

DEVELOPING FEDERAL POLICY FOR FIRST NATIONS PEOPLE IN URBAN AREAS: 1945-1975

Evelyn J. Peters
Department of Geography
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario
Canada, K7L 3N6

Abstract / Résumé

This paper explores the development of federal government policies for First Nations peoples in cities from 1945 to 1975. At mid-century, most First Nations people lived on Reserves, with existing services administered through Indian Affairs. The increasing migration of First Nations peoples to urban areas raised questions about how their needs should be conceptualized and administered. By 1975 government agencies differentiated between urban and Reserve residents in terms of service provision and administration. This differentiation provided the basis for the contemporary policy framework that strongly associates Aboriginal rights and services to First Nations peoples with Reserve residency.

Dans cet article nous traçons l'évolution des politiques du gouvernement fédéral pour les peuples des Premières Nations dans les villes, de 1945 en 1975. Vers le milieu du siècle, la majorité des peuples des premières Nations vivaient dans des réserves, où les services étaient administrés par le ministère des Affaires indiennes. La migration croissante des peuples des Premières Nations vers les villes a suscité des questions sur la meilleure façon de comprendre leurs besoins et d'y répondre. Les agences du gouvernement avaient établi à la fin de cette période une distinction entre les résidents des villes et ceux des réserves, en ce qui concerne la disponibilité et l'administration des services. Cette distinction est la base du cadre actuel, qui crée un lien fort entre les droits autochtones et les peuples des Premières Nations qui sont résidents des réserves.

As it evolved, "Indian policy" in Canada emphasized the settlement of First Nations people on Reserves in order to protect them, "civilize" them through education Christianization and agriculture, and in this way prepare them for assimilation. By the early decades of the 1900s almost all First Nations people were settled on Reserves, and, as a matter of policy, almost all Reserves were located at a distance from urban centres. Through a variety of mechanisms, these largely segregated patterns of settlement persisted into the 1950s. The settlement of First Nations people on Reserves accompanied their virtual disappearance from public life after the turn of the century (Tobias, 1983).

The decades between 1945 and 1975 saw growing public interest in the situation of First Nations people. First Nations' contributions to the war effort brought them into public view, and First Nations leaders were increasingly able to pressure governments to respond to their demands. In the context of the civil rights and anti-poverty movements south of the border, Canadians focused on marginalized populations in their own country. The growing First Nations population obviated the impossibility of their continued isolation. In the context of these events, government policy emphasized the integration of First Nations peoples into Canadian society and economy (Leslie, 1993).

A number of studies have analysed the changes in government policies toward First Nations peoples during this period of time. Leslie (1993) argues that a recognition of the inadequacy of legislative and administrative frameworks for Indians emerged in the 1930s, and he documents the attempts by Indian Affairs officials to make changes during the 1940-1970 period. Weaver (1981) summarizes events in the late 1950s and 1960s, and documents the processes involved in formulating the federal government's 1969 White Paper, which proposed to terminate the special status of First Nations peoples in an attempt to integrate them into Canadian society (see also Weaver, 1981; 1993). Cardinal (1969) describes Native responses to government policies, in the context of the history of Indian administration. The focus of Bostrom's (1984) paper is changing federal strategies, beginning in the early 1960s, to transfer some of its programs and fiscal responsibilities for Indians to provincial governments. Ponting and Gibbins (1980) describe the relationship between the National Indian Brotherhood and the Department of Indian Affairs in the 1970s and 1980s, and McFarlane (1993) describes federal policies in the context of George Manuel's role in the "Indian Movement". Other writers have addressed this period in their overview of Canadian Indian Policy (Adams, 1975; Barron, 1984; Buckley, 1992; Dyck, 1991; Manuel and Posluns, 1974; Surtees, 1988). Guillemin (1978) compares Canadian and U.S. administration, while

Smallface Marule (1978) compares Canadian government initiatives surrounding the 1969 White Paper to the earlier U.S. termination policy. The development of provincial policies for Aboriginal people in Saskatchewan is the focus of Barron's (1997) volume.

While many of these writers have addressed aspects of policy development for urban Aboriginal peoples, there is little available which focuses specifically on urbanization. This is despite the fact that the increasing migration of First Nations and Métis to urban centres, beginning around the 1950s, played a role in exposing the need for new directions in policy development and government-Aboriginal relationships. Breton and Grant (1984) document government policies and programs for peoples of Indian ancestry in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, but the time frame of their study largely postdates the period which is of interest here. There is some work which addresses aspects of policy responses to Native urbanization in particular places, or focuses on particular programs. Dosman (1972) addresses the situation of Native people in Saskatoon in the late 1960s, and Ryan (1978) examines an Indian Affairs treatment of a First Nations initiative to deliver social services to Indians in Calgary. The focus of Elias' (1975) study is primarily the social networks, local politics and local bureaucracy of Churchill which excluded Native people. Reeves and Frideres (1981) describe organizational responses to urbanization in Alberta, but the development of federal and provincial policies is beyond the scope of their study. A systematic examination of the development of federal government policy for urban Indians between 1945 and 1975, then, has not yet been undertaken.

There are a number of reasons why such a review may be timely. First, the proportion of First Nations peoples living in urban areas continues to grow. In 1991, census figures suggested that over 40 percent of First Nations peoples lived in cities. With these changing settlement patterns it becomes important to address the geographies of policies, rights and administration. Many interveners to the 1992-3 Public hearings of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples pointed out the contradictions in current administrative and funding policies for First Nations people living on and off Reserves (Peters, 1998; Canada, 1993). Attempts to unravel contemporary responsibilities for Native peoples in different geographic settings shows there is considerable confusion and debate. The report of the Royal Commission (Canada, 1996:547) noted the importance of clarifying federal and provincial responsibilities for social programs off Reserves. Morse (1989:88) concludes his analysis of government obligations to Aboriginal people under the Constitution Act, 1867 with the statement: "Thus, we can anticipate much uncertainty, extensive arguments, frequent litigation and

unusual developments in these issues over the next few years. The future will not be dull". Schwartz (1986:196) notes that if the courts were asked to consider the issue of federal and provincial responsibility for First Nations peoples off Reserves, any decision they made would be "highly creative" given the lack of guidance in legal and legislative frameworks. An overview of the historic development of these policies may help to expose the original rationale for particular administrative and legislative frameworks.

This paper begins with an overview of First Nations urbanization, beginning in the 1940s, and public responses to these changing settlement patterns. The second section describes the attempts by federal departments to understand the significance of migration for First Nations peoples and underscores how government definitions differed from perspectives put forward by First Nations spokespeople. The contradictions and conflicts emerging from attempts to translate definitions of urbanization into programs for First Nations peoples in cities come into focus next. By way of conclusion, the paper considers some of the implications of the ways in which policies and programs were formulated during this time period, for the contemporary situation. This paper considers primarily the situation of First Nations peoples. I recognize that debates about responsibilities for Métis and non-Status Indians also figured during this time period, but consideration of all these issues is beyond the scope of this paper.

Background

As information about First Nations communities came into public focus, many people were shocked at their intense poverty and isolation (Borovoy, 1966; Harding, 1965). Various groups called for an investigation into Indian administration and the conditions on Indian Reserves (Tobias, 1983:51). A Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons (1946-48) addressed Indian Act revisions and a Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons (1959-61) was appointed to examine Indian administration. The 1946-8 Special Joint Committee recommended extensive revisions of the Indian Act with the objective of facilitating the transition of Indians from wardship to full citizenship. In 1949 these objectives were reflected in the placement of the Indian Affairs Branch, with the Citizenship Branch and the Immigration Branch in the newly created Department of Citizenship and Immigration.¹ Prime Minister Louis St Laurent outlined the connection between citizenship, immigration and Indian affairs on introducing the parliamentary resolution to create the new department.

I believe it is the policy of all members of the house to attempt to have the Indian affairs branch administered in such a way as to bring the original inhabitants of Canadian territory to

citizenship as quickly as that can reasonably be accomplished ...Having citizenship, immigration and Indian affairs in the one department would indicate that the purpose of the activities of that department was to make Canadian citizens of those who were born here of the original inhabitants of the territory, or those who migrated to this country (Canada, 1949:2285).

The 1959-61 Joint Committee recommended various measures to increase the speed of integration, and strong public opinion put pressure on civil servants to design programs to speed up the integration of First Nations people into wider society (Weaver, 1981).

In the face of the depressed social and economic conditions of Indian Reserves, many studies pointed to urbanization as part of the solution. Hawthorn's work for the B.C. Department of Citizenship and Immigration argued that any long-term economic program for Indians must increase the flow of Indian labour to urban centres (1958:84). Lagassé's study for the Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Immigration indicated that Indian and Métis movement to cities would continue at "an ever greater rate" (1958:24), and represented a more permanent solution to unemployment than community development. Davis's study commissioned by the Saskatchewan Centre for Community Studies concluded that local economic development was not a feasible solution for most of the impoverished Indian and Métis settlements of Northern Saskatchewan, and recommended that policies be developed to encourage many to migrate to urban centres (1965:519).² Hawthorn's two volume report: *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: Economic, Political, Education Needs and Policies*, commissioned by the federal government in 1963, and published in 1966 and 1967, made recommendations for development in northern and rural Indian communities. However, researchers clearly felt that long-term economic improvement for Indian people could only be obtained through migration for employment, most of which would be to centres beyond commuting distance from the Reserves (1966:163-197). Even where analysts were convinced that urbanization was problematic, rapid population growth made out-migration from Indian Reserves seems inevitable (Table 1).

At the same time, it is clear that the presence of First Nations people in urban centres was seen as extremely problematic. Jean Lagassé's study for the Manitoba Ministry of Agriculture concluded that: "the belief that an Indian's place is on the reserve is still very strong among the Canadian people" (1958:141). Braroe (1975:183) quoted a municipal councillor on the possibility of Indians moving into Maple Creek in the mid-1960s:

Table 1: Indian Population, 1941-1981

Year	Registered Indian Population ¹	Percentage Increase	Year	Canadian Population	Percentage Increase
1939	118,378		1941	11,506,655	
1949	136,407	13.2	1951	14,009,429	21.8
1961	191,709	40.5	1961	18,238,247	30.2
1971	257,619	34.4	1971	21,568,311	18.3
1981	323,782	25.7	1981	24,083,496	11.7

¹Because of changing Census definitions, these counts are from the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs' records.

Sources: Canada, Statistics Canada, 1974:240; Canada, Statistics Canada, 1983:5.

They got no business here: they got no proper work to do, and would just be here so that they'd be closer to the pubs... We don't want any Indian town on the edge of [Maple Creek]. We got too much invested in keeping [Maple Creek] clean and peaceful.

Buckley's (1992:72-76) review of attitudes toward First Nations employment in Northern prairie resource towns in the 1950s and 1960s, concluded that, in public opinion, there was no place for them in these communities. Other studies described the intense hostility and discrimination which greeted First Nations people in towns and villages (Brody, 1984; Lithman, 1984; Stymeist, 1975).

It is difficult to document with any precision, the movement of First Nations peoples to cities and to relate urban population numbers to the growing public interest in their situation. Census data are problematic because definitions and categories change, and in different years ancestry is traced through the father, the mother and through both parents (Canada, 1983:5). An estimate of urban Indian populations can be made from the Indian Register kept by the Department of Indian Affairs. While the Department kept treaty pay lists prior to 1951, these do not identify place of residence of those receiving payments. Beginning in 1959, the Department began to collect information about individuals living "off-Reserve", that is neither on Reserves or crown land. These data can be used as a proxy for urbanization but the numbers must be interpreted cautiously. Limitations include changing definitions (Gerber, 1977:4), lack of specific information about exactly where individuals are living off the Reserve, the location of a number of Reserves in urban centres, and failure to regularly up-date records (Canada, 1991).

Table 2 shows the number of Registered Indians living off-Reserve between 1959 and 1981. The small numbers living off the Reserve suggests that, throughout this period, urbanization rates were very low, even though they were increasing. The greatest absolute increase in Indians living off Reserve was between 1966 and 1971, but even if all of these were urban migrants, this represents an increase of only a little over 5,000 per year in Canada's cities.

Available statistics also suggest that the number of First Nations people in major cities remained low, both in terms of absolute numbers and as a percentage of the total population, during the period addressed in this paper (Table 3). At the same time, population estimates from various organizations and individuals concerned with urban Native populations are much higher than Census counts (Table 4). Some of the difference may be a result of undercounting of Native populations, either because respondents did not

Table 2: Total and Off-Reserve Registered Indian Population, 1959-1991.

	Registered Indian Population	Off-Reserve		Enfranchisements ¹ Per 5-Year Period	
		Number ²	Percent	Number	Percent
1959 ³	179,126	30,372	16.9		
1961	191,709			2077	1.1
1966	224,164	43,746	19.5	3216	1.4
1971	257,619	69,106	26.8	3009	1.2
1976	288,938	79,301	27.4	1094	0.4
1981	323,782	96,290	29.6	40	0.01
1986 ⁴	387,829	123,642	31.9	14	0.00
1991	521,461	250,188	39.3		

¹Figures for 1961 and 1966 are estimates based on DIAND's fiscal year, figures for 1971 to 1986 are based on the calendar year.

²Not including those living on crown land.

³Statistics on off-Reserve residency began to be collected only in 1959 (Bradley, 1993).

⁴In 1985, the *Indian Act* was amended to allow, through Bill C-31, the restoration of Indian Status to those who had lost it due to discriminatory clauses in the *Indian Act*.

Sources: Canada. Department of Indian Affairs, 1992:5; Canada. Department of Indian Affairs 1967:5; Canada. Statistics Canada 1974:244.

Table 3: Aboriginal People in Major Metropolitan Centres, 1951-1991.

	1951	1961	1971 ¹	1981	1991 ²
Halifax	--	--	--	--	1185
Montreal	296	507	3215	14450	6775 ³
Ottawa-Hull	--	--	--	4370	6915
Toronto	805	1196	2990	13495	14205
Winnipeg	210	1082	4940	16575	35150
Regina	160	539	2860	6575	11020
Saskatoon	48	207	1070	4350	11920
Calgary	62	335	2265	7310	14075
Edmonton	616	995	4260	13750	29235
Vancouver	239	530	3000	16080	25030
Victoria	--	--	--	2800	4435

¹The 1971 data do not include the Inuit.

²Individuals who identified with an Aboriginal group pursuant to the Aboriginal Peoples Survey.

³The population for the Kahnawake and Kanesatake Reserves which are in the Montreal CMA boundaries were not enumerated in 1981 or 1991. Population estimates (5,218 and 618 respectively) were included in 1981 counts but not included in the 1991 counts.

Sources: Canada. Statistics Canada; 1993 cab. no. 94-327: AP5,4 and 7; Canada. Statistics Canada 1974:244; Canada. Statistics Canada, DIAND customized data, 1981.

Table 4: Population Estimates, Major Prairie Cities, 1951-1981

	Winnipeg	Regina	Saskatoon	Calgary	Edmonton
1951 Census:	210 Inuit and Indian	160 Inuit and Indian	48 Inuit and Indian	62 Inuit and Indian	616 Inuit and Indian
1961 Census:	1082 Inuit and Indian	539 Inuit and Indian	207 Inuit and Indian	335 Inuit and Indian	995 Inuit and Indian
1962 (Hirabayashi)	5500 Indian	750-900 Native	200 Indian	200 Indian	<3000 Native
1971 Census:	4940 Inuit and Indian	2860 Inuit and Indian	1070 Inuit and Indian	2265 Inuit and Indian	4260 Inuit and Indian
1979 (Price):	15-20,000 Native	10-15,000 Native	5-10,000 Native	5-10,000 Native	10-15,000 Native
1980 (Krotz)	25-80,000 Native	27,151 Native			30-40,000 Native
1981 Census:	16575 Native	6575 Native	4350 Native	7310 Native	13750 Native

Sources: Canada. Statistics Canada, 1974:244; Hirabayashi 1962; Krotz 1980; Price 1979; Canada. Statistics Canada, DIAND customized data, 1981.

identify themselves, or they were in living situations not easily accessible to census takers. However, the magnitude of the difference between census counts and estimates suggests that other factors were involved here. They suggest high levels of concern about the urban migrant situation, and a sense of being overwhelmed by the challenges this migration involved. In this context, government agencies experienced some pressure to define the nature of the problem and to design appropriate interventions in response.

Defining Urban Indians

Citizenship and Indian Affairs Branches

The Citizenship Branch and the Indian Affairs Branch adopted major roles in program formulation and design during this period. The changing settlement pattern of First Nations people, the emphasis on integrating them into wider society, and public concern over their conditions in urban areas, provided a rationale for the Citizenship Branch to expand its original focus on the integration of immigrants to include people of Aboriginal ancestry living in cities.³ In later years the director of the Citizenship Branch, Jean Lagassé, was to indicate that "The exodus of Indians from reserves to urban areas brought this ethnic group within the field of responsibility of the Branch which responded by launching its Indian Integration programme".⁴ Since the Indian Affairs Branch had traditionally assumed primary responsibility for all matters having to do with First Nations people, the Citizenship Branch's growing involvement with Indians led to concern over a clear definition of the respective roles and responsibilities of the two branches. The evolution of these discussions is interesting because it reveals the frameworks policy makers were developing to direct their decision-making. They also display quite clearly the difficulty both branches were having in making sense of the changing social geographies of First Nations peoples, in the context of historic branch mandates.

To provide a framework for policy intervention, it was necessary for the Citizenship and the Indian Affairs Branches to define the population category to which the new policies of integration should apply, and to explain the characteristics of that population category. Both branches relied heavily on a variety of "experts" to help them define the nature of the "urban Indian problem". In this, the Indian-Eskimo Association quickly came to play a lead role (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980; Weaver, 1981). In 1960 the Indian-Eskimo Association, originally the National Commission on the Indian Canadian, received its charter from the Federal government as a "non-sectarian, non-political, independent organization dedicated to the cause of Canada's

native people, not only working on their behalf, but working with the native people and inviting them into our membership" (Canada, 1960:391). During the period of this paper, the Indian-Eskimo Association provided a format for discussions about the situation of urban Indians, organizing roundtables and conferences, and making frequent representations to government officials (Hirabayashi *et al.*, 1962; Indian-Eskimo Association, 1966a; 1966b; 1967; National Commission in the Indian Canadian, 1957). Representatives from both the Citizenship Branch and the Indian Affairs Branch were regular contributors at the workshops and conferences. Many of these events received funding from one or both branches, and by the fiscal year 1963, the Indian-Eskimo Association was one of only two organizations receiving sustaining grants from the Citizenship Branch.⁵

A prevailing theme in the work of the Indian-Eskimo Association was that urbanization represented a process of culture change. At a 1957 Calgary conference on Aboriginal people in urban areas, Father Andre Renaud, one of the original organizers of the Association, gave the key-note address which set the agenda for the conference. He noted:

Our Indian Canadian is faced or hampered with... his [sic] own personality. The Indian Canadian is different from his fellow Canadians of European descent... These differences have nothing to do with his blood or heredity but are from his cultural heritage ... For instance, his concepts of time, money, social communication, hygiene, usefulness, competition and cooperation are at variance with our own and can prove a stumbling block to successful adjustment...

Our duty is to establish: (1) Where do these cultural traits interfere with smooth adjustment? At work, in recreation, at home etc. In other words where does he get into trouble because he is an Indian and what can be done about it? (2) Where does he make the most successful adjustment and cultural contribution to our society and how could we expand or open these areas? (Renaud, 1957:3).

Clearly, competing interpretations of the urbanization process were in circulation at the time, and many documents demonstrate a combination of interpretations, even where they are contradictory. Some writers argued that Reserves characterized dysfunctional or marginalized, rather than traditional cultures, and that this contributed to problems migrants were experiencing in the city (Dosman, 1972; Family Service Association of Edmonton, 1969; Honigmann, 1963; Zentner, 1972; 1973). Other elements such as discrimination, poverty, lack of education and employment, and processes of proletarianization were also contenders for the explanation of

"the urban Indian problem" (Braroe, 1975; Canadian Corrections Association, 1967; Currie, 1969; Elias, 1975; Kerri, 1978; Lithman, 1984; Shackleton, 1969; Vincent, 1971; Wall, 1965). However the idea of culture change took precedence as the main organizing framework during this period of time (Lithman, 1984:7).

The equation of urbanization and culture change had a number of implications for Indian policy. First, it created Reserves as islands of traditional culture in a modernizing society. In a move reminiscent of colonial practices of interpreting distance in space as analogous to distance in time,⁶ Reserves were defined as existing in a different time frame, characterized by cultures with behaviors, values, skills and institutions suitable to pre-modern society, but antithetical to life in modern urban settings (Asimi, 1967; Bond, 1967; Melling, 1967; Nagler, 1970; Trudeau, 1969; Zeitoun, 1969). While this framework for understanding urbanization threads through the public and internal documents of both the Citizenship and the Indian Affairs Branches, its clearest statement is probably found in a 1967 address by the Hon. Arthur Laing, Minister of Indian Affairs, to a Convention of the Native Brotherhood in Vancouver. "[T]he reserves will have to continue to be centres of Indian Community life for many years to come... The reserves must provide an essential time-cushion while Indian people make their own decision as to the kind of life they want to lead"⁷

Second, setting Reserves and urban life in opposition to each other created a new population category requiring innovation in policy and program initiatives. In 1962, R. Alex Sim, Chief Liaison Officer in the Citizenship Branch produced a paper proposing a role for the Citizenship Branch, built on the definition of a new "category" of Indian—"urban Indian".

It is time that the expression "Urban Indian" began to take its place with others—the Plains Indian, the Woodlands Indian, the Enfranchised Indians, and the Half-breed or Metis... From the point of view of the Citizenship Branch, an urban Indian is anyone who is living off the Reserve in a setting where there are industrial and commercial job opportunities, and who identifies himself as an Indian.⁸

In other words, the changing location of First Nations people was seen to represent a changing identity from the one they had held on the Reserve. Linked to these ideas was the implication that adaptation to city life meant that the linkages between urban and reserve populations were severed, as urban First nations people took on different qualities, perspectives, values and behaviours from Reserve residents.

Differentiating First Nations people by place opened up new possibilities for the administration of First Nations peoples—possibilities which

might facilitate the emphasis on their full integration into Canadian society. At a 1962 Edmonton conference entitled "The Challenge of Assisting the Canadian Aboriginal People to Adjust to Urban Environments", Alex Sim identified urban initiatives as providing an opportunity for pursuing fuller citizenship and equality with other Canadians.

There is an unsettled question that gleamed through many of the contributions we have heard at this conference. How can you retain a progressively improving and progressively concerned reservation system for Indians who stay back home where they were born, but at the same time develop a life for Indians in off reservation situations where they do not enjoy special privileges... It seems that we are prepared to pursue these two goals: One of first-class citizenship off the reservation, the other to maintain the principle of trusteeship implicit in the present reservation system. To do so is certainly not as simple as to have only one goal, but if we recognize the goals are different, there should be less confusion in the public mind, and less disillusionment for those who are moving from the reservation to the city (Sim, 1962:26).

This formulation created the possibility for organizing Branch responsibilities geographically, with the Citizenship Branch taking precedence for policy and program development for First Nations peoples in cities, and the Indian Affairs Branch maintaining its historic role with respect to Reserve residents.

Finally, this framework provided the rationale for governmental intervention in the urban Indian situation. As a process of culture change, urbanization was seen as inevitably damaging and disturbing. As representatives of past and pre-urban cultures, the process of culture change was defined as one of culture shock for First Nations migrants. The threat urban lifeways posed to First Nations cultures was seen to make it difficult for migrants to create these opportunities for themselves. As a result, government agencies assumed a responsibility to provide assistance to enable First Nations people to cope in the city.

First Nations Perspectives

There is a paucity of material which describes First Nations perspectives on urbanization during this time period. However the material which is available suggests that many First Nations people understood the process through different frameworks of meaning than the Citizenship and the Indian Affairs Branches. The following section describes some of these frameworks. The purpose is not to set up a First Nations/non-First Nations dichotomy. A number of First Nations people subscribed to a view of urbanization which equated it with culture change (for example Beaulieu,

1964; Currie, 1969). During the time period of this paper though, alternative interpretations were put forward primarily by First Nations representatives.

One theme threading through the First Nations material contradicts the distinction between "urban Indians" and Reserve communities. A 1976 proposal by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians to conduct a survey in urban areas clearly rejects the assumption that urbanization reflected a rejection of the Reserve community of origin and an attempt by migrants to adopt a new cultural identity. In the proposal the Federation characterized urban migrants as "treaty Indians who belong to the different Indian bands in the province".⁹ The 1978 report based on the study emphasizes: "Throughout the entire report, the reader should bear in mind that this is not a report on Urban Natives. It is a report on band members living off reserve" (Ellis *et al.*, 1978:3). The report noted that:

Although a large number of Indians have left their home Reserves, and it is likely that larger numbers will continue to do so, this cannot reasonably be interpreted to mean that these people are rejecting their Indian culture and traditions, their home reserves or their fellow band members. While this assumption may be true in a limited number of cases, the general discussions that interviewers held indicate that the vast majority of Indians living in cities still consider themselves to be members of their band—not urban Indians (Ellis, 1978:22).

The definition of urbanization as a problem of culture change was also challenged. For Andrew Bear Robe, Executive Director of the Calgary Friendship Centre, culture was only one of many more important factors affecting the ability to succeed in the city. Refusing to define First Nations migrants only in terms of their supposedly pre-urban culture, Bear Robe's argument contradicted the association of urbanization and culture shock.

An Indian moving into an urban community does not always find it difficult. It depends on many tangible and intangible factors such as the amount of education and skilled training a person has acquired; single or married, and if married—how large is the family; a student or a person looking for permanent employment; a Treaty, non-Treaty or a Metis person; a drinker or a non-drinker; an Indian thinker with typical habits and attitudes, or an Indian who has become acculturized to the dominant white society; good personal appearance accompanied by the important ability to express oneself articulately and distinctly, or a person with poor grooming and withdrawn personality—the availability of a car or no transportation at all, and many other factors which make a person more or less employable (Bear Robe, 1970:28).

In a report commissioned by the Citizenship Branch, Bear Robe linked difficulties Native migrants had in the city directly to the economic impoverishment of the Reserves from which migrants had come, rather than to some traditional culture which was incompatible with urban life (Bear Robe, 1971:1-2).

In contrast to perspectives which emphasized the inability of urban First Nations migrants to develop adequate coping strategies without non-Native intervention, First Nations people argued that they had an essential role in meeting the needs of urban Indians. The Federation of Saskatchewan Indians explained that Band councils continued to feel responsible for the welfare of Band members who migrated.

The bands to whom [migrants] belong, and the Federation as their representative, have serious concerns about what is happening to the people who make up this migration. As well, the Federation and the bands feel a deep responsibility for these people and wish to find ways of extending this concern by offering them help and support with the problems resulting from their move.¹⁰

Bear Robe argued that the situation for First Nations people living in cities would only improve once First Nations people had greater control over policies and decision-making.

This haphazard concern for the general welfare of the native people of Canada will not change until Indian leaders themselves demand the change. They will not effect the change unless they become involved with the main political and economic pulse of this country, either as city aldermen, members of the Provincial Legislative, members of Parliament, businessmen or leaders of organizations promoting social change for all people concerned... Until we actually have Indian people assuming important, influential and responsible roles in society, either in government or in business, the Indian voice and demands will never get top priority or have an adequate hearing (Bear Robe, 1971:30-1).

These interventions shift the emphasis from migrants' psychological malaise or culture shock, inter-cultural relations and culture clash, to issues of discrimination, politics and power.

Designing Programs for Urban Indians

While both branches agreed that "urban Indians" represented a distinct population category with particular shared characteristics, translating this understanding into program administration was not straightforward. There

were lines of cleavage not only between government bureaucrats and First Nations peoples, but also between and within government departments.

Indian Affairs Branch Placement Program

In its 1956-7 Annual Report, the Indian Affairs Branch announced a program addressing the urbanization of First Nations peoples. In response to what the branch called the "problems of adjustment to the standards of the non-Indian community", the branch created a placement program which worked in co-operation with the National Employment Service.¹¹ Indian Affairs placement officers were responsible for selecting individuals to be placed in urban employment, and providing them with support during the early period of their employment. Financial support included travel and moving costs for the worker and his family, a re-establishment allowance, grants for household furniture, and contingency grants for clothing, tools or safety equipment required for employment.¹² By 1962, fourteen placement officers had been appointed in urban areas.

While there has been little attention paid to this program, it seems to have had a considerable role in early urbanization patterns. The significance of the Indian Affairs placement program during these years lies partly in numbers. At a time when the rate of movement off Reserves and to urban areas was relatively low the program grew from 231 individuals (often accompanied by their families) placed in urban employment in 1958-9, to over 1,000 individuals placed in 1965-6. The importance of the program is also obviated by an examination of the circumstances faced by First Nations people who migrated independently of Indian Affairs sponsorship. The intense poverty of many First Nations people living on Indian Reserves meant that very few migrants arriving in urban areas had financial resources to depend on during a search for employment. Because of jurisdictional disputes between provincial and federal governments about responsibility for social assistance for First Nations people off the Reserves, it appears that many First Nations people arriving in urban areas either contacted local Indian Affairs offices first, or were referred there by provincial officials. At the Indian Affairs office the decision was made either to provide funding and support in finding employment, or to send migrants back to the Reserve (Cardinal, 1977:120-121; Ponting and Gibbins, 1980:184). Available evidence then suggests that, through its placement program, Indian Affairs played an important role in the urbanization process, especially during the early part of the time period under examination in this paper.¹³

From the beginning of the placement program, the emphasis was on careful selection. In 1961 Ellen Fairclough, Minister of Citizenship and

Immigration, linked the success of the program to the way in which candidates were chosen:

First, selected young people are counseled and encouraged to take regular employment, usually in the cities, in factories, offices, garages, stores. This is individual placement and is proving highly successful, largely because the candidates for the program are carefully chosen, usually while they are still in high school (Fairclough 1961:37).

The degree of involvement of placement officers was high, and in some cases officers intervened extensively in their clients' lives in the attempt to facilitate permanent urban employment and residence (Dosman, 1972:84-98; 101-106; Latham, 1958). Careful selection and intensive supervision after placement suggest that the program represented the extension of the wardship role of the Indian Affairs Branch into the city. Lithman notes that in order to take advantage of social support available from Indian Affairs, a migrant off the Reserve "would have to subject himself to a patron/client relationship with the IAB personnel" (Lithman, 1984:9).

While the Placement Program could be reconciled with the historic role of the Indian Affairs Branch, it was at odds with a perspective which employed the spaces of Reserve and city to define different categories of Indians and different modes of administration. Beginning in the early 1960s the Branch had defined the increasing involvement of provincial governments and other federal government departments in providing services to First Nations peoples as an important element in the integration of migrants. Indian Affairs maintained that provinces and municipalities were constitutionally responsible for providing social assistance to First Nations people off the Reserve.¹⁴ For Indian Affairs, then, the urban-Reserve boundary was interrupted for Indian people defined as being in the process of adaptation, who remained the responsibility of Indian Affairs during their transition period. Indian Affairs formulated two options for urban migrants—a continued relationship with the branch under the Placement Program which redefined them as wards in the urban setting, or dependence for programs and services on provincial, municipal, or another federal department which defined them as urban residents like any others. These options were potentially contradictory. The difficulty involved in reconciling them was demonstrated in what seemed to be considerable debate and discussion within the Branch about the desirability of involvement in the urban placement program. However H.M. Jones, Director of the Branch, viewed the placement initiative as a logical extension of Indian Affairs programs and objectives of integrating First Nations peoples.¹⁵ In addition, it is clear that the general public saw Indian Affairs as the obvious contact concerning

all issues having to do with First Nations peoples and many First Nations people, viewed Indian Affairs as the appropriate administrators of programs and services for First Nations people in urban areas (Battle, 1957; Cardinal, 1977). The resulting combination of initiatives proved difficult to manage.

Citizenship Branch

The "Friendship Centre movement" comprised the main mechanism through which the Citizenship Branch became involved with Native people in urban centres. The Winnipeg Friendship Centre emerged from the concerns about migrating Native people expressed by the Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg, and it became a prototype for other areas. Established as referral service for urban Native people, the Centre opened in April of 1959 with funding from the municipality, the province and the Citizenship Branch (Hourie *et al.*, 1983). By 1962 the Citizenship Branch indicated there were similar developments in nineteen urban areas.¹⁶ With the support of the Indian Affairs Branch,¹⁷ the Citizenship Branch developed a Friendship Centre program and by fiscal 1966, one-quarter of the \$250,000 in grants the Branch was dispensing to organizations and groups went to Native Friendship Centres.¹⁸

The Branch described urbanization as a matter of "internal migration", an analogue of overseas immigration, representing "a new phase where the skills that were applied to immigrant groups can be used with Indians who migrate to the cities."¹⁹ While the Citizenship Branch, like the Indian Affairs Branch, viewed urbanization through the lenses of culture change, it approached programming in its own way. For citizenship, the appropriate strategy was one which emphasized "culture as therapy".²⁰ According to this framework, the inevitable loss of traditional culture in the urban environment was a disabling experience, which must be counteracted with strategies to allow migrants to retain or regain aspects of their identity. As Jean H. Lagassé, later director of the Citizenship Branch, informed the audience at an Edmonton conference on urban Aboriginal people:

A way must be found by which cultural values from the native culture remain until values of the larger culture can be taken on. People who make a satisfactory adjustment are those who can maintain their own culture long enough to learn the new culture (Lagassé, 1962:13).

In this context, Friendship Centres were expected to promote aspects of Native culture as a mechanism for facilitating adjustment to the urban milieu. In a 1965 address at the Vancouver Friendship Centre, J.R. Nicholson, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, emphasized the role of

Friendship Centres in easing adjustment to urban life by providing some contact with Native culture.

It is your avowed purpose, the task of all in the Indian Friendship Centres, to assist [migrating Indians] to make the adjustment to a way of life which is in strong contrast to the traditional Indian culture of the reserve. It is up to you to help soften the blow

Unless such a service is available to him, the Indian who has newly arrived in the city often finds that he is being asked to reject completely everything that has been dear to him for generations, in favour of a way of life about which he knows little or nothing

It is up to you, in the Indian Friendship Centre, to provide a place where the harassed city-migrant can find a sheltered haven where he can rest and take stock of himself during the hectic process of adjustment to city life (Nicholson, 1965).

Contact with Native culture, then, was viewed as providing a sense of identity, a reprieve and a source of pride and self-esteem.

The cultural role of Friendship Centres provided a strong rationale for involving Native people in their management and administration. In his 1969 representation to the federal Standing Committee on Indian Affairs, Jean Lagassé, Director of the Citizenship Branch noted "If you think of the cultural part that we talked about, if that is going to be one of the roles of the centre, it is essential that there be as many people of Indian ancestry in the administration of the centre as possible" (Canada, 1969:561-2).

At the same time, the parameters of these cultural roles were sharply circumscribed. The Branch emphasized the role of Friendship Centres in promoting the "full utilization of, and referral to, existing services to prevent segregation". Migrating Natives were to be referred to provincial and municipal agencies for social assistance, employment and financial information, personal counselling, justice issues and any other social needs (Johnson, 1976). Native people were seen as essential participants for narrowly defined cultural programming, but the major role in facilitating integration was to remain with the institutions of the dominant society. Consistent with a prevailing view that modern urban society provided a strong contrast and a threat to Native culture, the Citizenship Branch saw the place of First Nations culture in urban life as highly circumscribed. Viewed as generally antithetical to urban life ways, it should be contained within the walls of the Friendship Centre through special celebrations and contact with other Natives. For the Citizenship Branch, then, urban and Reserve were not completely exclusive worlds. Some aspects of First

Nations cultures (still associated with past times and distance Reserve places), could be imported into city life.

First Nations representatives rejected the narrow scope and place for First Nations cultures in the city defined by the Citizenship Branch, and put forward an alternative perspective through a redefinition of the role of the Friendship Centres. In 1969, for example, Joe Keeper, Executive Director of the Manitoba Métis Federation, and Andrew Bear Robe argued to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development that Friendship Centres had an essential role in providing social services to migrants. They noted that mainstream service organizations did not have the skills or knowledge to provide appropriate assistance, that First Nations migrants preferred to be helped by Friendship Centre personnel, and that because of their lack of knowledge of First Nations cultures and circumstances, social service organizations often referred clients back to Friendship Centres (Canada, 1969:568; 570-1; 582).

Conflicts and Contradictions

The principle of classifying people by space (Cresswell, 1996) made an important contribution to the governance of First Nations peoples in cities during this period. However, the principles of wardship and urban ethnicity also played a role, creating messy and potentially contradictory organizing frameworks. Throughout the period described in this paper, the branches worked to define their respective roles,²¹ often with considerable conflict.²² Moreover, these frameworks were often at odds with the ways First Nations people defined the significance of the move to the city. Competing frameworks for understanding Indian urbanization made the exercise of program development and administration unstable and unpredictable.

Expanding Friendship Centre Programs

In 1972, the Citizenship Branch proposed an expanded five year program in support of Friendship Centres. The proposal drew on the results of consultation with the newly formed National Association of Friendship Centres concerning the needs of the Centres. Called the "Migrating Native Peoples Program" it included core funding and a Native demonstration project to allow groups "which devise experimental and imaginative projects to assist migrating Native people" to obtain funding. The proposal also called for the development of "Native Participation Councils", facilitated by Citizenship Branch personnel, to co-ordinate projects and funding at local and federal levels. The Citizenship Branch argued that "[t]hrough the council, the local friendship centre and native associations could draw on the talents of the community to actively join in assisting migrating Native

people." The estimated cost of the program was \$26.1 million over a five year term.²³ The Citizenship Branch's proposal was approved almost in its entirety by the federal Cabinet, including a sum of \$1.7 million dollars between 1972 and 1974 for the demonstration fund. However, Cabinet recommended that an interdepartmental committee be established to "ensure policy co-ordination of federal efforts".²⁴

Indian Affairs's reaction was immediate and negative. In preparation for the Cabinet meeting to discuss the issue, HB Robinson, Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs, prepared a briefing document for Jean Chrétien, then Minister, making an argument which appears to deviate substantially from previous Indian Affairs policies on urban Indians.

If it is the government's wish to improve and enrich services to Indians living in urban centres in Canada the Department already has the facilities to deal with Indian people and it would be easier to extend these facilities rather than have another Department duplicate them.

Therefore, it should be understood that all attempts to help Indians adapt to urban situations should be coordinated by the Minister of Indian Affairs.²⁵

While Indian Affairs did not put forward this position in subsequent negotiations, it shows the difficulty Indian Affairs officials had in sorting out their role with respect to "urban Indians".

In subsequent meetings of the interdepartmental committee, the Native Participation Councils and the demonstration fund proved most contentious. Officials from the Department of Health and Welfare argued that the demonstration fund should be incorporated into their programming, and this received support from Indian Affairs representatives. Together, they employed a variety of arguments including duplication of programs and unwieldiness to argue against the development of Native Participation Councils.²⁶ Representatives from the Citizenship Branch, supported by officials from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, argued that the purpose of the demonstration funds was to allow the Friendship Centres to fulfil the needs of migrating Native people, and that the scope must therefore be broader than Health and Welfare's programs allowed.²⁷

Clearly the debate around the Citizenship Branch's proposal had to do, in part, with political events unrelated to First Nations urbanization, including resentment over the Citizenship Branch's expanding role during the early years of the Trudeau government (Pal, 1993). In addition, in 1969 the federal government introduced a White Paper which argued that, in order to facilitate the integration of First Nations peoples, their special status should be phased out. This proposal met with unprecedented opposition

from First Nations groups, and the policies it suggested were not formally pursued. In the aftermath of the White Paper there was considerable confusion in Indian Affairs concerning its scope and mandate (Weaver, 1981). Eventually, policymakers used the differentiation of Reserve and city to organize ways of limiting the responsibilities of Indian Affairs.

However the definitions of the appropriate place and role in the city of First Nations peoples and cultures also shaped the results. The framework of meaning employed by the Citizenship Branch in its program development created a space, however circumscribed, for First Nations cultures in urban areas, and First Nations people increasingly used that space to demand expanded roles and responsibilities. In the context of the growing "Native nationalism" (Kicksee, 1995) of the period, the Citizenship Branch was prepared to provide more opportunities for First Nations involvement in decision-making about Friendship Centre programs and approaches. In a memorandum to the Interdepartmental Committee on Migrating Native People, Walter Rudnicki, Executive Director of CMHC pointed out that the Citizenship Branch proposal was "based on the belief that the Friendship Centres program belongs to Native People."²⁸ Indian Affairs' framework for understanding the "urban Indian problem"—either ward or provincial citizen—could not accommodate this perspective.

Contradictory frameworks for understanding urbanization and Branch rivalries made it impossible to create support in the Interdepartmental Committee for all aspects of the Migrating Native Peoples Program. Despite the fact that the program fit within the Citizenship Branch mandate for urban First Nations peoples, members of the Interdepartmental Committee were unable to reach consensus,²⁹ and neither the Demonstration Fund nor the Native Participation Councils were put into place.³⁰

First Nations Control of Service Delivery to Urban First Nations Peoples

In 1971, three Blackfoot men, supported by the Calgary district office of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, conceived of an alternative system of delivery of social services to urban Indians which was essentially controlled by First Nations people (Ryan 1978). Calling themselves the Calgary Urban Treaty Indian Alliance (CUTIA), the group submitted a proposal in 1972, to provide a multi-program centre to provide services to migrants. Supported by the Indian Association of Alberta, the Alliance received \$50,000 from Indian Affairs in 1973. Alliance services appear to have been used extensively by local service agencies, and First Nations groups in other cities began to express an interest in this model of service delivery (Ryan, 1978:14).

The Alliance, with the support of local Indian Affairs officials, began to negotiate for more stable funding. The Alliance's proposals generated considerable debate within the national Indian Affairs office. Points in favour of funding the Alliance included the argument that the program fit with Indian Affairs' initiatives to provide special services to migrating Indians during a transition period, and the fact that the program represented a shift of responsibility from Indian Affairs to First Nations people themselves. Arguments against were that the Alliance's services duplicated the Placement Program and Friendship Centre responsibilities, that the program should be administered by National Health and Welfare as part of its social service envelope, and that the Alliance's initiative was inconsistent with Indian Affairs' position that First Nations people living off the Reserve were the responsibility of the province (Ryan, 1978:10-11). In March 1974, the Alliance received information that their proposal for funding had been rejected. Jean Chrétien, Minister of Indian Affairs at that time, explained that the Alliance's proposed services did not fall under the mandate of Indian Affairs, and asked for a revised proposal which drew on more provincial and municipal support.

My decision was based on the fact that once Indian people move from their reserve to non-reserve communities, they should be regarded as citizens of the Province in the foremost sense. This is not to say that my Department would not continue to assist, but in a secondary role (quoted in Ryan, 1978:15).

This decision was viewed with bewilderment and anger, not only by Alliance staff, but also by Indian Affairs officials at the local and regional level, social service agencies, Alberta Indian Chiefs, and local activists.

CUTIA had been working from February 1973 until March 1974 with funds from Indian Affairs. A full proposal, endorsed by district, regional and head office staff and with the support of the Executive and Planning Committee [in Ottawa], as well as senior staff members [in Ottawa] was suddenly decreed illegal and outside the realm of Department services and programming (Ryan, 1978:16).

Moreover, by 1974 Indian Affairs expenditure for urban social services was over \$500,000, just in the Treaty 7 area (Ryan, 1978:17). In this context, it seemed incomprehensible that the main argument for not funding the Alliance was framed in terms of the provincial responsibility for Indians off the Reserve. Alliance personnel as well as Indian Affairs officials at local, regional and national levels continued to negotiate, but by October 1974 it was clear that no funds were forthcoming. The funding decision resulted in

an occupation of the Calgary Indian Affairs office, several arrests, threat of an American Indian Movement lawsuit, extensive media attention and the suicide of Nelson Small Legs, Jr., one of the three organizers of the Alliance initiative (Ryan, 1978).

The Alliance incident clearly demonstrates the roles available to 'urban Indians' as a result of the definition of their situation by government bureaucracies. They could act as wards of Indian Affairs and receive services under the Placement Program. They could participate in the Friendship Centre as an ethnic group and be involved in cultural programming, narrowly defined. They could act as "citizens of the province" and lose their cultural distinctiveness and recognition of their Aboriginal rights. What was unavailable were projects, supported by Indian Affairs, which gave First Nations people substantial autonomy and control in program design and management.

Subsequently, Jud Buchanan, who had replaced Jean Chrétien as Minister, obtained approval from Treasury Board for a contribution from Indian Affairs if half of the cost was shared with either the provincial or municipal government. This arrangement met Indian Affairs' increasing emphasis, after the withdrawal of the White Paper, on provincial and municipal responsibility for Indians living off-Reserves. Not unexpectedly, neither Alberta nor the City of Calgary agreed to contribute, taking the position that Indians were a federal responsibility.³¹ After these incidents, Indian Affairs' involvement in the Placement Program, generally, appears to have been scaled back. With the introduction of mobility assistance on a national basis by the Department of Manpower and Immigration, the Indian Affairs programs covered only occasional supplementary assistance or provided funding for individuals who did not qualify under the Manpower programs.³² As a result, Indian Affairs' responsibilities for First Nations peoples were decreased, and resulting programs and administrative frameworks were more easily reconciled with early attempts to identify Reserve residents with historic Indian Affairs responsibilities, and urban migrants with provincial governments and other federal departments.

Conclusions

Ideas about the incompatibility of First Nations cultures and modern industrial society predate the events of this paper. However, by the end of the period described here, these ideas had been anchored in a particular geography which defined cities and Reserves as different kinds of places in Canada, places in which different kinds of people lived, requiring different policies and programs, administered by different government units. Assisted by a variety of "experts", the Citizenship and Indian Affairs Branches

adopted a way of defining First Nations urbanization that would bring the urban population within the scope of new policy initiatives complementary to the goals of integration. This definition drew heavily on the practice of differentiating populations by space, with separate legal and administrative regimes and departmental responsibility for First Nations people living on and off Reserves. First Nations people on Reserves were defined in terms of traditional cultures and a legal status of wardship under the responsibility of Indian Affairs. In the city, First Nations people were viewed as integrating into modern society, citizens like other urban residents, under the responsibility of municipal or provincial governments or federal departments other than Indian Affairs.

These formulations were not easily translated into programs for First Nations peoples in urban areas. In moves which complicated a definition of First Nations peoples by place of residence, Indian Affairs developed programs to assist migrants to urban areas, and Citizenship Branch emphasized aspects of culture in Friendship Centre programming. However, while the White Paper did not have an immediate effect on policies and programs for urban First Nations peoples, over time federal policy makers began to use the distinction between urban and Reserve residents as one way of limiting the responsibilities of Indian Affairs. One of the results of the White Paper, then, appears to have been an increased emphasis on differentiating between First Nations peoples on and off Reserves. By 1975, despite the fact that this differentiation varied considerably from the perspectives of many First Nations people, the significance of urban and Reserve boundaries in defining First Nations peoples' identities, was firmly established in federal policies.

The ways in which policies and programs differentiated First Nations people on and off Reserve have also had a major effect on political development in First Nations communities. A number of descriptions of the attempts to organize provincial and national bodies during this period mention problems associated with an urban leadership which failed to represent Reserve constituencies. Ponting and Gibbins (1980:195) note that early attempts to organize were linked to meetings and conferences on urban First Nations peoples, and that the largely urban-based leadership of the National Indian Council, founded in 1961, had different interests and concerns from Reserve residents (see also Bear Robe, 1971:4).³³ Cardinal (1969:110) notes that "The membership and the leadership of the council was constituted to a high degree by the urban and marginal Indian population. The leadership came from those Indians who had moved to cities and, in many cases were employed by the government. The Reserve or rural communities were suspicious."

While I accept that individuals from different areas could have different perceptions and issues, I am concerned with the seeming acceptance of the obviousness of an urban/Reserve split in such materials. Recently, Patricia Monture Okanee wrote:

This "I'm on reserve, you're off reserve" is a split in our communities that troubles me greatly. It is directly, if only partially, responsible for our youth feeling lost, caught in the middle. It is a variation on the divide and conquer game that has been used by the settler populations to oppress our people. And it is time we stopped being so compliant with the rules to somebody else's game. The Indian Act is not ours. It is not a reflection of how we are a nation, or how we govern ourselves. Reserves are not our creation, so the distinction between being raised "on or off" is one that should not be central in how we think about ourselves. It is a false distinction. It is a distinction that oppresses us. I am Mohawk and my people have a territory. It spans the borders of New York State, Ontario and Quebec. It is that territory I come from and not the so-called province of Ontario. This oppressive thinking, which so many of my people have picked up, predisposes us to leading of a life of oppression (1992:129).

In this context, perhaps the contribution of the role of federal policy-making and administration in consolidating the differentiation between urban and Reserve residents deserves further examination.

Notes

1. In 1949, the Department of Citizenship and Immigration was created as part of the process of dismantling the last vestiges of wartime government organization. The new department combined the Citizenship Branch, previously under the Secretary of State, and the Immigration and Indian Affairs Branches, previously under the Department of Mines and Resources. In 1966, the Indian Affairs Branch was moved to the Ministry of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources. In 1968, Indian Affairs became part of a new Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. To avoid confusion, the terminology used here will be either "Indian Affairs Branch" or "Indian Affairs".
2. This conclusion appeared to be unpalatable to the Centre which supported a policy of community development, and Buckley's (1963) work, commissioned shortly thereafter, indicated that many Natives would experience difficulty adapting to urban life, and made some recommendations to improve northern economies.

3. Under the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, the Citizenship Branch defined for itself a dual focus on citizenship and integration. In its initial emphasis on immigrants, the branch saw this as a double edged process. "[I]mmigrants had to develop a satisfactory sense of the obligations and attune themselves to Canadian -ness; established Canadian had to open themselves and their organizations to the newcomers" (Pal, 1993:90). The branch worked through an emphasis on education and co-operation with a variety of voluntary groups and associations. Its involvement in Aboriginal issues was shaped by this definition of its mandate and its approach to implementation.
4. J.H. Lagassé, Director of Citizenship Branch. February 1968. Draft Cabinet Document, Memorandum to Cabinet, Confirmation of Citizenship Branch Role, National Archives of Canada, Record Group 6, Volume 661, File 2-2-4, Page 1.
5. J.H. Lagassé, Director of Citizenship Branch. 23 March 1966. Memorandum. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 6, Volume 661, File 2-4-8.
6. Anthropologists have documented the pattern of thought which assigns non-Western cultures to a separate time from Euro-North American cultures (Clifford, 1987; Fabian, 1983). These distinct cultures are viewed as traditional and unchanging, belonging to some ancient time, unsullied by contact with contemporary or modern society. McClintock describes these cultures as existing in "anachronistic space"—prehistoric, atavistic and irrational, inherently out of place in the historical time of modernity" (McClintock, 1995:40).
7. A. Laing, Minister of Indian Affairs. 25 February 1967 Address to the convention of the Native Brotherhood Vancouver. Available at the Department of Indian Affairs Library, Ottawa, 4,8.
8. R.A. Sim, No date but probably written in 1962. What Is Meant by "Urban Indians". National Archives of Canada, Record Group 29, Portion of 60 File 2-38-6 Volume 1, Page 1.
9. Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. November 2, 1976. Indian Urban Development Project, Phase I: A Proposal to Undertake an In-Depth Survey of the Circumstances of Treaty Indians Living in Urban Areas. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 10, Volume 12712, File 1/1-19-4, Page 1.
10. *Ibid.* See also the description of the Indian Association of Alberta's proposal to the federal government that Indians living off Reserve should continue to be under federal jurisdiction (Cardinal, 1977).
11. In 1954, the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs introduced a relocation program to facilitate the movement of American Indians from Reserves

- to urban areas. This program was similar in many ways to that introduced in Canada (Jorgensen, 1971; Neils, 1971). A comparison of the two programs is beyond the scope of this paper.
12. In the 1970s many of these costs were incorporated into general programs developed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration. However, Indian Affairs programs still provided supplementary assistance for items and costs not covered under these programs.
 13. By the early 1970s the influence of this program appears to have decreased and Dumalie's report for Indian Affairs noted that: "A survey of the literature indicated that an infinitesimally small proportion of Indians in urban centres were there as a result of a relocation/retraining program. Yet such programs, through Canada Manpower or Indian and Northern Affairs, have had considerable time and money devoted to them" (1974:10).
 14. Branch-sponsored research into constitutional obligations concluded that there were no barriers against the involvement of provincial governments and other federal government departments in providing and funding services for First Nations migrants. This policy culminated in the Trudeau government's 1969 *White Paper*, which proposed to do away with all elements of special status for First Nations people, in order to integrate them. In the face of overwhelming protests by First Nations peoples, the *White Paper* was officially withdrawn. However the emphasis on provincial involvement in providing services to First Nations peoples continued (Bostrom, 1984; Breton and Grant, 1984; Weaver, 1981).
 15. Letter from H.M. Jones, Director, Indian Affairs Branch, to Lagassé, J.H., Director, Citizenship Branch, 23 May 1962, National Archives of Canada, Record Group 26, Series A-1-b, Volume 69, File 2-38-6.
 16. Sim, 1962, op cit, p.6.
 17. Jones, 1962, op cit.
 18. Memorandum from J.H. Lagassé, Director, Citizenship Branch. 23 March 1966. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 6, Volume 661, File 2-3-8, Vol 1.
 19. Letter from R.A. Sim, Chief Liaison Officer, Citizenship Branch to R England 14 August 1962, National Archives of Canada, Record Group 30, Volume 2, File 19.
 20. This phrase is used in Wetherell and Potter (1992:131).
 21. In 1962, Alex Sim, Chief Liaison Officer, drafted a paper on the Citizenship Branch's role with respect to "urban Indians". In response to Sim's paper, H.M. Jones, Director, Indian Affairs Branch, suggested that the two branches negotiate their roles. An initial attempt to define

respective roles by Jean Lagassé, Acting Director of the Citizenship Branch, relied on ideas of ethnicity and Indian Act definitions. After further negotiations with Indian Affairs personnel, Lagassé's next attempt six months later, elaborated by drawing on traditional mainstays of Citizenship's mandate—intergroup relations, citizenship, voluntary organizations. Citizenship's attempts appeared to be too complex for senior officials at Indian Affairs and in early January 1965, R.F. Battle, Assistant Deputy Minister, proposed an outline of responsibilities, drawing primarily on the urban/Reserve distinction as an organizing principle, but making an exception for Indians under the sponsorship of the Placement Program. This approach was accepted by the Citizenship Branch. The 1965-6 *Annual Report* of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration reports that a formula for the division of responsibility for the two branches has been developed.

See: Sim, no date, op cit.

Jones to Lagassé 23 May 1962, op cit.

Letter from J.A. Lagassé to R.F. Battle. 17 December, 1964. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 5, Volume 662, File 2-13-5, Page 4.

Letter from R.F. Battle to J.A. Lagassé. 18 December, 1964. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 6, Volume 662, File 2-13-5 (A note in the margin indicates that Lagassé is in agreement with Battle's summary).

22. For example, Bernard Ostry, Assistant Under-Secretary of State – Citizenship, wrote that “The Branch was supposed to develop and strengthen a sense of Canadian citizenship, chiefly through programs that would aid participation and assuage feelings of social injustice. Indian, Métis and Inuit political, social and cultural organizations were established and funded in the teeth of opposition from the Department of Indian Affairs” (Ostry, 1978:115, emphasis added).
23. G. Pelletier, Secretary of State. 7 April 1972. Memorandum. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 10, Volume 12721, Cabinet Document No. 445/72.
Secretary of State. June 27 1972. News Release. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 10, Volume 12721, File 1/24-1-3, Part 3.
24. D.J. Leach, Supervisor of Cabinet Documents. 9 June 1972. Record of Cabinet Decision, Meeting of 8 June 1972: Migrating Native People. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 127, Volume 206, File 1830-WI-1, Part 1.

25. R.B. Robinson to J. Chrétien. No date, but the note at the end is dated 6 June 1972, Briefing Document. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 10, Volume 12721, File 1/24-1-3, Part 3, Page 2.
26. Indian Affairs officials' disenchantment with the Councils stemmed in part from their experiences with Regional and National Indian Advisory Boards which were created in 1966 to provide feedback about revisions to the Indian Act and the long-range objectives of the Branch. Representatives on these boards expressed discomfort representing communities and were frustrated with an advisory role concerning government policy. The boards were discontinued in 1967 (Weaver, 1981:29-31).
27. N. Prefontaine, Assistant Deputy Minister, National Health and Welfare. 4 May 1972. Memorandum. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 29, Volume 1625, File 8.
M. Trottier, Chair of Interdepartmental Committee on Migrating Native Peoples. No date. Minutes of meeting held 19 January 1973. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 127 Volume 74 File 140-22 Part 1.
W. Rudnicki, Executive Director, Canada Mortgage and Housing, to Trottier, K., Chair of Interdepartmental Committee. 5 January 1973. Memorandum on the Administration of the Demonstration Project Fund. National Archives of Canada, Record Group 127, Volume 74, File 140-22, Part 1.
28. Rudnicki, 1973 *Ibid.*
29. Trottier. Nodate, op cit.
30. G.Y. Rayner, Assistant Under Secretary of State, Corporate Management, to the Minister. 13 June 1977. Memorandum Re: Migrating Native Peoples' Programme. National Archives of Canada. Record Group 6, Accession 1989-90/316, Volume 391, Part of file 3535-1 (pt. 1).
31. Letter from federal M.P. Joe Clark to Judd Buchanan, Minister of Indian Affairs, 12 November 1974.
Letter from Judd Buchanan, Minister of Indian Affairs to Joe Clark, M.P., 2 January 1975. DIAND file 701/29-1. Welfare of Indians, General, Alberta Regional Office.
Letter from Judd Buchanan, Minister of Indian Affairs to Joe Clark, M.P., 18 February 1976 Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. File 701/29-1. Welfare of Indians, General, Alberta Regional Office.
32. While Manpower's Mobility Program was introduced in 1972, discussion to rationalize Indian Affairs and Manpower participation appear to have been conducted for the 1974/5 fiscal year. See: E. Korchinski,

Memo concerning Relocation Assistance – 1974/75, 29 December 1975, and Letter from R. Biddle to W.H. Hodge, 17 June 1976, NAC RG10 Volume I 12710 File 1/21-3 PT 10.

33. They also note that the NIC contained non-Status and Métis members who had different status and interests than the First Nations members. In 1968, this difference led to an amicable decision to split the NIC into the National Indian Brotherhood and the Canadian Metis Society.

References

- Adams, H.
1975 *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View*. Toronto: New Press.
- Asimi, A.P.
1967 *The Urban Setting. Resolving Conflicts: A Cross-Cultural Approach*. Winnipeg: Department of University Extensions and Adult Education, University of Manitoba.
- Barron, F.L.
1997 *Walking in Indian Moccasins. The Native Policies of Tommy Douglas and the CCF*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
1984 *A Summary of Federal Indian Policy in the Canadian West, 1867-1984. Native Studies Review* 1(1):28.
- Battle, R.F.
1957 *Rehabilitation and Placement Program: Indian Affairs Branch. The Indian in the City*. Ottawa: National Commission on the Indian Canadian.
- Beaulieu, I.
1964 *Urbanizing the Indian. Ontario Housing* 6:16 and 24.
- Bear Robe, A.
1971 *A Study Tour of Canadian Friendship Centres, June 1st – August 31st, 1970*. Ottawa, Ontario: Steering Committee for the National Association of Friendship Centres, Citizenship Branch.
1970 *Indian Urbanization. Tawow*. 1-2:2-5 and 28-31.
- Bond, J.J.
1967 *A Report on the Pilot Relocation Project at Elliot Lake, Ontario*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- Borovoy, A.A.
1966 *Indian Poverty in Canada. Canadian Labour* 12:13-15.

Bostrom, H.

- 1984 Recent Evolution of Canada's Indian Policy, in R. Breton and G. Grant (Editors): *The Dynamics of Government Programs for Urban Indians in the Prairie Provinces*. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Braroe, N.W.

- 1975 *Indian and White: Self-image and Interaction in a Canadian Plains Community*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Breton, R. and G. Grant (Editors)

- 1984 *The Dynamics of Government Programs for Urban Indians in the Prairie Provinces*. Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Brody, H.

- 1983 *Maps and Dreams: A Journey into the Lives and Lands of the Beaver Indians of Northwest Canada*. New York: Penquin Books.

Buckley, H.

- 1992 *From Wooden Plows to Welfare: Why Indian Policy Failed in the Prairie Provinces*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- 1963 *Indians and Metis of Northern Saskatchewan: A Report on Economic and Social Development*. Saskatoon: Centre for Community Studies.

Canada. House of Commons

- 1949 *Debates. Volume III*. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier.

Canada, House of Commons, Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

- 1969 *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence No. 17*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

Canada. Indian Affairs Branch

- 1967 *Indian Affairs Facts and Figures*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Canada. Indian and Northern Affairs

- 1992 *Indian Register Population by Sex and Residence*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Canada. Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Indian Affairs

- 1960 *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*. Thursday May 19. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.

- Canada. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples
- 1996 *Perspectives and Realities, Vol. 4. Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa: Canada Communications Group.
- 1993 *Aboriginal Peoples in Urban Centres: Report on the National Round Table on Aboriginal Urban Issues*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Canada. Statistics Canada
- 1993 *Age and Sex. 1991 Census of Canada*. Catalogue 94-327. Ottawa: Industry Science and Technology Canada.
- 1983 *Statistics Canada Daily*. February 1.
- 1974 *Perspective Canada: A Compendium of Social Statistics*. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry, Trade and Commerce.
- Canadian Corrections Association
- 1967 *Indians and the Law*. Ottawa: Canada Welfare Council.
- Cardinal, H.
- 1977 *The Rebirth of Canada's Indians*. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers.
- 1969 *The Unjust Society: The Tragedy of Canada's Indians*. Edmonton: M.G. Hurtig Ltd.
- Clifford, J.
- 1987 Of Other Peoples: Beyond the Salvage Paradigm, pp. 121-130 in H. Foster (Editor): *Discussions in Contemporary Cultures*. Seattle: Bay Press/Dia Art Foundation.
- Cresswell, T.
- 1996 *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Currie, W.
- 1969 *Urbanization and Indians*. Address to the Mid-Canada Development Corridor Conference, Lakehead University, available at the Department of Indian Affairs Library, Ottawa.
- Davis, A.K.
- 1965 *Edging Into Mainstream: Urban Indians in Saskatchewan*. Bellingham: Western Washington State College.
- Dosman, E.
- 1972 *Indians: The Urban Dilemma*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Dumalie, S.
- 1974 *Indian Urban Migration: An Abstract*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Research Division, Policy.

Dyck, N.

- 1991 *What is the Indian 'Problem': Tutelage and Resistance in Canadian Indian Administration*. St. John's, Newfoundland: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Elias, P.D.

- 1975 *Metropolis and Hinterland in Northern Manitoba*. Winnipeg: Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature.

Ellis, L, E. Pinacie, V. Turner and H. Swiftwolfe

- 1978 *Survey of Band Members Living Off Reserves*. Regina: Federation of Saskatchewan Indians.

Fabian, J.

- 1983 *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fairclough, Hon. E.L.

- 1961 *Indian Affairs in 1960: A Progress Report on the Government's Placement Program and Other Assistance*. *Monetary Times Annual*.

Gerber, L.

- 1977 *Trends in Out-Migration from Indian Communities Across Canada*. Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State.

Guillemin, J.

- 1978 *Urban Renegades: The Cultural Strategy of American Indians*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Harding, J.

- 1978 *Canada's Indians: A Powerless Minority*, pp. 239-252 in J. Harp and J. Hofley (Editors): *Poverty in Canada*. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall.

Hawthorn H.B.

- 1966- *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: A Report of*
1967 *Economic, Political and Educational Needs and Policies*.
Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- 1958 *Indians of British Columbia: A Study of Contemporary Social Adjustment*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hirabayashi, G.K., A.J. Cormier and V.S. Billow

- 1962 *The Challenge of Assisting the Canadian Aboriginal People to Adjust to Urban Environments*. Edmonton: Report of the First Western Canada Indian-Métis Seminar.

Honigmann, J.J.

- 1963 Social Disintegration in Five Northern Communities. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 2:199-214.

Hourie, A.B., L. Spence, L. Chippeway, B. Davis, M. Richard, Y. Monkman, and D. Tomasson

- 1983 History of the I.M.F.C. *History of the Winnipeg Indian & Metis Friendship Centre, 1958-1983, Indian Metis Friendship Centre*. Winnipeg: Indian Metis Friendship Centre.

Indian Affairs Branch

- 1957 *The Indian News* 2.

Indian-Eskimo Association Ontario Division

- 1967 *Indians and the City: An Action Research Project in Metropolitan Toronto*. Toronto: Indian-Eskimo Association.

- 1966a *National Conference on "Indians and the City"*. Ottawa: Indian-Eskimo Association.

- 1966b *Indians and the City. Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada Bulletin* 7,4.

Johnson, S.

- 1976 *Migrating Native Peoples Program Evaluation Summary*. Ottawa: National Association of Friendship Centres.

Jorgensen, J.

- 1971 *Indians and the Metropolis*, pp. 67-113 in O. Waddell and M. Watson (Editors): *The American Indian in Urban Society*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 67-113.

Kerri, J.N.

- 1978 *Unwilling Urbanites: The Life Experiences of Canadian Indians in a Prairie City*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Kicksee, R.G.

- 1995 "Scaled Down to Size": Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of "Indian Participation" in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo '67, 1963-1967. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Kingston: Department of History, Queen's University.

Klein, S. and W. Wright

- 1985 *The Development of Customized Status Indian Variables using 1981 Census Data*. Ottawa: Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Krotz, L.

- 1980 *Urban Indians: The Strangers in Canada's Cities*. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers Ltd.

Lagassé, J.H.

- 1962 *Culture Implications in Leaving the Reserve. The Challenge of Assisting the Canadian Aboriginal People to Adjust to Urban Environments.* Edmonton: Report of the First Western Canada Indian-Metis Seminar.
- 1958 *People of Indian Ancestry: A Social and Economic Study.* Manitoba: Department of Agriculture and Immigration.

Latham, C.R.

- 1958 Indian Placement Programme Administered by the Indian Affairs Branch of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. Unpublished M.A. report for the School of Social Work, University of Toronto.

Leslie, J.F.

- 1993 *A Historical Survey of Indian-Government Relations, 1940-1970.* Ottawa: Claims and Historical Research Centre, Department of Indian Affairs.

Lithman, Y.G.

- 1984 *The Community Apart: A Case Study of a Canadian Indian Reserve Community.* Winnipeg, Manitoba: University of Manitoba Press.

Manuel, G. and M. Posluns

- 1974 *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality.* Don Mills, Ontario: Collier-Macmillan.

McClintock, A.

- 1995 *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest.* New York: Routledge.

McFarlane, P.

- 1993 *Brotherhood to Nationhood: George Manuel and the Making of the Modern Indian Movement.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Melling, J.

- 1967 *Right to a Future: the Native Peoples of Canada.* Toronto: T.H. Best Printing Co. Ltd.

Monture Okanee, P.

- 1992 The Roles and Responsibilities of Aboriginal Women: Reclaiming Justice. *Saskatchewan Law Review* 56(2):237-266.

Morse, B.

- 1989 Government Obligations, Aboriginal Peoples and Section 91 (24), in D. Hawkes (Editor): *Aboriginal Peoples and Government Responsibility: Exploring Federal and Provincial Roles.* Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Nagler, M.

- 1970 *Indians in the City*. Ottawa: Canadian Research Centre for Anthropology, St. Paul University.

National Commission on the Indian Canadian

- 1957 *The Indian in the Community*. Calgary: Report of a Conference.

Neils, E.

- 1971 *Reservation to City: Indian Migration and Federal Relocation*. Geography Research Paper 131. Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Geography.

Nicholson, J.R.

- 1965 Address to the Indian Friendship Centre, Vancouver 5-6. Available at the Department of Indian Affairs Library, Ottawa.

Norris, M.J., D. Ker and F. Nault

- 1996 *Projections of the Population with Aboriginal Identity, Canada, 1991-2016*. Ottawa: Population Projections Section, Demography Division, Statistics Canada.

Ostry, B.

- 1978 *The Cultural Connection: An Essay on Culture and Government Policy in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Pal, L.A.

- 1993 *Interests of State: the Politics of Language, Multiculturalism, and Feminism in Canada*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Peters, E.J.

- 1998 Subversive Spaces: First Nations Women and the City. *Society and Space* 16:665-685.

Ponting, J.R. and R. Gibbins

- 1980 *Out of Irrelevance*. Toronto: Butterworths.

Price, J.

- 1979 *Indians of Canada: Cultural Dynamics*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada.

Reeves, W. and J. Frideres

- 1981 Government Policy and Indian Urbanization: The Alberta Case. *Canadian Public Policy* 7(4):584-595.

Renaud, A.

- 1957 The Indian in the Community in *National Commission on the Indian Canadian*. Toronto: National Commission on the Indian Canadian.

Ryan, J.

- 1978 *Wall of Words: The Betrayal of the Urban Indian*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Limited.

Schwartz, B.

- 1986 *First Principles, Second Thoughts: Aboriginal Peoples, Constitutional Reform and Canadian Statecraft*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

Shackleton, C.

- 1969 The Indian as Newcomer. *Canadian Welfare* 45:7-10.

Sim, R.A.

- 1962 Perspectives, pp. 22-29 in G.K. Hirabayashi, A.J. Cormier and V.S. Billow (Editors): *The Challenge of Assisting the Canadian Aboriginal People to Adjust to Urban Environments*. Edmonton: Report of the First Western Canada Indian-Métis Seminar.

Smallface Marule, M.

- 1978 The Canadian Government's Termination Policy: From 1969 to the Present Day, pp. 103-116 in I.A. Getty and D.B. Smith (Editors): *One Century Later: Western Canadian Indian Reserves Since Treaty 7*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Stymeist, D.

- 1975 *Ethnics and Indians*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates.

Surtees, R.L.

- 1988 Canadian Indian Policies, pp. 81-210 in W.E. Washburn (Editor): *History of Indian-White Relations: Handbook of the North American Indians*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

Tobias, J.L.

- 1983 Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History of Canada's Indian Policy, pp. 39-55 in I.A.L. Getty and A.S. Lussier (Editors): *As Long As the Sun Shines and Water Flows*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Trudeau, J.

- 1969 The Indian in the City. *Kerygma* 3:118-123.

Vincent, D.B.

- 1971 *The Indian-Metis Urban Probe*. Winnipeg: Indian-Métis Friendship Centre and Institute of Urban Studies, University of Winnipeg.

Wall, V.H.

- 1965 *A Report on the Canadian Indian Project Conducted by Central Neighbourhood House*. Toronto: Central Neighbourhood House.

Weaver, S.

- 1993 The Hawthorn Report: Its Use in the Making of Canadian Indian Policy, in N. Dyck and J.B. Waldram (Editors): *Anthropology, Public Policy and Native Peoples in Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- 1981 *Making Canadian Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda 1968-1970*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Wetherell, M. and J. Potter

- 1992 *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation*. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Zeitoun, L.

- 1969 Canadian Indians at the Crossroads: Some Aspects of Relocation and Urbanization in Canada. Unpublished report for the Manpower Utilization Branch. Ottawa: Department of Manpower and Immigration.

Zentner, H.

- 1973 *The Indian Identity Crisis*. Calgary: Strayer Publications Limited.
- 1972 Reservation Social Structure and Anomie: A Case Study in M. Nagler (Editor): *Perspectives on the North American Indians*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd.