

## Commentary

# Historical lessons for Canada's emerging national school food policy: an opportunity to improve child health

Anthony Zhong, MA (1,2); Lillian Yin, RD (3); Brianne O'Sullivan, MMASC (4); Amberley T. Ruetz, PhD (5)

This article has been peer reviewed.

 Tweet this article

## Background

Canada lags behind most high-income countries in child nutrition.<sup>1</sup> Less than one-third of children in Canada consume the recommended daily servings of vegetables and fruit.<sup>2</sup> They also consume five times more sugar than recommended by the national guidelines and get more than half of their calories from ultra-processed foods.<sup>3,4</sup> Overall, Canadians are the second largest consumers of ultra-processed foods and beverages in the world.<sup>5</sup> Poor diet has been linked with nutritional deficiencies and the development of chronic diseases such as obesity, type 2 diabetes and heart disease.<sup>6</sup>

Poor access to nutrition is also associated with worse learning outcomes, contributing to broader social inequities as an upstream determinant of health.<sup>7,8</sup> School meal programs can address these challenges by encouraging healthy eating behaviours and food-body relationships as well as the development of lifelong nutrition literacy.<sup>9,10</sup> Internationally, school meals have been shown to be one of the most successful drivers of improved health, education and even economic growth, with the equivalent of a \$3 to \$10 return on every dollar invested.<sup>11</sup>

Despite these potential benefits, Canada is the only G7 country without a national school food program.<sup>12</sup> Following the Government of Canada's historic—but unfunded—commitment to develop a national school food program in the 2019 Budget, the Liberal Party recommitted to

school food in its 2021 election platform by stating it would spend \$1 billion over 5 years to “develop a National School Food Policy and work towards a national school nutritious meal program.”<sup>13,p.7</sup> As Canadian policy makers develop a framework for such a program, they should consider the experiences of other countries.

The development and evolution of school meal programs in the United States (US) could offer Canada a series of lessons given the countries' geographical proximity and shared challenges with unhealthy food environments and persistent nutritional inequalities.<sup>14,15</sup> In 1946, the US established the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), which now feeds approximately 30 million children per year.<sup>16</sup> Although the NSLP has been successful in reducing child hunger in school environments, it has historically failed to meet minimum nutrition needs and perpetuated stigma and social inequalities.<sup>17</sup>

This commentary will draw on historical lessons from the NSLP and propose three priority areas to prevent unintended consequences and ensure a sustainable program in the Canadian context: (1) resisting corporatization and prioritizing health; (2) preventing stigma through universal access; and (3) ensuring cultural inclusion and appropriateness.

## Priority 1: Resisting corporatization and prioritizing health

The primary intention of a national school meal program should be to ensure equitable

## Highlights

- School meals are one of the most successful drivers of improved health and education.
- In 2021, the Canadian federal government committed \$1 billion over 5 years to develop a national school food policy and work towards a national school nutritious meal program.
- Canadian policy makers should learn from the experiences of other countries, including the United States' National School Lunch Program.
- We propose 3 priority areas to maximize health improvements: (1) resisting corporatization and prioritizing health; (2) preventing stigma through universal access; and (3) ensuring cultural inclusion and appropriateness.

**Keywords:** *nutrition, students, school meal programs, Indigenous populations, immigrants, inclusion*

access to nutritious food and to support the health and well-being of school-aged children. To achieve this, child health must be prioritized and, to the greatest extent possible, corporate interests curbed.

In the US, discourse on the need for school meal programs began as early as the mid-1800s, although it was not until the Great Depression that a nationwide school meal program emerged.<sup>18</sup> In 1933,

## Author references:

1. Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA
2. Department of the History of Science, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA
3. Department of Health Policy and Management, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
4. Department of Health Information Science, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada
5. Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, University of Saskatchewan College of Medicine, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

Correspondence: Anthony Zhong, Harvard Medical School, 25 Shattuck Street, Boston, MA 02115, United States; Email: [anthony\\_zhong@hms.harvard.edu](mailto:anthony_zhong@hms.harvard.edu)

the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation was established to address the twin crises of plummeting crop prices and soaring child hunger by redistributing agricultural surpluses to schools. The program was popular among agriculturalists and child welfare advocates, and was made into a permanent fixture of the school system with the *National School Lunch Act* of 1946.

While the program was considered a win-win for both children and farmers, it inextricably linked health with agricultural interests and paved the way for a program that primarily sought to “dump” surplus commodities, such as wheat and dairy products, rather than provide optimally nutritious meals to hungry children. These tensions are clear from the Congressional hearings that preceded the NSLP, such as the following exchange<sup>19,p.33-34</sup> between Representative Murray, a Republican from Wisconsin, and Representative Cooley, a Democrat from North Carolina.

To my mind, I don't see where we are going to do much on the surplus problem. I was just wondering how far we can go down that road, Mr. Chairman, and still keep to our main objective, which is to see that the children of this country, regardless of their incomes, have at least the income to get a lunch. [Murray]

Is that the objective? The main objective, as I understand it, is to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities, and the feeding of the school children is just collateral to that main objective... [Cooley]

To this day, corporate interests remain deeply embedded within the NSLP and serve as a barrier to prioritizing children's health. This focus on business has resulted in bizarre policies, such as changes to the NSLP's nutrition standards that classified ketchup and pizza sauce as vegetables to reduce program expenses.<sup>20</sup> In 1990, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) commissioned a comprehensive review of the NSLP; this found that only 1% of schools complied with the NSLP's guidelines for fat.<sup>21</sup> A similar study in 2015 found that NSLP meals still did not meet the agency's nutrition standards.<sup>22</sup> This has had troubling implications for child health, with one US study finding frequent school lunch consumption

to be a greater risk factor for obesity than spending 2 or more hours a day watching television.<sup>23</sup>

Although a national school meal program offers opportunities for economic growth through regional food production and job creation, experiences in the US show that policy makers must draw clear boundaries so that agricultural and corporate interests remain secondary to child health.<sup>24,25</sup> In fact, agenda distortion, reciprocity and corporate capture are just a few of the perils of private partnerships.<sup>26,27</sup>

In December 2021, the federal government tasked the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development with developing the national school food policy and meal program, given their mandates over Canada's food system and social safety programs.<sup>28</sup> While it is important to engage a variety of stakeholders, Canada must remain vigilant about the commercial determinants of health, defined as “the systems, practices and pathways through which commercial actors drive health and equity.”<sup>29,p.1195</sup> More specifically, it must protect students from corporate lobbying and the promotion of unhealthful products, especially as the historical record demonstrates how business interests can become insurmountable once ingrained.<sup>30,31</sup>

## Priority 2: Preventing stigma through universal access

Social stigma is often underestimated as a threat to public health, despite the fact that it can undermine individual well-being and exacerbate population health inequities by producing discrimination and reluctance to seek help.<sup>32,33</sup> Policy makers must carefully consider how school meal programs are framed and financed to protect students in under-resourced communities from the shame, psychological distress and reduced health-seeking behaviours that can arise from participating in stigmatizing programs for the “poor” or “needy.”

Although the US *National School Lunch Act* marked a major milestone in the development of America's social safety net, its reach in 1946 was significantly limited, especially for the most vulnerable communities. While the NSLP required that impoverished children receive free lunches, Congress did not initially pass

any enforcement mechanisms or appropriate funds to achieve these goals.<sup>34</sup> The United States Department of Agriculture also did nothing to ensure that the program was accessible to Black schools in racially segregated districts.<sup>34</sup> As a result, most schools simply ignored the free lunch mandate and the NSLP largely remained a program for those that could afford to pay.

Hoping to close this gap, Congress passed the *Child Nutrition Act* in 1966, which expanded the NSLP and mandated that all participating schools provide free meals to children experiencing poverty. However, this well-intentioned rebranding of the NSLP as an “anti-poverty” program was equally harmful, as it stigmatized participation. Many families began to pull their children from the program so as not to be labelled “needy,” “low-income” or “at risk.” Between 1970 and 1973, an estimated one million paying students dropped out of the NSLP.<sup>34</sup>

By the middle of the 1970s, few children who had any choice ate school lunches, cutting off an important revenue stream. Faced with a massive budget shortfall, policy makers opened the NSLP to industrial food service companies and fast-food companies like McDonald's, Pizza Hut and Taco Bell, hoping they would keep the program afloat by reducing unit costs while enticing paying students back into the program with branded and highly processed foods.<sup>34</sup> American policy makers have since recognized the drawbacks of this poverty-based, multitiered system and have shifted, in the past decade, towards universal free meals by establishing Community Eligibility Provision (CEP) programs.<sup>35</sup>

These historical vignettes highlight the pitfalls of means-tested social programs and demonstrate how social stigma can undermine school meal programs, particularly when there is a clear divide between those receiving free and paid meals. Means-tested programs not only create feelings of shame among participants, undermining voluntary participation and psychological safety, they warp incentives away from nutrition towards the recruitment of paying “customers” while creating administrative costs and inefficiencies.<sup>36,37</sup> As such, Canada's policies should consider a model based on universal access

(i.e. providing school meals at no cost to all children who choose to participate).

In addition, school meals should not replace other income-based solutions that address the underlying social inequalities that result in household food insecurity and differences in healthy eating, obesity and chronic disease outcomes.<sup>15</sup> Like our health and education systems, the national school meal program should be thought of as a universal public service to improve well-being rather than as a narrow anti-poverty program or a potential revenue stream.<sup>38</sup>

### Priority 3: Ensuring cultural inclusion and appropriateness

It is important that policy makers consider how culturally diverse and appropriate foodways will be incorporated into the national school food policy to take into account the heterogeneity of Indigenous and immigrant communities—who make up nearly a quarter of the population in Canada.

Given the strong relationship between food and identity, school meal programs have historically been used as part of broader assimilation efforts to coerce racialized communities into adopting Anglo-American tastes.<sup>34</sup> In American Indian boarding schools well into the 20th century, Indigenous students were forbidden from practising their food traditions in order to “kill the Indian, save the man.”<sup>39,40</sup> Targeted efforts were also made to assimilate immigrant children, with one early Americanization textbook noting, “One’s very food affects his Americanism. What kind of American consciousness can grow in the atmosphere of sauerkraut and Limburger cheese?”<sup>41</sup> Perhaps most dramatically, the US National Defence Advisory Commission established the Committee on Food Habits in 1940, which sought to imbue immigrants with common food habits, believing “the systematic exploitation of such cultural differences is part of the enemy tactic of war.”<sup>34</sup> In the following decade, the committee recommended that school lunch menus “transform diverse ethnic food cultures into a national identity” and that school cafeteria tables be assigned a “host” and “hostess” to lead the meal according to Anglo-American social norms.<sup>42</sup>

Unsurprisingly, these efforts to impose cultural conformity had serious repercussions for the mental well-being and participation of students. Reflecting on her

experience with school food in 1949, one second-generation Russian-Jewish immigrant lamented, “What came across was the idea that your home environment was no good and you had to make it different.”<sup>36</sup> Today, innovative pilot programs have emerged across the US to provide culturally diverse meals. For example, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe’s “farm-to-school” program provides locally sourced beef and buffalo to the five schools in its South Dakota reservation.<sup>43</sup> Many similar programs have since emerged that recognize the value of Indigenous sustainable food practices; however, in the absence of a national strategy, these efforts largely remain a patchwork.<sup>43</sup>

Benefiting from historical retrospection, policy makers should recognize that the lack of culturally appropriate foods in school meal programs can contribute to cultural erasure and limit uptake within racialized communities. Canada should be especially sensitive to these lessons given its own history of assimilationist immigration policies and the cultural genocide inflicted upon First Nations, Métis and Inuit children in residential and day schools.<sup>44-46</sup> As the Truth and Reconciliation Commission makes clear, to deny one’s food is to deny one’s culture.<sup>47</sup> Indigenous and immigrant knowledge keepers must therefore be equal partners at every step of the program planning, implementation and evaluation processes, with special efforts to protect and revitalize Indigenous foodways. Canada’s emerging school food policy must further consider how it will meaningfully scale up the provision of culturally appropriate foods—whether through funding, local partnerships or farm-to-school activities—so that the burden of ensuring cultural inclusion does not fall solely on already overstretched schools.

### Conclusion

A national school meal program is about much more than just food. Beyond serving as a social safety net, it offers opportunities to promote health equity, nutrition literacy and lifelong healthy eating habits. In addition, such a program can foster school environments that celebrate Canada’s cultural diversity. Still, while the theoretical benefits of school meals are plentiful, the practical implementation of the program will be most consequential. Like their American counterparts, Canadian policy makers will inevitably face organizational and administrative dilemmas that

determine whether the program strengthens or undermines students’ physical and mental health. If child health is to be prioritized, Canadian policy makers must implement conflict of interest safeguards to prevent the food industry from marketing unhealthful products to students, increase funding across all levels of government to sustain a program built upon universal access, and scale up policies that enable culturally important practices like the harvesting of traditional foods to ensure cultural inclusion and appropriateness.<sup>48</sup>

### Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Rebecca Lemov for her thoughtful comments.

### Authors’ contributions and statement

AZ: Conceptualization, Writing – Original Draft

LY: Writing – Original Draft

BO: Writing – Original Draft

ATR: Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

The content and views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Government of Canada.

### Conflicts of interests

None.

### References

1. UNICEF Canada. UNICEF Report Card 14: Child well-being in a sustainable world [Internet]. Toronto (ON): UNICEF Canada; 2017 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.unicef.ca/en/unicef-report-card-14-child-well-being-sustainable-world>
2. Statistics Canada. Reference guide to understanding and using the data: 2015 Canadian Community Health Survey – Nutrition [Internet]. Ottawa (ON): Statistics Canada; 2017 Jun [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/food-nutrition/food-nutrition-surveillance/health-nutrition-surveys/canadian-community-health-survey-cchs/reference-guide-understanding-using-data-2015.html>



3. Langlois K, Garriguet D, Gonzalez A, Sinclair S, Colapinto CK. Change in total sugars consumption among Canadian children and adults [Internet]. Ottawa (ON): Statistics Canada; 2019 Jan 19 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-003-x/2019001/article/00002-eng.htm>
4. Liu S, Munasinghe LL, Ohinmaa A, Veugelers PJ. Added, free and total sugar content and consumption of foods and beverages in Canada [Internet]. Ottawa (ON): Statistics Canada; 2020 Oct 21 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-003-x/2020010/article/00002-eng.htm>
5. Moubarac JC. Ultra-processed foods in Canada: consumption, impact on diet quality and policy implications [Internet]. Montréal (QC): TRANSNUT, University of Montréal; 2017 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.heartandstroke.ca/-/media/pdf-files/canada/media-centre/hs-report-upp-moubarac-dec-5-2017.ashx>
6. Roberts CK, Barnard RJ. Effects of exercise and diet on chronic disease. *J Appl Physiol* (1985). 2005;98(1):3-30. <https://doi.org/10.1152/japplphysiol.00852.2004>
7. Taras H. Nutrition and student performance at school. *J Sch Health*. 2005; 75(6):199-213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-1561.2005.00025.x>
8. James WP, Nelson M, Ralph A, Leather S. Socioeconomic determinants of health. The contribution of nutrition to inequalities in health. *BMJ*. 1997;314(7093):1545-9. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.314.7093.1545>
9. Colley P, Myler B, Seabrook J, Gilliland J. The impact of Canadian school food programs on children's nutrition and health: a systematic review. *Can J Diet Pract Res*. 2019; 80(2):79-86. <https://doi.org/10.3148/cjdpr-2018-037>
10. Hernandez K, Engler-Stringer R, Kirk S, Wittman H, McNicholl S. The case for a Canadian national school food program. *Can Food Studies*. 2018;5(3): 208-29. <https://doi.org/10.15353/cfs-rcsa.v5i3.260>
11. World Food Programme. Cost-benefit analysis: school feeding investment case [Internet]. Rome (IT): World Food Programme; 2016 Jan [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resources/wfp281517.pdf>
12. Bas JA. School food in the G7 – the time is ripe for Canada to catch up [Internet]. Montréal (QC): Coalition for Healthy School Food; [updated 2020 Aug 20; cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.healthyschoolfood.ca/post/school-food-in-the-g7-the-time-is-ripe-for-canada-to-catch-up>
13. Liberal Party of Canada. Forward. For everyone [Internet]. Ottawa (ON): Liberal Party of Canada; 2021 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://liberal.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/292/2021/09/Platform-Forward-For-Everyone.pdf>
14. Cummins S, Macintyre S. Food environments and obesity—neighbourhood or nation? *Int J Epidemiol*. 2006; 35(1):100-4. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyi276>
15. Dubois L, Girard, M. Social position and nutrition: a gradient relationship in Canada and the USA. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2001;55(5):366-73. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ejcn.1601165>
16. USDA Food and Nutrition Service. Child nutrition tables [Internet]. Alexandria (VA): United States Department of Agriculture; 2023 Mar 10 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/child-nutrition-tables>
17. Weaver-Hightower MB. Unpacking school lunch: understanding the hidden politics of school food. Cham (CH): Palgrave Macmillan; 2022.
18. Rutledge JG. From charity to security: the emergence of the National School Lunch Program. *Hist Educ*. 2015;44(2): 187-206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2014.979252>
19. Gosliner WA. The National School Lunch Program: ideas, proposals, policies, and politics shaping students' experiences with school lunch in the United States, 1946 - present [dissertation]. University of California, Berkeley; 2013. Available from: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/45n5k9mx>
20. Nestle M. Ketchup is a vegetable? Again? [Internet]. The Atlantic; 2011 Nov 16 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2011/11/ketchup-is-a-vegetable-again/248538/>
21. Hinman K. The school lunch wars. *The Wilson Quarterly*. 2011;35(2):16-21. Available from: [http://archive.wilsonquarterly.com/sites/default/files/articles/WQ\\_VOL35\\_SP\\_2011\\_Article\\_01.pdf](http://archive.wilsonquarterly.com/sites/default/files/articles/WQ_VOL35_SP_2011_Article_01.pdf)
22. Hopkins LC, Gunther C. A historical review of changes in nutrition standards of USDA child meal programs relative to research findings on the nutritional adequacy of program meals and the diet and nutritional health of participants: implications for future research and the Summer Food Service Program. *Nutrients*. 2015;7(12):10145-67. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu7125523>
23. Eagle TF, Gurm R, Goldberg CS, et al. Health status and behavior among middle-school children in a midwest community: what are the underpinnings of childhood obesity? *Am Heart J*. 2010;160(6):1185-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ahj.2010.09.019>
24. Ruetz AT, Fraser ED. National School Food Program a short-term opportunity for jobs creation and economic growth [Internet]. Richmond Hill (ON): Canadian Science Policy Centre; 2019 Mar 26 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://sciencepolicy.ca/posts/national-school-food-program-a-short-term-opportunity-for-jobs-creation-and-economic-growth-2/>
25. Gaddis JE. The labor of lunch: Why we need real food and real jobs in American public schools. Oakland (CA): University of California Press; 2019.
26. Mindell JS, Reynolds L, Cohen DL, et al. All in this together: the corporate capture of public health. *BMJ*. 2012; 345:e8082. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e8082>

27. Carriedo, A, Pinsky, I, Crosbie, E, Ruskin G, Mialon M. The corporate capture of the nutrition profession in the USA: the case of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. *Public Health Nutr.* 2022;25(12):1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980022001835>
28. Employment and Social Development Canada. Government of Canada launches consultations on a pan-Canadian school food policy [Internet]. Employment and Social Development Canada; 2022 Nov 01 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.newswire.ca/news-releases/government-of-canada-launches-consultations-on-a-pan-canadian-school-food-policy-822023151.html>
29. Gilmore AB, Fabbri A, Baum F, et al. Defining and conceptualising the commercial determinants of health. *Lancet.* 2023;401(10383):1194-213. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(23\)00013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00013-2)
30. Gaucher-Holm A, Mulligan C, L'Abbé MR, Potvin Kent M, Vanderlee L. Lobbying and nutrition policy in Canada: a quantitative descriptive study on stakeholder interactions with government officials in the context of Health Canada's Healthy Eating Strategy. *Global Health.* 2022;18(1):54. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-022-00842-4>
31. Gidney C. "Nutritional wastelands": vending machines, fast food outlets, and the fight over junk food in Canadian schools. *Can Bull Med Hist.* 2015;32(2):391-409. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cbmh.32.2.391>
32. Hatzenbuehler ML, Phelan JC, Link BG. Stigma as a fundamental cause of population health inequalities. *Am J Public Health.* 2013;103(5):813-21. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.301069>
33. Bolster-Foucault C, Ho Mi Fane B, Blair A. Structural determinants of stigma across health and social conditions: a rapid review and conceptual framework to guide future research and intervention. *Health Promot Chronic Dis Prev Can.* 2021;41(3):85-115. <https://doi.org/10.24095/hpcdp.41.3.03>
34. Levine S. School lunch politics: the surprising history of America's favorite welfare program. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press; 2008.
35. Hecht AA, Porter KM, Turner L. Impact of the Community Eligibility Provision of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act on student nutrition, behavior, and academic outcomes: 2011–2019. *Am J Public Health.* 2020;110(9):1405-10. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2020.305743>
36. Spring JH. Educating the consumer-citizen: a history of the marriage of schools, advertising, and media. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum; 2002.
37. Poppendieck J. Free for all: Fixing school food in America. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press; 2010.
38. Ruetz AT, Martin A, Ng E. A national school food program for all: towards a social policy legacy for Canada. *Our Schools/Our Selves.* 2022;Summer/Fall: 35-7. Available from: <https://policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2022/07/CCPA%20Monitor%20July%20August%202022%20OSOS%20WEB.pdf#page=35>
39. Maillacheruvu SU. The historical determinants of food insecurity in Native communities [Internet]. Washington (DC): Center on Budget and Policy Priorities; 2022 Oct 04 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/the-historical-determinants-of-food-insecurity-in-native-communities>
40. Sowerwine J, Mucioki M, Sarna-Wojcicki D, Hillman L. Reframing food security by and for Native American communities: a case study among tribes in the Klamath River basin of Oregon and California. *Food Secur.* 2019;11:579-607. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-019-00925-y>
41. Bierstadt EH. Aspects of Americanization. Cincinnati (OH): Stewart Kidd Company; 1922.
42. Rice S, Rud AG. Educational dimensions of school lunch: critical perspectives. Cham (CH): Palgrave Macmillan; 2018.
43. USDA Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Community Systems. Celebrating farm to school in Tribal Nations [Internet]. Alexandria (VA): United States Department of Agriculture; 2021 Nov 30 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/USFNS/bulletins/2fda04c>
44. Kelley N, Trebilcock M. The making of the mosaic: a history of Canadian immigration policy. Toronto (ON): University of Toronto Press; 2010.
45. Wilk P, Maltby A, Cooke M. Residential schools and the effects on Indigenous health and well-being in Canada—a scoping review. *Public Health Rev.* 2017;38:8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-017-0055-6>
46. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Ottawa (ON): Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada; 2015 [cited 2023 Apr 2]. Available from: <https://ehprnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Executive-Summary-English-Web.pdf>
47. Whitebean WS. Child-targeted assimilation: an oral history of Indian Day School education in Kahnawà:ke Wahéshon Shiann [thesis]. Montréal (QC): Concordia University; 2019 [cited 2023 May 24]. Available from: [https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/id/eprint/985347/1/Whitebean\\_MA\\_S2019.pdf](https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/id/eprint/985347/1/Whitebean_MA_S2019.pdf)
48. Ruetz AT. What we heard: Minister Gould's roundtable on the national school food policy at the University of Guelph. Guelph (ON): Arrell Food Institute; 2023 Jan 18 [cited 2023 Apr 02]. Available from: <https://arrellfoodinstitute.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/What-We-Heard-Minister-Goulds-Rountable-at-UofG-Feb-2-2023.pdf>