

CREATING A SEAT AT THE TABLE: A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY OF ABORIGINAL PROGRAMMING AT CANADIAN HERITAGE¹

Yale D. Belanger
University of Lethbridge
4401 University Drive
Lethbridge, Alberta
Canada, T1K 3M4

Kevin Fitzmaurice
University of Sudbury
935 Ramsey Lake Road
Sudbury, Ontario
Canada, P3E 2C6

David R. Newhouse
Trent University
First People's House of Learning
Enweying Building
Peter Gzowski College
1600 West Bank Drive
Peterborough, Ontario
Canada, K9J 7B8

Abstract / Résumé

Using person-centred interviews and employing thematic analysis, this paper evaluates Canadian Heritage's role in improving Aboriginal political participation in federal politics and overall political operations at the community level since the inception of its Aboriginal programming initiative in 1971. Specifically, did these programs achieve their goal of promoting Aboriginal participation in Canada society? And, if so, how will this fluid and competitive political environment influence Aboriginal-state relations, especially for those First Nations seeking to re-establish a nation-to-nation relationship with the federal Crown?

À l'aide d'entrevues centrées sur la personne et d'une analyse thématique, l'article évalue le rôle de Patrimoine canadien dans l'amélioration de la participation des Autochtones à la politique fédérale et aux activités politiques générales au niveau communautaire depuis le lancement de son initiative de programmation pour les Autochtones en 1971. En particulier, on pose les questions suivantes : Est-ce que les programmes ont atteint leur objectif de promotion de la participation des Autochtones à la vie de la société canadienne? Si oui, comment les circonstances politiques fluides et concurrentielles influent-elles sur les relations entre le gouvernement et les Autochtones, en particulier pour les Premières nations qui cherchent à rétablir des relations de nation à nation avec la Couronne fédérale?

Introduction

The visible engagement of Aboriginal peoples in the public policy process is an important legacy of Canadian Heritage's Aboriginal programming, a process not conceived of in this fashion prior to the Liberal government tabling its now infamous Statement on Indian Policy (the White Paper) in 1969. Nearly four decades later an infrastructure of engagement has clearly emerged in Canada that fosters and cultivates political and social change for Aboriginal peoples. Canadian Heritage's Aboriginal Affairs Branch (AAB) supports a wide-range of Aboriginal-specific programs and initiatives serving Inuit, Métis, non-status Indian and First Nations peoples living primarily off-reserve. The goal: to assist these populations in addressing the social, cultural and economic issues affecting their lives in Canadian society. These programs have two broad objectives: (1) strengthening Aboriginal cultural identity and languages; and (2) facilitating the inclusion of Aboriginal people into Canadian society in a manner that recognizes and respects their cultures and furthers their contribution to Canada. These programs and initiatives are intended also to provide a representative voice, connect communities, and support community services in urban and rural communities in improving Aboriginal peoples' quality of life. Therefore, understanding the last four decades' programming narrative is vital to better understanding the AAB's programmatic responses to Aboriginal issues and why it adopted specific strategic directions. With these ideas in mind, the purpose of this paper is to provide a retrospective overview of the cluster of programs within the Aboriginal Affairs Branch at Canadian Heritage asking the question, are these programs achieving their goal of promoting Aboriginal participation in Canada society? And, if so, what are the consequences for Aboriginal-state relations, especially for those First Nations seeking to re-establish a nation-to-nation relationship with the federal Crown?

Methodology

A distinctive feature of this paper is that it is based primarily upon the views and experiences of Aboriginal people and/or people who have worked as Aboriginal program administrators, either within the AAB or in Aboriginal organizations affected by its policies and programs. The paper presents the voices of those administrators engaged in the public policy process and is an example of the change that has occurred over the last three decades, according to a study submitted to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP), which concluded:

... the principal change in the nature of public policy dis-

course in Aboriginal affairs has been from a situation where Aboriginal people were treated as the object of public policy discourse (so that policy makers were engaged in what was in effect a soliloquy or monologue) to one where Aboriginal peoples' representatives have engaged the 'others' in a dialogue; from the point of view of the policy centre, they have become subjects in the discussion, with their own voices, agendas and legitimacy. (Abele, Dittburner & Graham, 1996)

The research process for this project consisted of two inter-related activities: document reviews of pertinent Canadian Heritage files and academic literature; and interviews with key informants. Data collection proceeded in two stages. First, secondary source material was used to identify investigative areas. Based upon these investigations, an interview booklet was developed to guide the interviews. On the advice of Aboriginal Affairs Branch (AAB) officials interviews were conducted with 20 individuals chosen from a list of 40 people involved with developing Canadian Heritage's Aboriginal programming during the last four decades or who have been directly affected by the programming itself. This included current and former federal public servants responsible for Aboriginal programming, Friendship Centre directors, Aboriginal political leaders, and a handful of academics.

The research team utilized the person-centred interview, an exploratory, discussion-based research method structured to "clarify the relations of individuality, both as output and input, to its sociocultural context" while eliciting behaviors and attitudes that suggest "hidden or latent dimensions of the organization of persons and of the sociocultural matrix and their interactions" (Levy & Hollan 1998, 334). In this instance, the participants' stories act as a source of understanding (Cortazzi 2001) that provide insight into personal and bureaucratic decision-making processes. Ferrier has argued that "knowledge is constructed by people and groups of people; reality is multiperspectival; truth is grounded in everyday life and social relations; life is a text but thinking in an interpretative act; facts and values are inseparable; and science and all other human activities are value laden" (quoted in Mitchell & Egudo 2003). The person-centred interview enabled the researchers to become further grounded in the context of social interface that led to specific meanings developing about AAB programming (Mitchell & Egudo 2003). For the final phase of the research a thematic analysis was conducted to draw themes central to the question probing the efficacy of AAB programming (Daly, Kellehear & Gliksman, 1997) through "careful reading and re-reading of the data" (Rice & Ezzy 1999, 258). The coding process involved identifying an important comment or interview moment prior to

proceeding with the data interpretation process (Boyatzis 1998). Encoding enabled the organization and categorization of data from which central themes were identified and developed (see Fereday & Muir-Cochrane 2006, 3). Data collection and analysis proceeded simultaneously, and transcripts were re-read to ensure accuracy and thematic applicability to the original data.

Historical Overview

Three decades (1970-2000) of Aboriginal programming at Canadian Heritage (formerly located within the Department of the Secretary of State) was examined within the larger context of Canadian nation building. It is within this climate of amplified cultural diversity and Aboriginal political assertiveness that the initial recommendations aimed at providing core funding to First Nations associations emerged. Two key events led to the creation of Aboriginal programming. The first was Canada's attempt to accommodate Quebec's demands for greater autonomy and the increasing levels of cultural diversity of the 1960s. Second was First Nations resistance to the Liberal government's White Paper proposal in 1969, a policy aimed at dismantling the unique legal relationship between 'Indians' and the federal government.² Upset that their belief in First Nations nationhood within Canada was being ignored First Nations were further incensed with the newly articulated federal view promoting them as one of several multi-cultural ethnicities requiring federal assistance to ensure their political participation in Canadian Confederation. Generally speaking, post-war Canada experienced a prolonged period of steady economic growth and prosperity. In an effort to bolster its pool of skilled laborers, federal officials increasingly turned to immigrants. To maintain its Euro-Canadian national character, early selection criteria hinged upon the 'absorptive capacity' of particular nations and races of people resulting in the preferential acceptance of northern European immigrants who were not expected to significantly challenge the established cultural and political order (Mackey 2002, 50). By the late 1960s, however, to meet the continued need for immigration in the face of a dwindling European labor pool Canada slowly abandoned its discriminatory immigration practices by adopting a de-racialized system of merit that opened the doors to Asian and other Third World skilled immigrants.

Canada at the same time sought to create a bilingual partnership between French and English Canadians within a multi-cultural mosaic structured to accommodate increasing levels of cultural diversity in addition to Quebec's demands for greater autonomy. Adopted as an official policy in 1971, multiculturalism sought to foster a national identity in two ways. First, it was a manner of distinguishing Canada as an inde-

pendent nation separate from the cultural melting pot of the U.S. Second, it sought to cultivate a Canadian cultural plurality by assisting ethnic groups to participate within Canadian society. Its four fundamental objectives were that:

- (1) resources permitting, the government will seek to assist all Canadian cultural groups that have demonstrated a desire and effort to continue to develop a capacity to grow and contribute to Canada;
- (2) the government will assist all members of cultural groups to overcome cultural barriers to full participation in Canadian society;
- (3) the government will promote creative encounters and interchange among all Canadian cultural groups in the interests of the national unity; and
- (4) the government will assist immigrants to acquire at least one of Canada's official languages in order to become full participants in Canadian society.

It is important to note that notwithstanding state aspirations for plurality, within one unified Canada existed the problematic notion of a diversity of cultures and their contributions to one nation. In other words, implicit within the goals of multiculturalism was the creation of ethnicities whose contributions to the dominant, non-ethnic Euro-Canadian order were considered bureaucratically manageable (e.g. Kymlicka 2003, 2000, 1995, Macklem 2001, Taylor 1994, 1993). Multiculturalism then, despite assisting ethnic groups to participate more fully within Canadian society functioned to transform these groups into political clientele so that their cultural expressions could be managed without the need to change the dominant federal system in any significant way.

It was from within this larger multi-cultural policy framework of supporting cultural diversity within a strong Canadian nation that core funding for Aboriginal organizations was first developed by the Department of the Secretary of State (DSOS). The rationale was articulated in a report of the Sub-committee of the Interdepartmental Committee on Indian and Eskimo Policy (1971).³

It was acknowledged that viable, adequately funded associations have the capacity to develop program and project proposals according to the agenda and the degree of interest of the Native people themselves. Thus, the program of sustaining support to these associations is directly related to these new citizenship objectives...to enable the Native citizens of Canada to organize their own opinion and to develop program proposals of imminent concern to them. It is felt that programs developed in this manner have a higher

potential for successful implementation than programs developed by non-Native agencies imposed upon the Native people.

This expressed desire for increased levels of Aboriginal participation in Canadian society can be further understood as a reaction to concerted First Nations resistance to the 1969 White Paper proposal which sought to rescind the unique legal Indian-Crown relationship. In resisting, Aboriginal people were reiterating their longstanding treaty message of equal co-existence with the Crown. This message unfortunately contrasted sharply with the federal view of Aboriginal people as one multi-cultural ethnicity among many requiring federal assistance to better contribute to the Canadian nation. The official Canadian view had Aboriginal people differing insubstantially from other minorities albeit uniquely impoverished and disorganized. Aboriginal people however claimed that they had what the Supreme Court of Canada later characterized as a *sui generis* relationship with the Crown—a unique bond simultaneously symbolized and codified by treaty and centuries of socio-political interface (R v. Sparrow 1990). Canada never accepted Aboriginal nationhood claims; rather, it acknowledged that First Nations were an ethnic group that had not reached a level of political organization characterized by their utilizing complex European models that would facilitate Canadian officials dealing with these communities as nations (see Flanagan 2000). This foundational political tension concerning the nature of Aboriginal difference informed the early organizational funding development at the DSOS.

Established in 1971, the Aboriginal Representative Organizational Program (AROP) was Canada's initial attempt to provide core funding to assist with Aboriginal political organizations' operations that simultaneously promoted the 'development of stable and effective organizational structures capable of interacting with all levels of government and society, and to participate in and effect positive changes to their political, social, cultural, educational and economic lives.' This central mandate informed programming for Aboriginal women, friendship centres, communications, and social and cultural development that later extended into constitutional reform and northern broadcasting. In the late 1990s, youth and language programming was added under *Gathering Strength* (1997), Canada's official response to the RCAP's final report tabled in 1996. This financial support promoted increased Aboriginal political representation *vis-à-vis* the emergent (albeit limited) political infrastructure that materialized in the form of Aboriginal organizations and a handful of grassroots groups. It also led to expectations that this would improve Aboriginal participation in the creation and implementation of Aborigi-

nal-specific programs. To capitalize on this increased political activism and the expressed desire to take control of their destiny would further result in augmented Aboriginal influence in the Canadian parliamentary and bureaucratic processes. Such innovative programming, it was surmised, would assist in the evolution of greater Aboriginal self-sufficiency and amelioration of existing socio-economic hardships through relationship building.

Representation and Community Development, 1970-1980

The three decades 1970 to 2000 represent a complex period in the history of Aboriginal programming in Canada (APPENDIX A). The key informants separated the last four decades into two key phases: (1) Canadian Heritage programming prior to the late 1980s; and, (2) post-1989 programming. Informants describe the first phase in glowing terms with each one acknowledging Canadian Heritage's goals and recognizing the work accomplished in creating a forum for Aboriginal voices to be heard. The second phase is characterized by cutbacks to Aboriginal programming and a rise in tensions between government and Aboriginal organizations.

Consistent with its roots in the idea of a just society, the Canadian Heritage programs have developed a substantial capacity for Aboriginal engagement in the public policy process. The Aboriginal Policy Research Conference held in Ottawa in 2002, for example, attracted more than 700 policy-makers, researchers, scientists, academics, and Aboriginal community and political leaders. More than half of the policy makers on hand represented Aboriginal organizations traceable to the support received from Canadian Heritage Aboriginal programming. For many First Nations these programs could be described as an essential service in light of claims that "in any given year, the Aboriginal policy agenda accounts for anywhere from 10 to 30 percent of Parliament's time" (White, Maxim & Beavon 2004, 2). However, in the late 1960s Aboriginal peoples and their political concerns hardly made a dent in the parliamentary agenda. Even following a protracted two-year period of intense activism after the tabling of the White Paper, the First Nations voice was literally negligible in Canadian politics. Recognizing that these mobilized voices could not be ignored, the DSOS began to facilitate First Nation leaders' inclusion within the federal political process. Former Brandon Mayor and program director of Native citizens that handled DSOS Aboriginal programming, Bill Shead (2004) effectively summed up this initial period of program development:

The Heritage programming was established at a time when no Indian programming existed. The goal was to address a

void in modern Indian leadership by developing programs to help strengthen those leaders while also educating the non-Aboriginal public and helping them to better understand the issues. This has been fostered over time to the point that there is in place solid leadership and the public has an improved grasp of Aboriginal issues in Canada.

A peripheral benefit of this augmented political control was the creation and continued development of a communications infrastructure that Shead anticipates will permit the Aboriginal leadership to continue to flourish. First Nations University of Canada Professor Del Anaquod (2004) claimed that without Canadian Heritage's support, "which got the whole political organization process going I don't think that we would have made the advances we have."

The creation of AROP in 1971 was timely for by 1973 Aboriginal issues had become a national issue following the Supreme Court of Canada's *Calder* decision recognizing the existence of Aboriginal rights. This decision and the continued political mobilization led most observers to conclude that Aboriginal concerns would need to be dealt with; something the creation of AROP appears to have anticipated. The creation of the Indian Claims Commission followed in 1974, as did the first modern day treaty signed between Canada, Quebec, and the James Bay Crees in 1975. The federal government during this period also began the devolution of social control to Aboriginal peoples by initiating the transfer of responsibility for programs to various Aboriginal organizations and communities (Pompana 1997). Somewhat serendipitously the DSOS through its programs was promoting increased Aboriginal political participation during the pinnacle of this activity. Federal officials also promoted the utility of these programs to national First Nation leaders, who soon became aware that the proposed programming was also aimed at promoting cultural revival, increasing Aboriginal political involvement and Parliamentary representation, creating the program delivery institutions, supporting communications across northern communities, and enhancing education and labor force participation. Aboriginal health, economic involvement and housing were further prioritized as was improving public awareness about Aboriginal issues, including land claims and constitutional reform (Lanigan 2004). Suddenly, after years of being ignored by Canadian officials, Aboriginal issues were a serious bureaucratic and parliamentary matter.

This period of enhanced interactivity led to programs beyond AROP such as the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program, the Aboriginal Women's Program, the Native Social and Cultural Development Program, and the Native Communications programs, each of which contributed

significantly to an enhanced Aboriginal political and program delivery capacity. According to Roy Jacobs (2004), the former director of the Native Citizens Directorate, the original funding schedules were quite comprehensive, offering existing and newer organizations the capacity to offer programming while at the same time becoming politically established. These programs also helped to expand and streamline existing infrastructure, the latter of which consisted of a handful of Aboriginal political and grassroots organizations. With federal support and a proactive Aboriginal leadership working in concert, by the late 1970s an infrastructure of Aboriginal organizations was firmly in place that continued its expansion during the next two decades. Significantly, the programs' content and scope were broad and comprehensive. The Friendship Centre programming, for instance, was structured to ease the transition of Aboriginal individuals leaving the rural and/or reserve environment for the city. The Aboriginal Women's Program was geared toward assisting Aboriginal women as they became participants in public policy development and decision-making processes. And the Northern Native Broadcasting program enabled "Native people to develop and control modern communications networks," building on the popularity of Aboriginal newspapers and magazines that emerged in the early 1970s (Lougheed and Associates 1986, 1-3). Once again, the goal was to improve socio-economic and socio-political conditions being experienced by Aboriginal people by providing them with a representative voice. This necessitated promoting culture and connecting communities while also creating and supporting existing community services in urban and rural communities.

AROP programming had by the end of the 1970s become well established and provided a foundational Aboriginal representational infrastructure that advocated limited self-sustainability. With social issues such as training, unemployment, housing, and community services somewhat under control, federal and Aboriginal focus shifted to the greater challenges of Aboriginal rights and governance. These efforts also helped in part to establish the core Aboriginal programming that, close to 40 years following the White Paper's proposed policy of legislative termination of Aboriginal status has resulted in an organizational infrastructure of approximately 4,000 Aboriginal organizations the core of which is represented by Aboriginal Women's organizations, Aboriginal political organizations, and Friendship Centres.⁴ Most interview participants commented that these core organizations, which also served to become significant sources of Aboriginal labor for governments, were much needed advocates both pursuing and promoting Aboriginal public policy research, something sorely lacking prior to the 1970s.

Recognition of Rights-Driven Governance, 1980-1989

The DSOS's establishing Aboriginal programming was followed by Aboriginal people initiating what Jim Lanigan (2004) of Heritage Canada's Citizen's Participation Directorate described as a transition from "wards of the state" reliant upon federal handouts to political players focussed on educating the Canadian public, generally, and federal politicians, specifically, about Canada's treaty obligations. Very quickly these programs strengthened existing Aboriginal organizations by providing consistent and stable financial support, increased support for Friendship Centres, and enhanced communications *vis-à-vis* funding for Aboriginal newspapers and radio, for example. The result was two-fold. First, Aboriginal concerns were becoming dominant political issues attracting Parliamentary attention through Aboriginal lobbying efforts. With Canadian Heritage's support, Anaquod (2004) claims that in addition to changing the attitude structure about government programs concerning Aboriginal people the aforementioned much needed infrastructure was slowly evolving in support of greater Aboriginal independence. Participation by Canadian Heritage was by all appearances essential to promote a new Canada-Aboriginal relationship predicated on discussion and interaction rather than activism and distrust (Appendix B).

This led gradually to what Lanigan (2004) described as the alteration in the Canada-Aboriginal relationship to one of mutual responsibility embracing a need to both acknowledge past wrongs and the centrality of land and culture. Teresa Dore (2004), Director of the Aboriginal Programs Department at Canadian Heritage, adds that the programs were also aimed at reducing state paternalism. This is evident in Aboriginal participation in the constitutional discussions of the late 1970s that eventually led to the entrenchment of existing Aboriginal and treaty rights in Sec. 35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*. Supported by the DSOS, Aboriginal activists had become increasingly politically conscious and effective if not gradually co-opted into the federal policy process. The resulting political influence led federal officials in 1978 to invite the National Indian Brotherhood, the Native Council of Canada, and the Inuit Committee on National Issues to participate in the constitutional discussions. However, not satisfied to watch from the periphery, eleven additional Aboriginal organizations initiated an influential lobby effort (Sanders 1983). It is important to note that on the eve of the constitutional conferences Canadian Aboriginal policy had shifted dramatically from a policy of legislative termination embodied by the White Paper of 1969 to constitutional recognition of Aboriginal peoples as important political players with rights independent of mainstream Canadians (e.g. Belanger & Newhouse 2008). This change in federal attitudes was due in large part

to both Canadian Heritage programming and the effective Aboriginal leadership of these programs thereby enhancing Aboriginal political influence.

Many significant changes occurred during the 1980s, arguably the most noteworthy period for Aboriginal peoples since Canadian Confederation (1867). Aboriginal lobbying efforts resulted in the federal government initiating the Parliamentary Task Force on Indian Self-Government in 1982 (the Penner Report), which eventually acknowledged Aboriginal self-government; the inclusion of section 37 in the *Constitution Act* mandating the First Ministers Conferences between 1983-87 to better define Aboriginal self-government; the Ministerial Task Force on Program Review (Nielsen Report) in 1986; and the Indian Self-Government Community Negotiations policy statement in 1986 (Boldt 1993). These developments were viewed as a way to “partially reverse hundreds of years of oppressive government policies and neglect, and to improve their intolerable socio-economic condition” (Hawkes 1987, 1). A by-product of this political activity: by the early 1980s Aboriginal issues were more widely understood by politicians and citizens alike, resulting in an increasingly rights conscious Canada (Saunders 2004; also Ignatieff 2000). The influence of DSOS programming, for example, could be seen during the public deliberations that took place during the research phase of the Penner Report. In all, representatives of 42 Aboriginal organizations testified before the Penner committee during its cross-country travels aimed at eliciting informed opinion regarding the meaning of Aboriginal self-government (Penner 1983). This could be seen as a microcosm of what was occurring at various political levels across Canada throughout the 1980s, where Aboriginal political organizations became everyday political players.

The Impact of Fiscal Prudence: Program Reviews, 1989-1996

The majority of the key informants identified the early 1990s as the start of a phase of Aboriginal-Canadian Heritage tensions. It happens also to correspond with a period of debilitating federal cutbacks to Canadian Heritage programs enacted in the late 1980s/early 1990s by the Brian Mulroney-led Progressive Conservative Party. In particular, these cutbacks effectively gutted, among others, the Native Communications program. During this period, however, Aboriginal leaders nationally were not willing to wait for federal officials to respond to their concerns. In many ways, even in the face of dramatic cutbacks and perceived delays on the part of the Indian Affairs bureaucracy, Aboriginal leaders took the initiative to maintain programs that they had increasingly come to re-

gard as their own.

This five-year period (1986-1990) marks a significant shift instigated by government's insistent desire to put its fiscal house in order. Restraint measures such as the Neilson Task Force and various program reviews all combined with the sting of the Charlottetown Accord's failure leaving little hope among politicians and Aboriginal leaders alike that diplomacy could halt the downward spiral of federal funding cut-backs and government indifference to what were previously considered valuable Aboriginal programs. Aboriginal Multi-Media Society of Alberta (AMMSA) publisher Bert Crowfoot (2004), for example, was forced to fund-raise to maintain his newspaper publications following the exclusion of the Native Communications Program funding for Aboriginal newspapers. Crowfoot responded by increasing advertising revenues that ultimately saved the publications. Originally the AMMSA became eligible in 1984 for funding under the Northern Native Broadcast Access Program to produce and broadcast radio programming, which it now does twenty-four hours-a-day, seven days-a-week. Today, AMMSA funding is supplemented by radio advertising and radio bingo revenues. Not all broadcast societies were as fortunate, however. Program officer for the Aboriginal People's Program, Art King, claims that despite success stories like Crowfoot's many broadcasters continue to operate with limited budgets and fixed revenues. As well, the broadcasting systems installed more than two decades ago are in need of upgrades if not outright replacement, and it is estimated that an infusion of \$10 million is required to meet current industry standards (King 2004).

Study respondents King, Crowfoot, First Nations University of Canada professor Shannon Avison, University of Lethbridge professor emeritus Leroy Little Bear, Métis National Council member and past president of the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, Jim Sinclair, and Del Anaquod implored federal officials to consider long-term funding arrangements as a way to alleviate financial difficulties. Not only would it assist program administrators in establishing long-range economic plans, it would help administrators to break away from the funding cycle consuming much of their energies. This would allow organizations and programs the ability to build momentum and become better known and therefore more likely to be accepted within both urban and rural communities. Sinclair (2004) in particular expressed his concern with the time it takes between preparing a funding proposal and eventual funding allocation. Amplified political influence and greater public acceptance of Aboriginal concerns did not stop the Mulroney government from ignoring Aboriginal leaders during the Meech Lake constitutional discussions in 1989, however. Following Meech Lake's ruin, Mulroney initiated the Charlottetown Ac-

cord in an attempt to renew Canadian federalism in August 1992. It called for guaranteed Aboriginal senatorial representation while likewise promoting discussion concerning Aboriginal participation in the House of Commons. This time representatives from the Assembly of First Nations, the Native Council of Canada, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, and the Métis National Council were invited to participate in the development stage of a Constitutional package intended to “bring Aboriginal people into existing institutions” (Smith 1999, 117).

It is difficult to fully elaborate upon Canadian Heritage’s influence in assisting Aboriginal people nationally to develop into influential political players. In addition to the level of participation in constitutional talks, Canadian Heritage programming also played an important role in helping to stimulate and revitalize on-reserve socio-economic development. This greater stability was required if constitutional challenges and increased political influence were to be effective. The programming was developed to alleviate the economic, political and economic difficulties being experienced (APPENDIX C). With this in mind, one informant described AROP as the glue that holds Aboriginal communities together (Dore 2004). And, as of the 1980s, most programs were deemed successful due in part to improving socio-economic indicators (Saunders 2004). This nevertheless did not keep federal officials from slashing funds to these organizations during tough economic times, something program administrators refuse to forget when engaging in long-term planning.

New Tensions: Reconciliation and Rebuilding the Relationship, 1996-2005

Of all the major political developments to occur in Canada during the last three decades, the emergence of Aboriginal self-government has to rank high on the list. The movement towards self-government is usually conceived of only in terms of the development of Aboriginal governance and its associated public administrations. Over the last three decades, however, Canadian Heritage’s Aboriginal programming has provided a foundational capacity for the advancement of Aboriginal self-governance in its broadest sense. Specifically, the evolution of self-government is more than just the development of governing structures and processes in the national government model proposed by the RCAP’s final report. Self-government also involves the development of a societal capacity to advance its own interests and to provide programs and services.

The institutional infrastructure that finds its origins in Canadian Heritage programming represents this capacity for those living both in re-

serve communities and those formulating urban self-governance models. This infrastructure of organizations delivers social, economic, and cultural programming in urban centres, provides support for those who are moving from rural and reserve communities, facilitates and encourages the development of language and cultural expression, and advocates on behalf of local populations, in all seeking to influence policy to create better lives for Aboriginal peoples. The aforementioned infrastructure is diverse and could be more aptly described as a policy community. There are more than 4,000 Aboriginal political organizations as well as an estimated 24,000 Aboriginal-owned businesses. There are 628 First Nation communities with their own band councils and over 1,000 Aboriginal communities, all of which are in some way responsible for localized service delivery. Thirteen broadcast societies currently utilize seventeen Aboriginal languages, English and French while serving nearly 400 communities in the three territories and the northern portion of seven provinces. We are witnessing the existing financial and political infrastructure connected by an extensive communications infrastructure.

In terms of educational advancement whereas less than 300 Aboriginal people annually attended university in the early 1970s recent statistics show greater than 30,000 people of Aboriginal descent attending post-secondary institutions. Contributing to this growth is the emergence of the First Nations University of Canada, nine Native Studies departments across Canada in addition to the proliferation of several more programs and discipline-specific content focusing particularly on Aboriginal issues. This increased education level and plane of political influence have led to the creation of the Institute of Indigenous Governance (IIG) (1997), "Canada's first independent degree-granting First Nations post-secondary institute." Here the course of study is designed to present an Aboriginal perspective on contemporary issues including the history of unresolved land claims, and methods on conducting the necessary research in culturally-appropriate ways (Calliou 1997, 172). Additional issues dealt with include "Aboriginal title and rights, the land, nationhood, sovereignty, jurisdiction, the doctrine of consent, the trust relationship and trust obligations, treaties, treaty-making, oral testimony, speeches, declarations, petitions [and] position papers" (IIG 1997, 29).

This policy community is interactive and increasingly educated, and has engaged the federal government in various fora attributable to work initiated by the DSOS in the early 1970s, the most visible of which has been the Canada's land claims process. Now under the guidance of the Claims and Indian Government Sector, the comprehensive and specific land claims branch has resolved fifteen comprehensive claims since the process was initiated in 1974 and since 1993, six final self-government

agreements have been negotiated. There are currently 72 national self-government negotiating tables in place representing 445 Aboriginal communities (this total includes 427 First Nations, 18 Inuit communities, and some Métis locals) (Morse 2008). Several agreements-in-principle are in process while dozens of land claims requests await negotiations. And during the last 35 years Aboriginal people have gone from targets of assimilation and cultural annihilation to in many cases self-governing political entities. One of the more provocative consequences of this increased political interaction was the creation of the Office of the Treaty Commissioner (OTC) in Saskatchewan in 1990, a tri-partite negotiating body representing the interests of Saskatchewan First Nations, the province of Saskatchewan and Canada. The OTC was created by the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations (FSIN) and the Government of Canada and mandated to review treaty land entitlement (TLE). In May 1990, the OTC presented a report that provided the foundation for negotiations that resulted in the Saskatchewan Treaty Land Entitlement Framework Agreement and TLE agreements for 28 First Nations in Saskatchewan.

The internal workings of the aforementioned infrastructure are complex and not only involve but compel interaction between Aboriginal communities and political organizations as well as organizations and communities interfacing with the federal and increasingly provincial and municipal governments. Canadian Heritage programming has led to improved socio-economic and -political positioning of Aboriginal people and can be cited as a motivating factor leading to the participation in and eventual election of five current Members of Parliament (MP) and five sitting Senators.⁵ As well, in 2002 a Federal Court decision (Misquadis) determined Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (formally HRDC) discriminated against the urban Aboriginal community while highlighting a correlation between Aboriginal reserve and off-reserve residents. In terms of the continued evolution of Aboriginal self-government the courts have now defined off reserve Aboriginal people as comprising a self-organized, self-determining, and distinct community. Although the decision reinforced the separation between on- and off-reserve Aboriginal people, the court also determined that urban Aboriginal organizations can represent urban Aboriginal interests and that HRSDC is responsible to provide funding to aid in establishing the necessary infrastructure to affect service delivery and establish representative governance.

Arguably the combination of Canadian Heritage programming and a motivated Aboriginal leadership have led to Aboriginal people sitting in the House of Commons and the Senate while also occupying high-pro-

file positions in the Canadian bureaucracy. Political organizations including the AFN, the MNC, the ITK, the FSIN, and the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs (UBCIC) have become effective lobbying agents and established at program delivery. The existing Aboriginal communications network of newspapers, radio, and television suggests that the infrastructure exists to enact various Aboriginal self-governance models. Yet despite the far-reaching nature of the aforementioned infrastructure, the move toward increasing powers of self-government that has been aided by Canadian Heritage programming has not resulted in greater public understanding of what Aboriginal self-government is. In 1991, for instance, a study indicated that, despite misunderstanding what self-government was, most Canadians opposed it (Wells & Berry 1992, 76). The reasons here had more to do with study participants' concerns over how the implementation of self-government might affect them. By 1998, however, the majority of Canadians considered self-government a government priority despite a lack of consensus as to how self-government powers were to be formally understood (Martin & Adams 2000, 87). Perhaps most disturbing was the authors' finding that Canadians do not distinguish between self-government and cultural adaptation, leading the authors to conclude that self-government may be publicly viewed as a method of assimilation.

Dissenting Opinions

Clearly Canadian Heritage's Aboriginal programming has been successful from various perspectives. But in any study evaluating government programs, allowances must be made for dissenting opinions concerning program success. Such tensions are natural by-products of what can be politically—and emotionally—charged relationships. In this case, the development of Canadian Heritage's Aboriginal programming during the last three decades brings with it new tensions that require investigation. Some of these are common to all government-funded programs and revolve around issues such as accountability requirements, the level of available funding, and the fit of programs with local objectives and realities. Most important is the continuing debate over the nature of the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and the federal government characterized by the Aboriginal political desire to typify their relationship with Canada as nation to nation. This is opposed to the federal characterization of Aboriginal people as little more than Canadian citizens of 'Indian' ancestry comprising an ethnic group. This divergence leads to requests from Aboriginal leaders for a unique accountability and reporting relationship. Moreover, the capacity that Canadian Heritage has supported is important and is leading to an increasing desire

for engagement and higher resource requirements. It also hampers progress by enabling a multitude of special interest groups to operate in opposition to organizations mandated to renew the nation to nation pact.

This may be the reason for each study participant condemning Canadian Heritage for its failure to listen to Aboriginal concerns. Irrespective of protracted political discussions structured to keep the lines of communication open in an attempt to resolve key socio-economic issues confronting Aboriginal peoples nationally, each respondent claimed that regardless of inter-agency interaction Canadian Heritage regularly chooses not to listen to Aboriginal concerns, especially when it comes time to engage in nation to nation talks. This was most often framed as an inability of Canadian Heritage programming to evolve with Aboriginal needs and political aspirations, as Anaquod (2004) maintains, due to changes in “the political environment...over the last three decades” — those individuals in charge of Aboriginal programming must make the necessary adjustments if they are to remain viable. Compounding what is already a complex relationship is Canadian Heritage’s reliance upon legal/racial categories when it comes time to assign funding, an approach that has the effect of alienating non-status Indians from existing programs. In discussing the Friendship Centres, Social Planning Council of Winnipeg executive director, Wayne Helgason (2004), and Damon Johnson (2004), executive director of the Centre for Aboriginal Human Resources Development, both expressed concern that Canadian Heritage programming is only directed at three groups, those being the constitutionally recognized Indian, Inuit and Métis. Non-status individuals are in turn estranged from Canadian Heritage programs. Canadian Heritage needs to begin adapting to the new political environment it helped to create, added Shead (2004), by modifying its programming to anticipate the needs of future generations rather than simply relying upon a template of existing programs. This would require the Aboriginal community’s direct involvement informing the process rather than relying on the bureaucracy to continue generating mandates and formulating the programs.

Shead (2004) also identified accountability as a major issue, something he concluded Canadian Heritage should be fostering through its programming. He also highlighted the evolution of the democratic process at the community level and that Canadian Heritage should be creating programs to enhance existing electoral systems while emphasizing that the communications infrastructure constructed with Canadian Heritage funding will not only continue to permit but, if properly utilized could potentially allow the existing leadership to flourish by enabling the growing interest in party politics to be promoted through proper

programming. Shead further suggested that perhaps it was time to reform the system by looking at various other departments with Aboriginal programming authority to develop a more strategic and integrated model in lieu of the current single-agency dependency model for funding and program legitimacy. Legal scholar Leroy Little Bear (2004) expressed similar sentiments concerning the need to integrate Canadian Heritage programming into existing programs to make Aboriginal people more a part of what he describes as the 'everyday business' of Canada, thus improving Aboriginal political and social visibility. This would be characterized by increased Aboriginal participation in politics and the expressed desire to adopt governance responsibility on behalf of their constituents. This is a particularly difficult and new tension in the Aboriginal-Crown relationship, which of course raises the question as to whether or not Canadian Heritage, having succeeded in fostering Aboriginal political influence, can give up its programming control to an increasingly demanding Aboriginal 'clientele'. Canadian Heritage has, to date, been able to minimally reconcile this tension through existing devolution efforts evident in the transfer of the Aboriginal Friendship Centres Program (AFCP) to the National Association of Friendship Centres (NAFC) and third party Aboriginal delivery of the Youth and Language programs.

Importantly, the recent policy principles of 'mutual respect, recognition, responsibility, and sharing' as articulated in *Gathering Strength* and reiterated in the Prime Minister's Round Table discussions (April 2004) are helping to create the necessary framework from within which these types of shifts in power relations can occur. Furthermore, new developments in Aboriginal-State/private sector partnerships and Aboriginal institutions are emerging. In recent years we have seen federal initiatives such as the Aboriginal Healing Foundation, the National Aboriginal Achievement Foundation, and the Urban Aboriginal Strategy, all of which are designed to support Aboriginal social and cultural reconciliation.

Final Thoughts

The recognition of Aboriginal issues as important to the future of Canada and the response by the federal government in the early 1970s to create specialized programs to assist in improving Aboriginal living conditions by fostering enhanced Aboriginal political influence is a central legacy of Canadian Heritage Aboriginal programming. However, notwithstanding Canada's leadership role in helping to develop these programs, we must acknowledge that Aboriginal people took a proactive role in making these programs a success. The programs also represented a readily accepted chance to influence national Indian policy. All study

participants indicated that in the beginning Canadian Heritage officials were attuned to what Aboriginal leaders were saying about the various issues and acted accordingly; hence the success of the early programming initiatives. This is not to suggest that Aboriginal people had previously been politically dormant for a number of studies demonstrate that Aboriginal leaders had been speaking consistently to governments since Confederation (1867) with limited results (e.g. Belanger 2006, Leslie 1999, Meijer-Drees 2002, Shewell 2004, Tennant 1990). The RCAP report further revealed that from 1965 to 1992 Aboriginal organizations produced more than 800 reports. Despite a growing political influence, Canadian Heritage funding augmented Aboriginal political influence through funding initiatives that provided stability to early political organizations which in turn led to amplified Aboriginal participation in federal and provincial policy making forums ranging from appearances before House of Commons and Senate committees, federal task forces and advisory committees, federal work groups and commissions, joint Aboriginal-Federal task forces, research teams composed of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal researchers, provincial task forces and committees, local municipal committees, health committees, environmental committees among many others (APPENDIX B).

The Aboriginal contribution to the policy making process is wide ranging, substantial, continuous and long standing resulting in an expectation among contemporary Aboriginal leaders that they will continue to be consulted in the development of policy, plans or programs affecting Aboriginal peoples. This expectation is in part being met as evidenced by the high level of Aboriginal involvement in public policy development at all levels of government. Viewed in another way, it has become accepted policy to seek Aboriginal input into decision making at all levels of government. This involvement represents a real change since the preparation and subsequent tabling of the two-volume Hawthorn-Tremblay Report in 1966-1967. There were no Aboriginal researchers or directors involved in the preparation of this report even if it does represent a watershed in how research concerning Aboriginal people was conducted—by consulting with Indians across Canada and considering seriously their concerns. Contrast this to the work of the RCAP in the early 1990s where the majority of commissioners were Aboriginal as were the majority of the researchers. All the same, the early 1990s is represented in this paper as a cost cutting phase characterized by grassroots administrators quickly adjusting their programs in an effort to keep them operating in the wake of reduced funding opportunities. We also note that Aboriginal people responsible for guiding the programs made the necessary adjustments to ensure their continuation.

Moreover it is apparent that the Aboriginal people running the programs have a clear understanding of what is required to keep them culturally applicable and continually relevant, and have adapted accordingly. Respectively many of the respondents claim that Canadian Heritage has not adapted, which is evidenced by continued budget cuts and the agency's perceived lack of interaction with grassroots program administrators.

Study participants were universal in emphasizing the importance of and the role Canadian Heritage played in growing an organizational infrastructure during the last three decades. In addition to demonstrating Aboriginal politics to be more than an 'Indian industry' keeping the economic, educated and political elites in power, Aboriginal leaders have used it to extend their influence beyond federal politics and into the provincial and municipal governing realms. This extension has in many cases compelled Canadian officials to adapt to meet Aboriginal needs and desires. The emergence of an intelligent and informed Aboriginal leadership traceable to opportunities for development provided by Canadian Heritage programming helps Canada deal with Aboriginal issues in a more holistic and composite way. It further suggests that perhaps the time has come for those who are affected by the programs to have a say in how they are created and financed. This is required for two reasons: (1) Aboriginal peoples in Canada are disproportionately affected by the problems that existing social programs are in place to address; and, (2) the "involvement of Aboriginal people in designing and delivering social programs often goes to the heart of their concept of self-government" (Hylton 1999, 79).

Clearly Canadian Heritage's Aboriginal programming has successfully fostered Aboriginal political integration in Canada, but at what cost? A dearth of related research makes answering this question tricky. Arguably the decentralization of political power inherent with Canadian Heritage's programmatic approach has resulted in a situation whereby many organizations face limited political influence to the detriment of one or several centralized organizations exercising considerable political power. Further, the growing number of Aboriginal political groups makes it difficult for politicians to keep up with demands for change. This highly bureaucratized environment also makes it tough to determine: (1) which groups represent what Aboriginal peoples; (2) the extent of this representation; and, (3) the specific mandates of organizations embracing umbrella causes such as economic development, health or well-being. The decentralization of power arguably has been detrimental to national and provincial organizations such as the AFN and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, for instance, which find it difficult to speak

on behalf of all organizational members thereby compromising their political potency. The same is likely to be said of band and tribal councils, who despite playing important roles in land claims negotiations and the developing self-government dialogue are increasingly shut out of other political arenas due to competition for funding needed to ensure operational stability. Canadian Heritage's current program focus is arguably to the detriment of non-status Indian political organizations, which inevitably will impact these groups ability to secure political voice.

It is also reasonable at this point to suggest that Canadian Heritage funding has effectively dispersed a once focussed First Nations response to White Paper colonialism towards a multiplicity of Aboriginal demands. This has had the inadvertent effect of undermining nation to nation aspirations while simultaneously turning Aboriginal people into one 'type' of ethnic voice located among many in a multicultural Canada all the while protecting the dominant Euro-Canadian order. Overall, the programming and funding efforts of the DSOS/Canadian Heritage have been helpful in creating an institutional infrastructure which Aboriginal peoples can use to advance their own interests within Canada and which provides a political voice that would otherwise not be heard.

Notes

1. We use the term Aboriginal peoples to describe any one of the three legally defined culture groups that form what is known as Aboriginal peoples in Canada (Métis, Inuit, and Indian) and who self-identify as such. The term Indian is used in legislation or policy and hence in discussions concerning such legislation or policy and in its historical context whereby Native and Aboriginal people were described within the popular and academic literature as Indians; and in such cases where it is used in quotations from other sources.
2. Expressed most succinctly in the National Indian Brotherhood's *Red Paper*: "We view this as a policy designed to divest us of our Aboriginal, residual, and statutory rights. If we accept this policy we lose our rights and our lands, we become willing partners in cultural genocide. This we cannot do."
3. Created in 1971 by the Sub-committee of the Interdepartmental Committee on Indian and Eskimo Policy committee which was comprised of representatives from Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Secretary of State, National Health and Welfare, Privy Council, and Treasury Board to Indian Provincial and Territorial Associations, National Indian Brotherhood, Inuit Organizations, Métis and Non-Status

tus Indian Associations, and Native Women and Native Youth Associations.

4. In a 1991 article, Ian Chapman, David Newhouse and Don McCaskill concluded that more than 6,000 Aboriginal organizations existed in Canada, divided equally between the private and public sectors based on data culled from *Arrowfax Directory of Aboriginal Organizations* (1990). This new total is an amended number representing an estimate of existing Aboriginal political organizations that does not account for Aboriginal business or peripheral organizations.
5. At the time of this writing, the Aboriginal MPs were Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Liberal), Bernard Cleary (Bloc Quebecois), Paul Devillers (Liberal), David Smith (Liberal), and Nancy Karetok-Smith (Liberal). Aboriginal Senators are Willie Adams (Liberal), Gill Aurelien (Liberal), Gerry St. Germain (Progressive Conservative), Nick Sibbeston (Liberal), and Charlie Watt (Liberal).

References

Primary Sources (Interviews)

Anaquod, Del, Professor of Indigenous Studies, First Nations University of Canada; Saskatoon, SK., September 2004.

Avison, Shannon, Coordinator, Indian Communication Arts Program Coordinator First Nations University of Canada; Regina, SK., September 2004.

Barnsley, Paul. Editor, *Windspeaker*; Edmonton, AB., August 2004.

Brascoupe, Simon, President, Apikan Indigenous Network; August 2004.

Crowfoot, Bert. Publisher, Aboriginal Multi-Media Society (AMMSA); Edmonton, AB., September 2004.

Dore, Phillip, former Director General, Aboriginal Affaires, Canadian Heritage; July 2004.

Dore, Teresa, Director, Aboriginal Programs Department of Canadian Heritage; July 2004.

Dunn, Martin, Research Officer, Council of Aboriginal People; August 2004.

Greyeyes, Audrey, Policy Analyst, Aboriginal People's Program, Canadian Heritage; August 2004.

Helgason, Wayne, Executive Director, Social Planning Council of Winnipeg; Winnipeg, MB., October 2004.

Jacobs, Roy, Former Director, Native Citizens Directorate; October 2004.

Johnson, Damon, Executive Director, Centre for Aboriginal Human Resources Development; Winnipeg, October 2004.

King, Art, Program Officer, Aboriginal People's Program, Canadian Heritage; August 2004.

Lanigan, Jim, Citizen's Participation Directorate, Canadian Heritage; September 2004.

Little Bear, Leroy, Professor Emeritus, University of Lethbridge; Lethbridge, AB., September 2004.

Maracle, Mark, former Executive Director, Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program; August 2004.

Saunders, Richard, Director, Corporate Aboriginal Policy and Management Branch, ONAS; August 2004.

Shed, Bill, former Program Director of Native Citizens, Department of the Secretary of State Aboriginal programming, October 2004.

Sinclair, Jim, Métis National Council & past president, Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (past president); Regina, SK., September 2004.

Williams, Shirley, Professor Emeritus, Department of Native Studies, Trent University; Peterborough, September 2004.

Primary Sources (Government Documents)

Hawthorn, H.

1966 & 1967 *Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada*, Vol. 1 & 2. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Indian Affairs Branch.

- The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP)
 1996 *For Seven Generations: An Information Legacy of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* (6 Vol.). Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Sub-committee of the Interdepartmental Committee on Indian and Eskimo Policy
 1971

Secondary Sources (Books and Articles)

- Abele, Frances, Carolyn Dittburner & Katherine Graham
 1996 *Soliloquy and Dialogue: The Evolution of Public Policy Discourse on Aboriginal Issues*. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Indian Affairs Branch.
- Arrowfax
 1990 *Directory of Aboriginal Organizations*. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Belanger, Yale D.
 2006 "Seeking a Seat at the Table: A Brief History of Indian Political Organizing in Canada, 1870-1951." Ph.D. diss., Peterborough: Trent University.
- Belanger, Yale D. & David R. Newhouse
 2008 "Reconciling Solitudes: A Critical Analysis of the Self-Government Ideal." In Yale D. Belanger (Ed.), *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues*. 1-19. Saskatoon, SK.: Purich Publishing.
- Boldt, Menno
 1993 *Surviving as Indians: The Challenge of Self-Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Borrows, John
 1994 "Contemporary Traditional Equality: The Effect of the Charter on First Nation Politics." *University of New Brunswick Law Journal*, 43.
- Boyatzis, R.
 1998 *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
- Calliou, B.
 1999 "Sunrise: Activism and Self-determination in First Nations Education (1972-1998)." In J. Hylton (Ed.), *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues*. 157-186. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing.

- Chapman, Ian, David Newhouse & Don McCaskill
1991 "Management in Contemporary Aboriginal Organizations." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 11(2): 333-349.
- Cortazzi, M.
2001 "Narrative Analysis in Ethnography." In P. Atkinson (Ed.), *Handbook of Ethnography*. 384-394. London: Sage.
- Daly, J., A. Kellehear & M. Gliksman
1997 *The Public Health Researcher: A Methodological Approach*. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Fereday, Jennifer & Eimear Muir-Cochrane
March 2006 "Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 5(1): 1-11.
- Flanagan, Tom
2000 *First Nations? Second Thoughts*. Kingston & Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Hawkes, David
1987 *The Search for Accommodation*. Kingston, ON.: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations.
- Hylton, John (ed.)
1999 *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing.
- Ignatieff, Michael
2000 *The Rights Revolution*. Toronto: Massey Lecture Series.
- Kymlicka, Will
2003 *Immigration, Citizenship, Multiculturalism: Exploring the Links*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kymlicka, Will
2000 *Multicultural Citizenship*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will
1995 *Multicultural Citizenship: A Theory of Minority Rights*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leslie, John
1999 "Assimilation, Integration, or Termination?: The Development of Canadian Indian Policy, 1943-1963." Ph.D. Diss. Ottawa: Carleton University.

- Levy, Robert I. & Douglas Hollan
1998 "Person-Centred Interviewing and Observation." In H. Russell Bernard (Ed.), *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. 333-364. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 1998).
- Lougheed & Associates
1986 *Report on the Native Communications Program and the Northern Native Broadcast Access Program*. Ottawa: Program Evaluation Directorate of Secretary of the State.
- Martin, D., & C. Adams
2000 "Canadian Public Opinion Regarding Aboriginal Self-Government: Diverging Viewpoints as Found in National Survey Results." *The American Review of Canadian Studies*, 30(1), 79-88.
- Macklem, Patrick
2001 *Indigenous Difference and the Constitution of Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mackey, E.
2002 *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Meijer-Drees, Laurie
2002 *The Indian Association of Alberta: A History of Political Action*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Morse, Bradford
2008 "Regaining Recognition of the Inherent Right of Aboriginal Governance" in Yale D. Belanger (Ed.), *Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada: Current Trends and Issues*. 39-68. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.
- Pompana, Yvonne
1997 "Devolution to Indigenization: The Final Path to Assimilation of First Nations." M.A. Thesis. University of Manitoba.
- Rice, P., & D. Ezzy
1999 *Qualitative Research Methods: A Health Focus* (Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press).
- Sanders, Ronald
1983 "The Indian Lobby." In K. Banting & R. Simeon (Eds.), *And No One Cheered. Federalism, Democracy and the Constitution Act*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Shewell, Hugh
2004 *Enough to Keep them Alive': Indian Welfare in Canada, 1873-1965*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Smith, David
1999 *The Republican Option in Canada, Past and Present.*
Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Sluman, Norma & Jean Goodwill
1984 *John Tootoosis.* Winnipeg: Pemmican Publications.
- Taylor, Charles
1994 *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition.*
Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, Charles
1993 *Reconciling the Solitudes: Essays on Canadian Federalism and Nationalism.* Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Tennant, Paul
1990 *Aboriginal People and Politics: The Indian Land question in B.C., 1849-1989.* Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Wells, M., & J. Berry
1992 "Attitudes Toward Aboriginal Self-Government: The Influences of Knowledge, and Cultural and Economic Security." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 12(1), 75-93.
- White, Jerry, Jerry Maxim & Dan Beavon (eds.)
2004 *Aboriginal Policy Research: Setting the Agenda for Change.* Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Court Cases

- Attorney General of Canada v. Misquadis
2002 *F.C.A.* 473.
- Calder v. The Attorney General of British Columbia
1973 34 *D.L.R.* (3d) 145 (also reported: [1973] S.C.R. 313, [1973] 4 *W.W.R.* 1).
- R. v. Sparrow
1990 1 *S.C.R.* 1075.

APPENDIX A**Important Developments in Aboriginal-State Relations (1969-2004)**

Closing of residential schools (began in the 1960s with the final one closing 1987)

White Paper (1969)

Calder decision (1973) resulting in the recognition of the existence of Aboriginal rights.

Indian Claims Commission (ICC)(1973)

Devolution of federal responsibilities to Aboriginal organizations (1973 and on)

Modern-day Treaties: James Bay (1975), Nisga'a (2000)

Affirmative Action Programs (generally, the 1980s and on)

Section 35, Constitution Act of 1982

Penner Report (1983)

First Ministers Conferences (1983-87)

Bill C-31 (1985)

Neilson Report (1985)

Meech Lake Accord and Elijah Harper (1989)

Office of the Treaty Commissioner (OTC) (1990)

Oka (1990); Ipperwash & Gustafson Lake (1995); Burnt Church (2000)

RCAP (1991-1996)

Charlottetown Accord (1992)

Federal policy on Self-government (Inherent Rights Policy) (1995)

Federal Apology for Residential schools (1997)

Delgamuukw decision (1997)

Gathering Strength (1997)

Nunavut (1999)

First Nations Governance Act (FNGA) (2002)

Prime Minister's Round Table Discussions (2004)

APPENDIX B
Aboriginal Participation in Selected National Public Policy
Discussions 1982 - 2003

Negotiations on Constitution Act, 1982

Indian Organizations Invited to participate:

National Indian Brotherhood
Native Council of Canada
Inuit Committee on National Issues

Lobbyists:

Indian Association of Alberta
Assembly of First Nations
Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs
Council of Yukon Indians
Four Nations Confederacy of Manitoba
New Brunswick Indian Association
Nova Scotia Indian Association
Native Women's Association of Canada
Aboriginal Rights Coalition
Métis Association of Alberta
Federation of Saskatchewan Indians

Report of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government, 1983
(The Penner Report)

List of Aboriginal Organizations to Appear (42 total)

Alberta Native Women's Association
Alberta Council of Treaty Women
Assembly of First Nations
Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs
Association of Iroquois and Allied Bands
Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians of Saskatchewan
British Columbia Native Women's Society
Brotherhood of Indian Nations
Council for Yukon Indians
Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations
Greater Winnipeg Indian Council
Indian Association of Alberta
Indian Equity Foundation
Indian Homemakers of British Columbia
Indian Women's Council of Manitoba

Manitoba Indian Association
 Manitoba Indian Agricultural Program
 Métis Association of Alberta
 Métis Association of the Northwest Territories
 Montagnais Women's Association
 Moosonee Métis and Non-Status Indian Association
 National Indian Business Association
 Native Council of Canada
 Native Council of Nova Scotia
 Native Women's Association of Canada
 New Brunswick Association of Métis and Non-Status Indians
 New Brunswick Native Indian Women's Association
 Ontario Métis Association
 Ontario Native Women's Association
 Regina Indian Development Association
 Saskatchewan Indian Education Commission
 Saskatchewan Indian-Community College
 Saskatchewan Indian Cultural College
 Saskatchewan Indian Nations Company
 Saskatchewan Indian Veteran's Association
 Saskatchewan Indian Women's Association
 Saskatchewan Native Women's Association
 Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs
 Union of New Brunswick Indians
 Union of Nova Scotia Indians
 United Native Nations
 Yukon Indian Women's Association

Meech Lake Accord, 1989

Meech Lake was negotiated behind closed doors, hence the decision to engage Native leaders for Charlottetown. Resistance from AFN was significant.

Charlottetown Accord 1992

Representatives from the Assembly of First Nations, the Native Council of Canada, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the Métis National Council were all directly involved in the development stage of the accord.

The Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC) sued Canada arguing that it was entitled to participate in the constitutional review pro-

cess on equal terms. They lost their case.

Standing Committee on Bill C-7 (FNGA), 2000-2002

There were 89 individuals and 175 organizations that appeared before the Committee in its hearings in Ottawa and across Canada. There were 147 group representatives and 44 individuals for a total of 191 presentations opposed to Bill C7. There were 7 group representatives (including the Minister and DIAND officials) and 3 individuals who favored Bill C-7. There were 7 such individuals and 10 organizations.

- Aboriginal Financial Officers Association of Canada (AFOA)
- Aboriginal People Council of Toronto
- Aboriginal Rights Coalition
- Aboriginal Urban Alliance of Ontario
- Anishinabek Nation (Union of Ontario Indians Inc.)
- Assembly of First Nations,
- Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs
- Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians
- Atlantic Policy Congress of First Nations Chiefs (APCFNC)
- BC Association of Aboriginal Friendship Centres
- Centre for Nation Building
- Confederacy of Mainland Mi'kmaq
- Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (CAP)
- Council of Yukon First Nations
- Federation of Newfoundland Indians
- Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations
- First Nations Accountability Coalition
- First Nations Accountability Coalition
- First Nations Summit
- Indian Taxation Advisory Board
- Kainaiiis, the Voice of Blood Indian Women
- Kitcisakik Anicinape Community
- London District Chiefs Council
- Maritime Aboriginal Peoples Council
- National Aboriginal Women's Association (NAWA)
- National Association of Friendship Centres
- National Council of Women of Canada
- Native Alliance of Quebec
- Native Council of Canada
- Native Council of Nova Scotia
- Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC)
- New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council

New Brunswick Aboriginal Women's Council Inc.
 Provincial Council of Women of Manitoba, Inc.
 Skeena Native Development Society
 Tribal Chiefs Association (Tribal Chiefs Ventures)
 Union of BC Indian
 United Anishnaabeg Councils
 United Chiefs and Councils of Manitoulin
 Wabanaki Nations Cultural Resource Centre
 Women's Commission, Prince Albert Grand Council

**Standing Committee on Aboriginal Peoples Groups Appearing
 from Feb. 1996 – Nov. 2003**

**35th Parliament, 2nd Session
 (February 27, 1996 - April 27, 1997)**

Lesser Slave Lake Indian Regional Council
 RCAP

**36th Parliament, 1st Session
 (September 22, 1997 - September 18, 1999)**

North Slave Métis Alliance:
 From the South Slave Métis Tribal Council
 Native Brotherhood of B.C.
 From Laxgal'Sap Nisga'a Fishermen's Commission
 Metis Settlements General Council
 National Aboriginal Housing Association
 Congress of Aboriginal Peoples (Saskatchewan)
 Aboriginal Women's Council
 First Nations Forum
 Indian Taxation Advisory Board
 Makivik Corporation
 Métis National Council of Women
 Native Council of Canada
 Council of First Nations of Manitoba
 New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council
 Ontario Federation of Friendship Centres
 From the National Association of Friendship Centres
 Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs
 Metis Nation of Alberta
 Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg

Native Women's Association of Canada
Assembly of First Nations
Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations

**36th Parliament, 2nd Session
(October 12, 1999 - October 22, 2000)**

British Columbia Treaty Commission
Assembly of First Nations

**37th Parliament, 1st Session
(January 29, 2001 - September 16, 2002)**

Aboriginal Business Canada
Congress of Aboriginal Peoples
The Métis National Council
Aboriginal Healing Foundation
Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami
Pauktuutit Inuit Women's Association
The Native Women's Association
Assembly of First Nations

**37th Parliament, 2nd Session
(September 30, 2002 - November 12, 2003)**

The National Aboriginal Health Organization
The Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health
The Odawa Native Friendship Centre
Big Soul Productions.
Piitoayis Family School
Gabriel Dumont Institute
Native Canadian Centre of Toronto
Saskatoon Indian and Metis Friendship Centre
Aboriginal Youth Leadership Development Program
Saskatchewan Indian Federated College
The National Aboriginal Achievement Foundation
The Urban Society for Aboriginal Youth: The Regina Native Youth
Community Services:
The Calgary Urban Indian Youth Centre
The Native Child and Family Services
The Canadian Aboriginal AIDS Network
Aboriginal Family Services Centre

The Aboriginal Resource Centre.
Aboriginal Sports and Development Centre
Ben Calf Robe School
The Amiskwaciy Academy
The Aboriginal Justice Initiatives Unit
The Edmonton Metis Cultural Dance Society
The Native Alliance of Quebec
The Centre for Native Education, Concordia University
The Native Friendship Centre of Montreal
Thunder Bay Indian Friendship Centre:
Oshki-Pimache-O-Win Education and Training Institute
New Brunswick Aboriginal People's Council
All Nations Hope Aboriginal AIDS Network
The Aboriginal Labor Force Development Circle
The Assembly of First Nations Chief's Committee on Human Resources
The Miziwe Biik Aboriginal Employment and Training
The National Native Sports Program
The Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs
The Anokiiwin Group
The Centre for Aboriginal Human Resources Development
The Urban Aboriginal Education Coalition
The Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre.
Circle of Life Thunderbird House
The Manitoba Aboriginal Sports and Recreation Council
The Aboriginal Centre of Winnipeg
Eslha7an Learning Centre
First Nations Education Steering Committee
Pacific Sport National Sport Centre
Urban Native Youth Association

APPENDIX C

Canadian Heritage Aboriginal Programming Overview

Aboriginal Representative Organizations Program (AROP): provides core funding to the Métis National Council, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples and their respective provincial/regional/territorial affiliate organizations. These organizations represent Métis, Non-Status Indian and Inuit people living off-reserve and interact with all levels of government to influence decision-making. The AROP program is designed to assist in the development of strong Aboriginal leadership, encourage Aboriginal - State partnerships, and to help build capacity at the community level so as to facilitating community participation in the development of government policies. There has been additional funding provided under *Gathering Strength* for capacity-building at the community level and the enhancement of the representative skills of Aboriginal organizations.

Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program (AFCP): provides core funding to the National Association of Friendship Centres (NAFC), its provincial/territorial associations and local friendship centres to operate the friendship centre organizations. The overall objective of the Aboriginal Friendship Centre Program is to improve the quality of life for Aboriginal people in an urban environment. The program emphasizes the support of self-determined activities that encourage equal access to, and participation within, Canadian society and that respect and strengthen the increasing focus on Aboriginal cultural distinctiveness. Friendship centre organizations constitute the largest off-reserve Aboriginal service infrastructure in Canada, and provide a wide-range of programs and services in such areas as housing, education, human resource development and employment, youth and family services, health, recreation and culture to off-reserve First Nations, Non-Status Indian, Métis and Inuit people residing in, or travelling through urban communities. There are currently over 100 friendship centres across Canada. The management and administration of the AFCP was transferred to the NAFC in 1996. Interim annual funding has been provided to the NAFC since October 2001 for core funding of seventeen previously unfunded friendship centres.

Aboriginal Women's Program (AWP): provides funding for both core and project funding. The project funding assists regional and community Aboriginal women to initiate, participate, and contribute to public policy development and decision-making and to address issues of par-

tical concern to Aboriginal women. Overall program objectives include the maintenance of the cultural distinctiveness and preserve the cultural identity of Aboriginal women, the enhancement and development of strong leadership capabilities, individual and collective skills and talents, and the improvement of the social and economic conditions for Aboriginal women. The program serves predominantly the urban and off-reserve populations, with most regional/provincial organizations located in urban centres. Allocations includes additional funding under *Gathering Strength* to support and enhance the participation of Aboriginal women in the design and advancement of self-government and, under the *Federal Family Violence Initiative*, to address family and related violence predominantly in off-reserve Aboriginal communities.

Urban Multipurpose Aboriginal Youth Centres (UMAYC): provides funding annually to support the establishment of the network of projects and activities that address the needs of urban Aboriginal youth. The initiative is specific to the off-reserve Aboriginal youth population (ages 15-24 years) living in communities with populations of 1,000 and over. The objectives of the initiative are to provide urban Aboriginal youth with accessible, Aboriginal community-based, culturally relevant and supportive projects. As well, the program supports professional and peer counselling towards the improvement of the economic, social and personal prospects for Aboriginal youth. The initiative is managed and administered by the National Association of Friendship Centres, the Métis National Council and its provincial-member organizations, the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and regional Inuit associations, and the Department of Canadian Heritage in six western cities.

Young Canada Works for Aboriginal Urban Youth (YCWAUY): is a component of the Youth Employment strategy, and provides funding to the National Association of Friendship Centres which organizes summer work experience for urban Aboriginal youth on projects that take place in a culturally supportive milieu within Aboriginal Friendship Centres across Canada. These projects are primarily directed to youth issues, recreation, and events.

Post-Secondary Scholarship Program: was provided an endowment fund in 2003-04 for need and merit based scholarships to First Nations, Non-Status Indian, Métis and Inuit students enrolled in full-time or part-time post-secondary programs for a duration of two or more academic years. The program is managed and delivered by the National Aboriginal Achievement Foundation, through an endowment.

Northern Native Broadcast Access Program (NNBAP): provides sustaining funding to thirteen Aboriginal communications societies for the production and distribution of Aboriginal radio and television programming. The program's initial objective was to provide Native peoples in Northern Regions with the opportunity to broadcast radio and television programs in Native languages reflecting Native values. Today, these broadcasting services are provided by thirteen broadcast societies funded by the NNBAP. The programs serve approximately 400 communities in the three territories and the northern portion of seven provinces. Broadcasts are in seventeen Aboriginal languages, English and French, and they reflect Aboriginal culture, community issues, concerns and current affairs.

Canada-Yukon Aboriginal Language Accord: provides funding in support of a cooperative approach with the territorial government for the revitalization, preservation, development and enhancement of eight Aboriginal languages in the Yukon Territory. The program facilitates the involvement of the Aboriginal communities in activities that may complement but not supplement territorial programming.

Canada-Northwest Territories Aboriginal Language Accord: provides funding in support of a cooperative approach with the territorial government of the Northwest Territories for the preservation, development and enhancement of six Aboriginal languages in the Northwest Territories. The program facilitates the involvement of the Aboriginal communities in activities that may complement but not supplement territorial programming.

Canada-Nunavut Aboriginal Language Agreement: provides funding in support a cooperative approach with the territorial government for the preservation, development and enhancement of the Inuit languages in the Nunavut territory. The program facilitates the involvement of the Aboriginal communities in activities that may complement but not supplement territorial programming.

Aboriginal Languages Initiative (ALI): provides funding to support community and home initiatives for the revitalization, preservation and enhancement of Aboriginal languages leading to the increase in the number of speakers, the expansion of the areas in which Aboriginal languages are spoken in communities and the enhancement of inter-generational language transmission. The initiative is inclusive of all Aboriginal people regardless of residence and is responsive to different com-

munity needs, circumstances and priorities. The Assembly of First Nations administers the First Nations languages component, the Métis National Council and its affiliates administer the Michif language component; and the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and its affiliates administer the Inuktitut language component.

Aboriginal Languages and Cultures Centre (ALCC): is to be established in 2005. It has been designed to recognize and support Aboriginal stewardship in the preservation and maintenance of Aboriginal languages and cultures for all Canadians.

Northern Distribution Program: was approved in 1988 by the Department of Communications. The program is now administered by the Broadcasting Policy and Innovation Branch of the Department of Canadian Heritage. The program provides annual funding in order to lease and operate a satellite channel to serve 96 communities across Northern Canada. The funding was originally provided to Television Northern Canada (TVNC). On 22 February 1999, the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) granted TVNC a licence to operate a national Aboriginal broadcasting cable television network to be named the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN).

National Aboriginal Day Program (NAD): provides seed money to national and regional Aboriginal organizations across Canada so as to promote National Aboriginal Day (June 21). The program is part of the “Celebrate Canada!” week and is intended as a way of supporting the recognition of Aboriginal cultures and celebrating the valuable contributions that Aboriginal peoples have made to Canadian society.