sugar.

Lunch - At the Institute this consisted of water as the beverage, if you were a senior boy or girl you received (Grade V or above) one and half slices of dry bread and the main course consisted of "rotten soup" (local terminology) (i.e. scraps of beef, vegetables some in a state of decay.) Desert would be restricted to nothing on some days and a type of tapioca pudding (fish eyes) or a crudely prepared custard, the taste of which I can taste to this day. Children under Grade V level received one slice of dry bread - incidentally we were not weight watchers.

Supper - This consisted of two slices of bread and jam, fried potatoes, NO MEAT, a bun baked by the girls (common terminology - "horse buns") and every other night a piece of cake or possibly an apple in the summer months.

The manner in which the food was prepared did not encourage overeating. The diet remained constant, hunger was never absent. I would say here that 90% of the children were suffering from diet deficiency and this was evident by the number of boils, warts and general malaise that existed within the school population.

I have seen Indian children eating from the swill barrel, picking out soggy bits of food that was intended for the pigs.

At the "mushole" we had several hundred laying hens (white leghorn). We received a yearly ration of one egg a piece - this was on Easter Sunday morning, the Easter Bunny apparently influenced this.

The whole milk was separated in the barn and the cream was then sold to a local dairy firm, "The Mohawk Creamery", which I believe is still in business. All eggs were sold as well as the chickens at the end of their laying life - we never had chicken - except on several occasions when we stole one or two and roasted them on a well concealed fire in the bush - half raw chicken is not too bad eating!

The policy of the Mohawk Institute was that both girls and boys would attend school for half days and work the other half. This was Monday to Friday inclusive. No school on Saturday but generally we worked.

The normal work method was that the children under Grade V level worked in the market garden in which every type of vegetable was grown and in the main sold - the only vegetables which were stored for our use were potatoes, beans, turnips of the animal fodder variety. The work was supervised by white people who were employed by the Institute and beatings were administered at the slightest pretext. We were not treated as human beings - we were the Indian who had to become shining examples of Anglican Christianity.

I have seen Indian children having their faces rubbed in human excrement, this was done by a gentleman who has now gone to his just reward.

The normal punishment for bed wetters (usually one of the smaller boys) was to have his face rubbed in his own urine.

The senior boys worked on the farm - and I mean worked, we were underfed, ill clad and out in all types of weather - there is certainly something to be said for Indian stamina. At harvest times, such as potatoe harvest, corn harvest for cattle fodder - we older boys would at times not attend school until well on into fall as we were needed to help with the harvest.

We arose at 6:00 a.m. each morning and went to the barn to do "chores". This included milking the cattle, feeding and then using curry comb and brush to keep them in good mental and physical condition.

After our usual sumptuous breakfast we returned to the barn to do "second chores" 8:00 to 9:00 a.m. - this included cleaning the stables, watering the young stock and getting hay down out of mow, as well as carrying ensilage from the silo to the main barn.

We also had some forty to eighty pigs depending on time of year - we never received pork or bacon of any kind except at Christmas when a single slice of pork along with mashed potatoes and gravy made up our Christmas dinner. A few rock candies along with an orange and Christmas pudding which was referred to as "dog shit" made up our Christmas celebrations. The I.O.D.E. sent us books as gifts.

Religion was pumped into us at a fast rate, chapel, every evening, church on Sundays (twice). For some years after leaving the Institute, I was under the impression that my tribal affiliation was "Anglican" rather than Delaware.

Our formal education was sadly neglected, when a child is tired, hungry, lice infested and treated as a sub-human, how in heavens name do you expect to make a decent citizen out of him or her, when the formal school curriculum is the most disregarded aspect of his whole background. I speak of lice, this was an accepted part of "being Indian" at the Mohawk - heads were shaved in late spring. We had no tooth brushes, no underwear was issued in the summer, no socks in the summer. Our clothing was a disgrace to this country. Our so called "Sunday clothes" were cut down first world war army uniforms. Cold showers were provided summer and winter in which we were herded en masse by some of the bigger boys and if you did not keep under the shower you would be struck with a brass studded belt.

The soap for perfuming our ablutions was the green liquid variety which would just about take the hide off you.

Bullying by larger boys was terrible, younger boys were "slaves" to these fellows and were required to act as such - there were also cases of homosexual contact, but this is not strange when you consider that the boys were not even allowed to talk to the girls - even their own sisters, except for 15 minutes once a month when you met each other in the "visiting room" and you then spoke in hushed tones.

Any mail coming to any student or mail being sent was opened and read before ever getting to the addressee or to the Indian child - money was removed and held in "trust" for the child.

It was our practise at the "Mohawk" to go begging at various homes throughout Brantford. There were certain homes that we knew that the people were good to us, we would rap on the door and our question was: "Anything extra", whereupon if we were lucky, we would be rewarded with scraps from the household - survival of the fittest.

Many children tried to run away from the Institute and nearly all were caught and brought back to face the music - we had a form of running the gauntlet in which the offender had to go through the line, that is on his hand and knees, through widespread legs of all the boys and he would be struck with anything that was at hand - all this done under the fatherly supervision of the boys' master. I have seen boys after going through a line of fifty to seventy boys lay crying in the most abject human misery and pain with not a soul to care - <u>the dignity of man</u>!!

As I sit writing this paper, things that have been dormant in my mind for years come to the fore - we will sing Hymn No. 128!!

This situation divides the shame amongst the Churches, the Indian Affairs Branch and the Canadian public.

I could write on and on - and some day I will tell of how things used to be - sadness, pain and misery were my legacy as an Indian.

The staff at the Mohawk lived very well, separate dining room where they were waited on by our Indian girls - the food I am told, was excellent.

When I was asked to do this paper I had some misgivings, for if I were to be honest, I must tell of things as they were and really this is not my story, but yours.

There were and are some decent honourable people employed by the residential schools, but they were not sufficient in number to change things.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL SCHOOLS

1. Religion should not be the basic curriculum, therefore, it is my feeling that non-denominational residential schools should be established. (dreamer)
2. More people of Indian ancestry should be encouraged to work in residential schools as they have a much better understanding of the Indian "personality" and would also be more apt to be trusted and respected by the students.
3. Indian residential schools should be integrated - the residential school should be a "home" rather than an Institute.
4. Salaries paid to the staff members should be on a par with industrie - otherwise you tend to attract only social misfits and religious zealots.
5. The Indian students should have a certain amount of work (physical) to do - overwork is no good and no work is even worse. I believe that a limited amount of work gives responsibility to the individual and helps him or her to develop a well-balanced personality.
6. Parents of Indian children should be made to contribute to the financial upkeep of their children - I realize that this would be difficult, but it at least bears looking into.
7. Each child should be given individual attention - get to know him or her - encourage leadership, this could be accomplished by giving awards for certain achievements.
8. Last, but most important, solicit ideas from the students, we adults do not know all the answers.

SUMMATION - The years that an Indian child spends in an Indian residential school has a very great deal to do with his or her future outlook on life and in my own case it showed me that Indian are "different", simply because you made us different and so gentlemen I say to you, take pains in molding, not the Indian of to-morrow, but the Canadian citizen of to-morrow. FOR "As ye sow, so shall ye reap".

28/12/65

Russell Moses,

Russ and Thelma Moses at the Mohawk Institute Indian Residential School in Brantford, Ontario, in October, 1943, during the once-monthly, 15-minute visiting session for brothers and sisters.

The memoir ends there. Russ's suggested improvements for residential schools at the end are noteworthy and reflective of the era in which they were written: no one, not even my father, had any expectation that the schools would be eradicated. They were an entrenched part of the reality of being an Indian person in Canada at that time, and the best that one person acting on their own could do would be to make recommendations for their gradual improvement. **END OF PART II**

Now having stated all of the foregoing – and thank you for having stuck with me thus far – I know this is some heavy material - I want to speak now more specifically concerning my employer, my museum, the Canadian Museum of History, for which I am proud to work, and how it has sought to address reconciliation matters over the years, in years even predating Canada's current reconciliation environment. The current CMH traces its origins to 1856 and the founding that year of an ethnographic survey collection within the Geological Survey of the United Provinces of Upper & Lower Canada. As such, the Museum itself thus predates Canadian Confederation in 1867. In 1910 the museum function was formalized and expanded, and with the creation of a dedicated Anthropology Division, the National Museum of Canada came into being. Throughout the 20th century the Museum underwent a variety of name and mandate changes spanning the National Museum of Canada to the National Museum of Man to the Canadian Museum of Civilization in 1986. It became the Canadian Museum of History in 2012. Its purpose under its current enabling legislation, the *Museums Act*, is to QUOTE "enhance Canadians' knowledge, understanding and appreciation of events, experiences, people and objects that reflect and have shaped Canada's history and identity, and also to enhance their awareness of world history and cultures." END OF QUOTE. During the

decade of the 1960s the Museum was the major source of artifact content and interpretive support for the ground-breaking Indians of Canada Pavilion at Montreal's Expo 67. The Expo Pavilion marked a paradigm shift and was a watershed in Indigenous self-representation before national and global audiences of world's fairgoers. There is much talk these days in Canada of decolonizing, Indigenizing and unsettling the museum and gallery space. The Indians of Canada Pavilion at Montreal's Expo 67, although ephemeral, was ground zero for all of that, and this Museum played a role. In the 1970s the Museum became the first national museum anywhere in the world to undertake the repatriation of a portion of its collections back to their Indigenous communities of origin – a move for which it was actually criticized by the international museum community of that era as setting a dangerous precedent. In the 1980s the current Museum complex across the river in Gatineau at Parc Laurier was designed by the renowned Indigenous architect (Blackfoot & Metis) Douglas Cardinal; and its principal architectural feature, the Grand Hall, was designed and built in close collaboration with Northwest Coast Indigenous artists and craftspeople. Also in the 1980s and into the 1990s, the Museum was a major sponsor and facilitator of the Joint CMA-AFN Task Force Report on Museums and First Peoples, following the *Spirit Sings* exhibition controversy concerning corporate sponsorship and the contentious issue of who gets to speak on whose behalf concerning museum-based representations of Indigeneity. Also in the 1990s, the Museum implemented its Indigenous Internship Program in Museum Practice as part of its institutional response to the CMA-AFN Joint Task Force Report findings; followed by its priority-based and criteria-based Repatriation Policy in 2001. In 2003 the Museum opened its present First Peoples Hall, which was co-developed in its entirety by Museum

staff working with Indigenous experts on Indigenous issues to provide direct, unfiltered Indigenous perspectives. Most recently, a new generation of Indigenous museum experts has worked in collaboration with Museum staff, to ensure appropriately presented Indigenous content through all zones of the newly reconstituted Canadian History Hall, which opened to the public on July 1st, 2017. The Canadian History Hall confronts and interrogates Canada's internal colonialism against Indigenous peoples; it addresses the system of residential schools and its legacies; it addresses the Inuit relocations; and it addresses the tragic circumstances of murdered and missing Indigenous women and girls. It pulls no punches, and I urge all of you to visit it during your time here this week.

So notwithstanding injustices and transgressions of the past, truth telling and reconciliation has been and remains ongoing, and museums like the Canadian Museum of History are premiere venues within which this important work continues to unfold. Likewise are all museum professionals, including conservators, potentially at the forefront of this movement for change. We must remain vigilant, however, and make efforts on a daily basis to incorporate reconciliation principles and thinking in our daily practice. Thank you for your time this evening. Nia:wen.