INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**Wardship to Citizenship: Integrated Education and Canadian Indian Policy
Change—1945 to 1969**

.....

by

Andrew P. Ross B.A. B.Ed.

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in Canadian Studies**

Carleton University

OTTAWA, Ontario

August, 2001

Copyright 2001, Andrew P. Ross

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**385 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**385, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-66849-5

Canada

**The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis
“Wardship to Citizenship: Integrated Education and Canadian
Indian Policy Change – 1945-1969”**

submitted by Andrew Ross, B.A., B.Ed.

**in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts**

.....
Thesis Supervisor

.....
**Director
School of Canadian Studies**

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

September, 2001

ABSTRACT

Education is one of the most important influences on the cultural reproduction of societies. This thesis examines federal government departmental documentation from the 1945-1969 period in order to evaluate the ideological underpinnings of Indian education policy. The analysis of Indian policy discourse reveals that the formal long-time policy of cultural assimilation was transformed into an informal policy following WWII. This change, although constituting a degree of continuity, was characterized by the emergence of a liberal discourse, and a move toward the idea of political assimilation. Effectively, the presence of an established white, western cultural paradigm, inherent to the proposed political citizenship and educational curriculum, acted to hinder the cultural reproduction of First Nations societies. The federal government's failure to recognize this as a problem in need of direct attention constituted a policy of inaction that furthered the goal of assimilating First Nations children into a cultural, political, and economic Canadian identity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my parents Robert and Linda Ross for their enormous care and support. I certainly owe them a debt of gratitude that words cannot begin to express. Without the wisdom and friendship of my brother Jon Ross, this project may never have met its initial or final deadlines—thank-you. My partner Kelly McGee was an immense source of inspiration for this project. Her love and support cannot be measured by the successful completion of this thesis alone.

My friends Lori Buck and Brian Brady, who adopted me as a non-tax refundable dependent, need a special thanks. My friend Jessa Chupick-Hall was a tremendous resource throughout this project, as were Katherine Scott, and Walter McGee.

Without the mentorship and support of several spectacular educators, I would not have been equipped or prepared to succeed in university. These people are many but I would particularly like to thank Gary O'Dwyer, John Milloy, and my thesis advisor Kerry Abel.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my grandfather Leonard Morrison.

FOREWORD

Over the course of writing this thesis, it was sometimes necessary to use specialized jargon and terminology. For the purpose of understanding, a few points should first be clarified.

The term "First Nations" will be used to describe the descendants of some of Canada's first inhabitants. The government refers to these people as "Indians." This thesis sometimes relies on the term "Aboriginal" as a substitute for "First Nations" when the use of "First Nations" becomes repetitive within the context of a paragraph. The term "First Nations" is meant to be understood as a respectful description for some Aboriginal people. This term should not be confused with "Inuit" or "Métis" which are terms used to describe other indigenous societies.

The term "Indian" describes an imaginary person or peoples. Originally, "Indian" was a misnomer for the first inhabitants of what explorers and newcomers arrogantly labeled the Americas. Since then, "Indian" has come to represent just about anything that white, western culture could dream-up. The use of "Indian" in this thesis is meant to illustrate the Canadian government's perspective of First Nations individuals and groups as legal entities of the Canadian state: people to whom the government has special responsibilities stemming from legal tradition, treaties, and agreements.

In addition to the term "Indian," there are several other terms that will be used in this thesis. "Indian status" describes those First Nations people the government has chosen to recognize as being *real* Indians. The "vanishing Indian" refers to an ethnocentric belief that the First Nations are a backward people slated by God and evolution to disappear. The "Indian problem" refers to the federal government's apparent long-standing goal to terminate "Indian status," and in many respects, their desire to terminate First Nations culture.

Many times in this thesis, I refer to "First Nations cultures." The use of this term is meant to describe the myriad of languages and educational, political, economic, social, cultural, and religious perspectives associated with the many distinct First Nations peoples in Canada.

This thesis will discuss the federal government's education policy in regards to "status Indians": Indian education.

I acknowledge that in the following pages, only part of a story will be told. I encourage others to study this topic, or to make use of their own personal experience in order that someday a just relationship can be restored between Canadians and First Nations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
FOREWORD	i
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Research.....	1
Chapter Outline.....	3
What is at stake in this thesis?.....	6
 CHAPTER 1	
Methodological and Historical Perspectives.....	7
Methods.....	7
Education.....	9
Public Policy.....	12
Periodization.....	15
Historical Context.....	18
Post-WWII Political Environment.....	27
A New Perspective.....	29
 CHAPTER 2	
Citizens Both Now and In the Future:	
Civic Education for First Nations Children—1945 to 1958.....	33
The Special Joint Committee of Senate and House of Commons: 1947-49.....	41
 CHAPTER 3	
Side By Side With Us?	
Formalizing the Canadian Identity—1959 to 1968.....	69
The Special Joint Committee of Senate and House of Commons: 1959-61.....	72
The Hawthorn Report.....	99
 CHAPTER 4	
Canadians of Full Status.....	114
Conclusions.....	115
<i>Economic and Political Citizenship.....</i>	116
<i>The Language of Equality.....</i>	116
<i>The Multicultural Citizenship Debate.....</i>	117
<i>Curricular Goals.....</i>	117
<i>The Language of Choice.....</i>	118
Continuity and Change.....	118
Epilogue and Suggestions for Further Research.....	122
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	129

Unpublished Primary Sources.....	129
Published Primary Sources.....	133
Secondary Sources.....	134

INTRODUCTION

**You talk big words of integration in the schools. Does it really exist?
Can we talk of integration until there is social integration?... Unless
there is integration of hearts and minds you have only a physical
presence...and the walls are as high as the mountain range.¹**

—Chief Dan George

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this thesis is to evaluate integrated Indian education policy as it was formulated by the federal government following WWII. The goal of the research is to determine how the government used education to answer the growing public demand for equal rights while balancing its own agenda for the termination of special Indian status. What were the ideological underpinnings of an Indian policy developed at a time when the perception of Indians as wards was shifting towards their perception as citizens? Integrated education continues today despite the government's supposed commitment to a policy of Indian control of Indian education. Hopefully, this thesis will challenge people to think not just about past policies, but about our current government policy regarding Indian education and critically evaluate its continuing failure to provide an acceptable education to First Nations children.

This thesis will focus on integrated education as it was proposed to be delivered to status-Indian children at provincial schools. During this period, from 1945 to 1969, residential education continued to be offered to some First Nations, Métis, and Inuit children. Furthermore, this thesis does not take into account those First Nations children who, without status, attended provincial schools as a matter of course. In this regard, however, it will be evident that some of the same conclusions can be drawn about the purpose of their education.

In tackling this topic, I have two main goals. I wish to address the relative lack of attention paid to Indian joint-education as an agent of Canadian social construction. In recent years, a great deal of energy has been spent focussing on social engineering through residential schools. How did (does) integrated education differ from its predecessor's egregious yet feckless attempt to transform Indians into Canadians? In tandem, I am also curious to address the issue of Indian assimilation policy. How did this once driving force behind Indian education come to a sudden halt? Or did it?

Although I have studied First Nations and Indian education for some time, it was only recently brought to my attention that joint-education was, in many respects, not much different from residential schooling. In order to attend provincial schools, for example, First Nations students from remote areas were forced to leave their communities just as with the residential system. In some cases, they were required to live in dormitories at converted residential schools. First Nations languages continued to be ignored while daily instruction was offered solely in English or French. Many First Nations students were ridiculed and ostracized by the majority of non-Aboriginal students attending joint-schools. If not harassed for their cultural differences, the children were often bullied because of their depressed economic background. The most obvious parallel between joint and residential schooling, however, was(is) that the government continued(es) to refuse the establishment of a culturally relevant curriculum for First Nations students.

Not all experiences at joint-schools were negative. In many cases, though, joint-schools were the cause of painful long-term memories for their First Nations students. This thesis will not attempt to evaluate the joint-schooling experience. That is a story better left

¹ Chief Dan George as quoted by Verna J. Kirkness, *First Nations and Schools*:

told by First Nations people themselves—it is not my story to tell. **This thesis will not attempt to speak *for* First Nations people.** Instead, I will focus the attention of my research on the federal government, and the non-Aboriginal policy community who ultimately established integrated education as official Indian policy. In this sense, I hope to tell a Canadian story: a story of how the Canadian government built and influenced an integrated Indian education system that continues to educate close to 40% of high school aged children living on-reserve, and countless off-reserve children ineligible or who cannot afford to attend federally funded First Nation's schools.²

Chapter Outline

In Chapter 1, I will briefly discuss education theory drawing on both western and First Nations perspectives; however, a particular focus will be centred on the role of education as the principle agent of socialization in the Canadian public school system. How can education be used to shape identity? Why is the study of education a useful method for understanding the First Nations and Canadian state-relationship?

Also in Chapter 1, I will develop a framework for the study of public policy in general. What is public policy, and who is responsible for it? By answering these questions, I will show how a policy community, in this case a community of elected officials, appointed officials, senior bureaucrats, and members of the knowledge élite, influence policy. In addition, I will explain how outside influences, from the political environment, contribute to

Triumphs and Struggles (Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1992) 14.

² Canada, Auditor General of, [OAG] "Indian and Northern Affairs Canada—Elementary and Secondary Education," *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2000) 4.7.

the formation of policy. Active and inactive policy will be discussed to emphasize that both officially stated policy and unofficial policy contribute to the formation of actual policy.

Chapter 1 will continue by positioning the topic of integrated Indian education policy within an historical context of First Nations and Canadian state-relations. This section will attempt to answer how the study of integrated Indian education policy fits into this current academic study of Canadian history. Discussion will immediately turn toward the previously mentioned political environment. What was the political environment of post-WWII Indian policy, and what was the history of Indian education policy prior to the adoption of integrated education? Answering these questions will establish a context and basis for the focus of this thesis.

Finally, Chapter 1 will conclude with a suggestion about how we might view the policy of integration: not merely as a continuation of assimilation policy but as the beginning of a new policy of Canadianization. It is at this point that my thesis will become most apparent. How did the increased emphasis on citizenship education influence Indian policy? Was education truly to be used to integrate First Nations students into a society where they could both contribute and participate, or was education to continue in an attempt to preserve the established political order? How was that political order to be defined?

Chapters 2 and 3 will adopt a chronological approach to the study of this topic in order to show how four enduring themes dominated Indian education policy discourse from 1945 until 1969. The chapters are divided by decade, and will each contribute to an explanation of how education policy was designed to make First Nations students into Canadians at the expense of their own cultures.

The extension of Canadian citizenship is a prominent theme during the post-WWII period. It will be shown that the definition of such citizenship consisted of four variables: economic participation seemed to define citizenship through the ability to learn a trade or profession that would be used in non-Aboriginal society; liberal equal rights discourse defined citizenship in terms of a universal civic identity; the language surrounding liberal multiculturalism was split between those envisioning a First Nations cultural contribution to the political order and those who seemed to prevail with a vision for liberal multiculturalism inhibiting such a contribution; and finally, provincial citizen status seemed to be an important pre-requisite to Canadian citizenship likely because it bonded First Nations to a normative relationship with other Canadian citizens.

The focus on joint-schools, with their proposed programme of civic education constitutes another important theme in Indian education policy during this era. It will be shown that a regime of joint-education was proposed with the aim of instilling First Nations children with a Canadian citizenship and its counterpart, a Canadian identity. It will also be shown that integrated education policy never fully recognized the importance of First Nations cultures in the formation of Canadian citizenship and identity.

A concept of progress, also associated with official assimilation policy, remained an important influence on Indian policy in the post-WWII period. Furthermore, the discourse on progress can be seen as an enduring theme which shaped Indian education policy discourse. It will be shown that frequent allusions to modernity, the future, new ways of life, and other such terms devalued First Nations cultures and helped to protect the established white, western paradigm.

Finally, the theme of terminating Indian status permeated the entire post-WWII period. It will be shown that the termination of Indian status was a major, if not the major driving force behind extending Canadian citizenship in the post-WWII period. In many respects, the determination to extinguish this special status resonated with the long sought goal of solving the Indian “problem.”

Chapter 4 will present the conclusions of this thesis. It will be shown that there was both continuity and change with regards to post-WWII Indian policy. In addition, a short epilogue and suggestions for further research will bring this thesis to a close.

What is at stake in this thesis?

Many people often question me about the relevance of this thesis outside the walls of academia. What does this thesis mean to First Nations students in provincial classrooms? How does this help us to re-negotiate the state-relationship with First Nations? I began this introduction with the words of Chief Dan George because they seemed to be an accurate reflection on integrated Indian education policy, and especially because his words seemed pertinent to answering these two questions. Many people are ill-informed about federal Indian policy. Others are searching for reasons why they should support First Nations in their struggle for cultural survival. Regardless of our situation, if ever we are to contribute to a healthy, balanced relationship with First Nations, we must be reminded why there are “walls, as high as the mountain range,” that divide our cultures.

CHAPTER 1

Methodological and Historical Perspectives

Methods

Research for this paper was conducted exclusively at the National Archives of Canada (NAC) and the National Library. Primary research material from the NAC and the National Library is generally limited to official government documentation, correspondence, and publications. Materials from Record Groups (RG) are regulated and released under the jurisdiction of respective government departments, private donors, and federal access to information law. One is often given the impression while researching RG 10 (Indian Affairs) documents that researchers are subject to the capricious nature of a department once shrouded in secrecy: missing or restricted boxes, files, and documents are quite common in this record group. In addition, researching from these sources has the potential to provide a one dimensional view of history.

Nevertheless, exclusive use of federal archival materials is an important asset to this thesis because it is a study of the federal government itself. This paper does not claim to be a definitive interpretation of Indian education policy from the perspective of all involved. This paper is one piece of a grand puzzle meant, as historian J.S. Milloy says of his work on education policy, “to be a site of introspection and extirpation.”³ Furthermore, the regulation of archival materials, although frustrating for those interested in obtaining relevant documents in a timely fashion, is always improving. As a result, the general public can now

³ John S. Milloy, *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System—1879-1986* (Winnipeg, University of Manitoba Press, 1999) xviii.

access information from any record group after a 20-year waiting period. More and more information, therefore, is continuously being released, allowing researchers to gain a more informed historical understanding. This is one such project. Finally, although materials are not always accessible, critical arguments can often be sustained based on a deficit analysis just as easily as with substantive evidence.

Unfortunately, there is very little that can be done to go beyond archival research for this topic given its nature, and the project timeline. Most of the people involved with federal Indian educational policy during these years, Ellen Fairclough and R.F. Davey for example, are now deceased; otherwise, interviews like those conducted by historian Sally Weaver in the 1970s would be an alternate source of research.⁴ The bottom line, however, is that the official thoughts and opinions of government are captured in a variety of documents including reports, memos, letters, policy documents, and testimonies which add to the richness and credibility of this methodology.

The actual methodology of archival research is simple. One begins with an enormous amount of information: policy documents, correspondence, official memoranda, departmental publications, personal notes and jottings, tables, charts, etc. Then, by limiting the parameters of the research to a specific focus—in this case Indian education policy from 1945 to 1969—the researcher is able to collect artifacts from several different pertinent sources. Canadian writer Timothy Findley tells of this process:

You begin at the archives with photographs...Boxes and boxes of snapshots and portraits; maps and letters; cablegrams and clippings from the papers. All you have to do is sign them out and carry them across the room. Spread over table tops, a whole age lies in fragments underneath the lamps...All you can hear is the wrist watch on your arm.

⁴ Sally Weaver, *Making Canadian Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda—1968-70* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981).

Outside, it snows. The dark comes early. The archivist is gazing from her desk. She coughs. The boxes smell of yellow dust. You hold your breath. As the past moves under your fingertips, part of it crumbles. Other parts you know you'll never find. This is what you have.⁵

By comparing established historical information with archival sources, the context in which specific documents were produced can be established, and the bias and assumptions inherent in the documents can be assessed. In this way, an informed analysis of the document can be undertaken, and used to explore the discourse surrounding a given topic. As the artifacts are analyzed, they begin to contribute to an evolved understanding of history. In this sense, the point of Findley's description becomes evident. Indeed, "as the past moves under your fingertips, part of it crumbles." In this case, a wide variety of historical documents relating to the policy of integrated Indian education will, I hope, contribute to a new understanding of the First Nations and Canadian state relationship.

Education

Education plays an important part in the cultural construction of society. It stands to reason, then, that the study of education is very much the study of the administration and control of culture. In this sense, education, politics, and culture are inextricably linked. Educational historian Ronald Manzer uses classical education theory to describe this phenomena: "Plato taught, a theory of education is a critical element in every political theory; the converse of Plato's dictum is also true: every theory of learning is a theory of politics."⁶ Similarly, First Nations Elder Eber Hampton says that, "No aspect of culture is

⁵ Timothy Findley, *The Wars* (Toronto: Penguin Books, 1996) 3.

⁶ Ronald Manzer, *Canadian Public Schools and Political Ideas: Canadian Educational Policy in Historical Perspective* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994) 11.

more vital to its integrity than its means of education.”⁷ In the words of another prominent First Nations educationalist, Jacqueline Hookimaw-Witt: “Education cannot be separated from the formal institutions which control it nor from the social conditions which it creates.”⁸ An exploration of education policy, therefore, should yield a great deal of insight to the cultural and political enterprises of a society.

What is the purpose of education? Most scholars seem to agree that education is a principle agent of socialization. Manzer provides a good general framework to explain the purpose of education that recognizes the potential for various parties to contribute to the educational milieu. He concludes that

Sometimes public schools are built and maintained entirely on the basis of community consensus. More often however, schools are rent by conflicting political, economic, and cultural interests that seek to organize schools to fit particular conceptions of a good community and a good life and to teach knowledge and skills serving particular interests, or at least particular conceptions of public interest.

As stakes in power struggles public schools are not only objects of domination and products of compromise, they are also potentially agencies for creating political consensus. Their organization and curricula may be imposed by a dominant social group or result from accommodation among conflicting interests.⁹

In short, education is about the transmission of knowledge and skills constituted by a conflicted or shared notion of the public good. The purpose of education, therefore, can be defined once the motives and the relative power relationships among the key stake-holders are determined.

⁷ Eber Hampton, “Towards a Redefinition of Indian Education,” *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*, ed. Marie Battiste and Jean Barman (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1995) 7.

⁸ Jacqueline Hookimaw-Witt, “Any Changes Since Residential School?” *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 22.1 (1999): 173.

⁹ Manzer, 3.

This definition recognizes that education is not a neutral enterprise. People do not always share political consensus in regards to education. When one considers, as do the researchers in Barman et al., that “the key to the future of any society lies in the transmission of its culture and worldview to succeeding generations,” and that “the socialization of children, through education, shapes all aspects of identity, instilling knowledge of the group’s language, history, traditions, behaviour, and spiritual beliefs,”¹⁰ it becomes obvious why this is. Control over education has a direct bearing on cultural reproduction. If a single homogenous group were to dominate the “conflicting political, economic, and cultural interests,” it could conceivably attempt to disrupt the cultural reproduction of a subordinate group. The federal government discourse on Indian education policy, apart from being an important element in the state relationship between the two groups, may well be an example of such a phenomena.

Education for First Nations students living on reserves, unlike that of non-Aboriginal and First Nations children living off reserve, is regulated through the jurisdiction of the federal government. Since 1945, there have been five principle ways that the federal government has attempted to deliver education services to First Nations children: residential schooling, federal day schools, integrated provincial schools, hospital schools, and private schools. During the 1945-1969 period, the most commonly prescribed *modes educatus* became integrated provincial schooling. Historian Sally Weaver contends that “the branch’s devolution policy in education resulted in increasing the proportion of Indian children attending provincial schools from 5.6 per cent in 1949 to 59 per cent in 1968/69.”¹¹ This

¹⁰Jean Barman, Yvonne Hebert, and Don McCaskill eds., *Indian Education in Canada: The Legacy* 2 vols. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1986) 1: 3.

¹¹ Weaver, 25.

thesis will evaluate the purpose of federal education policy from the end of WWII until 1969.

Public Policy

This chapter will now construct a theoretical and methodological framework for the study of Indian policy. Policy makers and stake-holders will be identified; a policy community will be postulated; and finally, a theoretical framework for the study of the Indian education policy will be established. But first, what is public policy?

A commonly used definition is given by political scientist Stephen Brooks:

“Policy...involves conscious choice that leads to government action—the passage of a law, the spending of money, an official speech or gesture, or some other observable act—or inaction.”¹² This is a nice broad definition for policy; however, it does not take into account the difference between actions in the policy-making process, and actions in the policy delivery process. *Holus bolus*, public policy must be considered to have both ideological and practical components.

As stated earlier, the focus of this thesis is on the ideological underpinnings of public policy. This thesis will not evaluate the delivery of policy through programs. Instead there will be a specific focus on the exchange of ideas that shaped Indian education policy during the 1940s through 1960s. Brooks explains that this “...exchange is a policy discourse—an unfolding tapestry of words and symbols that structures thinking and action—constructed out of the multiple definitions or denial of a problem.”¹³ This thesis will be an examination of the observable actions or in-actions of those who most influenced policy, as they relate to the

¹² Stephen Brooks, *Public Policy in Canada*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: McClelland&Stewart, 1992) 12.

¹³ Brooks, 15.

debate on Indian education. Determining the salient discursive elements of Indian education policy during this time period will help to clarify the goals of Indian Affairs more broadly in post WWII Canada.

Where is the locus of policy power? According to political scientists like Michael Whittington and Richard Van Loon, in an ideal Parliamentary system, democratically elected members of parliament are responsible to an informed, active electorate. The reality of a large parliamentary democracy like Canada, however, is that an executive branch comprised of cabinet and public servants must work together in order to interpret and administer policy. When considering the many influences on the executive branch of government, Whittington and Van Loon argue that policy is actually derived from

a constellation of individual and organizational actors which together make up the policy community. The composition of a policy community will be determined by who the stakeholders are in the given policy area—by who has the most to gain and lose in the policy decision. Such stakeholders will include Cabinet Ministers, the senior officials of the lead agency or sponsoring department, the leadership of key interest groups, journalists, MP's and interested individuals.¹⁴

This model of policy development takes into account the varying degrees of power wielded by each stakeholder. For instance,

...in one policy community the decision making process may be state-centred or dominated by the Cabinet and the bureaucracy, and in another, the process may be pluralistic with a more even distribution of influence among the various government agencies and interest groups.¹⁵

Who were the power brokers/stakeholders in the “policy community” affecting Indian education during the 1946-69 period?

¹⁴ Michael S. Whittington and Richard J. Van Loon, *Canadian Government and Politics: Institutions and Processes* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1996) 29.

¹⁵ Whittington and Van Loon, 30.

The influence of bureaucrats on the policy community was paramount at this time. Senior civil servants in most government departments were delegated a wide range of discretionary power, and long-serving senior officials were able to dominate the policy-making community. This is particularly true of the education policy at Indian Affairs, where H.M. Jones served as director from 1953 until 1963, and R.F. Davey served as director of the education division from 1953 until 1968.¹⁶ In addition, two separate Special Joint Committees of Senate and the House of Commons—although relying heavily upon the testimony of the other prominent stake-holders—surely factor as significant influences. Independent researchers, like those involved with the “Hawthorn Report,” and influential and respected members of the public, such as educators and members of public associations, rounded out the policy community as members of the “knowledge élite.”¹⁷

Questions of accountability and control arise from Indian Affairs’ domination of the policy community during these years. As Weaver says, Indian Affairs was “buttressed” with a strong, centralized, and secretive bureaucracy, “making them an administrative island unto themselves.”¹⁸ As will be elaborated upon in this thesis, even the churches, who had once yielded significant clout, seemed to be stymied by the Branch’s efforts to secularize education. The overall situation created a “state-centred” stronghold on the policy-making process.

Other factors also play a role in the formation of policy. The so-called “environment” of the policy community has a large impact on the decision-making process of the stakeholders. “Public policy,” according to Stephen Brooks, “is not formulated in a void. It

¹⁶ Weaver, 45.

¹⁷ This is a term for influential non-governmental members of the policy community used by Whittington and Van Loon, 30.

is influenced by the economic, social, and cultural characteristics of a society, as well as by formal structures of government and other features of the political system.”¹⁹ This paper, although recognizing the impact of economic forces in post-WWII Canada, will focus more on the prevailing social and cultural forces in the formation of federal Indian education policy. This thesis will attempt to come to grips with the meaning of a post-WWII nation-building project that oversees a transition in the social construction of First Nations as Canadians.

Periodization

There are five general labels that some historians use to categorize the changing Canadian and First Nations state-relationship. “Co-operation,” “Protection,” “Civilization,” “Assimilation,” and “Confrontation” comprise this framework, and are used in both Olive Dickason’s and J.R. Miller’s seminal surveys of First Nations in Canada.²⁰ The validity of these categories to interpret history is further supported by their modified use in the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples report (RCAP), where they appear in a broader sense as “Contact and Co-operation,” “Displacement and Assimilation,” and “Negotiation and Renewal.”²¹ The report’s interpretation, furthermore, is similar to a model used by political scientist Gerald Alfred that posits relations on a scale of “co-operation,” “co-optation,”

¹⁸ Weaver, 46-47.

¹⁹ Brooks, 49 and Whittington and Van Loon, 15.

²⁰ Olive P. Dickason, *Canada’s First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples from Earliest Times* 2nd ed. (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997), and in J.R. Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada* 3rd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).

²¹ Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Looking Forward, Looking Back* (Ottawa: Communications Group Publishing, 1996) 1-732, vol.1 of Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (Ottawa: Communications Group Publishing, 1996) 37.

“confrontation,” and “crisis.”²² These analyses contribute to a body of work that characterize state-relations according to general policy themes during certain time periods. Ultimately, these can be useful categories for the study of history if understood in a malleable shifting context: that is to say, if each is regarded to also have a certain degree of influence outside its given time period.

It would be careless to assume that elements of the various categories did not manifest themselves outside their prescribed historical period. Elements of attempted assimilation, for example, are clearly evident in French colonial North America—a period generally accepted as an era of co-operation—and elements of protection extend to the present day—a period thought of as crisis, confrontation, and negotiation. Most of the historiography used in this thesis recognizes, as does J.L. Tobias, that the characterizations of “protection, civilization, and assimilation” are ubiquitous “principles” in all eras of Canadian Indian policy.²³

It is also of importance to recognize that First Nations were active participants in history. If not taken into critical perspective, some may mistakenly interpret “periodization” as a portrayal of First Nations as inactive participants. Darlene Johnson refers to this as the “Great Lie,” a mythology which “portrays a transition from ally to subject to ward to citizen”²⁴ without regard to the actions of Aboriginal people to co-operate, confront, and negotiate policy change throughout history. Although the focus of this thesis is on federal

²² Gerald R. Alfred, *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahanawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1995) 180.

²³ John L. Tobias, “Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History,” *Sweet Promises: A Reader on Indian-White Relations in Canada*, ed. J.R. Miller (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991) 127.

education policy discourse, it cannot be denied that the actions of First Nations to resist assimilation have played an important role in limiting formal assimilationist policies.

Ultimately, the “periodization” model is helpful and necessary in understanding the broad historical trends of Canadian and First Nation’s state relations. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, to ensure that these trends are explored thoroughly, and the events within these periods are depicted accurately. In relation to the other trends, assimilation became the dominant paradigm in federal Indian policy at the time of Confederation and lasted until 1973. This period is understood largely from the perspective of segregated assimilation policy and focuses on residential schools, treaty making, and coercive Indian Act legislation as the key elements of policy. To date, critical historical analysis of the assimilation period generally stops at WWII, thus leaving a 30 year gap between this period and its successor, “negotiation and renewal.” At least one historian, John Leslie, points to the post-WWII period as a time when the emerging policies of integration redefined the nature of assimilation.²⁵ Assimilation certainly continued as the government’s Indian policy, but how did it differ from pre-WWII times? Without a clear understanding of the policy discourse during these years, it is surely difficult to evaluate change in Canadian and First Nations state-relations.

After World War II, the federal government set upon a course of Indian policy guided by integration strategies. In fact, the government dropped assimilation as its official policy objective and replaced it with integration. These strategies appeared less coercive than their

²⁴ Darlene Johnson, “First Nations and Canadian Citizenship,” *The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship*, ed. William Kaplan (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1993) 349.

²⁵ John Leslie, “Assimilation, integration, or termination? The development of Canadian Indian policy—1943-1963,” diss., Carleton University, 1999.

predecessors. This change came at a time when the federal government realized the inefficacy of segregation assimilation policies, and was faced with the fact that First Nations populations were booming.²⁶ Whereas segregation was premised on the commonly held view that the Indian was “vanishing,” integration was premised on the reality that their population was actually growing. It would appear that the distinction between segregation and integration policies reveals a major cleavage within the period known as simply as “Assimilation.” This thesis will attempt to shine a light into this dark crevice of Canadian history. What drove post-WWII policy to be different from pre-War policy? What distinctive assimilative strategies emerged from the post-WWII period? How might these call into question later characterizations of Canadian and First Nations state-relations? This thesis will, in part, help to answer these questions. Before tackling these important questions, this thesis will first discuss the history of Indian education policy in Canada.

Historical Context

Where does it all begin? In the Barman et al. classic *Indian Education*, the authors make reference to the Eurocentric education of First Nations people beginning in the 16th century.²⁷ Although unclear, this could be a reference to Jacques Cartier’s kidnapping and “education” of Stadaconnan men Taignoagny and Domagaya in 1536.²⁸ A more precise time frame is given by historian Olive Dickason who argues that the official colonial education of First Nations people began in New France during the early 17th century. According to Dickason, “when the French returned to Quebec after their temporary eviction by the

²⁶ These statements will be qualified with greater detail in the next section of the thesis.

²⁷ Barman et al., 1: 3

²⁸ Olive P. Dickason, *The Myth of the Savage: And the beginnings of French Colonialism in the Americas* (Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 1997) 169.

English, 1629-32, they prepared for an all out offensive against the religious beliefs of the their Amerindian allies.”²⁹ Day schools were started by the Jesuits, Recollets, and Capuchins as early as 1632, in order to “capture the young minds” of Aboriginal children.³⁰ In conjunction with Dickason’s assertions, long-time education division director of Indian Affairs R.F. Davey also pointed to the mid-17th century as the beginning of Eurocentric education for the First Nations. Ursaline sisters, according to Davey, were responsible for the education of young Aboriginal girls in integrated boarding schools: “French and Indian girls were brought up together in a boarding school. The primary aims were to convert the Indian children to Christianity and the French way of Life.”³¹ Doubtless, it was important for the French to embark on this “mission” of education during the hey-day of imperialism in order to establish a strong French presence in the “New World.”

In terms of Eurocentric education policy, two important and long lasting themes emerged from this period. Religious and cultural assimilation seem to have been the underpinnings of the educational discourse. The French hoped to ally with the First Nations through the Roman Catholic Church whilst attempting to cultivate a colony of French speaking, French living, hybrids. Education policy was the bastion of the imperial policy focused on the purpose of securing land against other interests—namely British interests. This early attempt at assimilation of the First Nations, however, was too localized to be successful against a flourishing and dominant Aboriginal cultural presence.³²

²⁹ Dickason, *The Myth of the Savage* 251.

³⁰ Dickason, *The Myth of the Savage* 258.

³¹ R.F. Davey, “The Enrolment of Indian Children in Provincial Schools,” *The Indian Superintendent 1965: The Education of Indian Children in Canada*, ed. Indian Affairs, Education Division (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965)

³² Dickason, *The Myth of the Savage* 270.

The French were never overly forceful nor successful in their attempts at administering a European education to the Aboriginal people in New France. After the defeat of the French in 1760, the British began the process of colonizing what now is called Canada, and by 1763, a Royal Proclamation was issued that defined, in part, the relationship between the Crown and the First Nations as a treaty of contractual commonwealth. It is well documented, and perhaps best by historian Robert S. Allen in his book *His Majesty's Indian Allies*, that the British relied heavily upon the goodwill and military alliance of First Nations people until the early 19th century.³³ The British colonization, therefore, did not signify a serious shift in the attempt, or a success in the administration of a foreign education to First Nations children. In fact, the programme of Christian conversion and Euro-assimilation never reached much further than the act of persuasion.³⁴ For these reasons, "Co-operation" best describes state relations during this period.

Most historians concur that in the period from 1760 to approximately 1850, Aboriginal people recognized that there was value in learning a European curriculum, and some freely chose to have their children attend white schools. Their goal for this education was to ensure that they could sustain a balanced relationship with settlers in a growing Euro-Canadian environment. Barman et al. argue that this situation lasted until at least the 1850s.³⁵ The end of this phenomenon coincided with an increased European settlement of Canada, and a decline in the need for Aboriginal military alliance.³⁶ Despite the lessening dependence on Aboriginal alliance, there are several instances of communities applying for

³³ Robert S. Allen, *His Majesty's Indian Allies: British Indian Policy in the Defence of Canada, 1774-1815* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1992).

³⁴ J.R. Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 18.

³⁵ Barman et al., 1: 5.

³⁶ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 103.

and receiving grants to attend provincial schools, and in the case of Chief Joseph Brant, a grant to build an Aboriginal-run school on what is now the Six Nations reserve at Brantford.³⁷ According to historian John Milloy, moreover, “the nation to nation status quo was maintained even after 1830” and lasted until the major constitutional reorganization at Confederation.³⁸ Indian education policy, much like Indian policy in general during this era, was in a process of reorganization and largely left to the developing practices of a dominant non-Aboriginal society.

The 1830s and 1840s were not entirely bereft, however, of the assimilationist policies which would come to dominate the post-Confederation period. Experiments in “protection”—first begun by the Royal Proclamation—were extended with the beginnings of the reserve system in the 1830s. According to John L. Tobias, Imperial officials used the reserve system “...as a social laboratory, where the Indian could be prepared for coping with the European.”³⁹ This policy quickly expanded, and hence defiled the traditional relationship of “co-operation.” “No longer,” according to Tobias was the intention “simply to teach the Indian how to cope with persons of European ancestry; he was to become European and fully assimilated into the colonial society.”⁴⁰ It was hardly surprising therefore, that the Bagot Commission report on Indian Affairs in 1842 recognized education as the most important *modus operandi* for the project of civilization and assimilation.⁴¹ Attitudes of this type were largely spurred by the belief that Aboriginal people were a “vanishing race” in need of

³⁷ Davey, *The Indian Superintendent* 1.

³⁸ John S. Milloy, “The Early Indian Acts: Developmental Strategy and Constitutional Change,” *Sweet Promises: A Reader on Indian-White Relations in Canada*, ed. JR. Miller (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991) 146.

³⁹ Tobias, 129.

⁴⁰ Tobias, 130.

⁴¹ J.S. Milloy, *A National Crime* Refer to Chapter 2.

“protection.” Grounded in the bias of European ethnocentricity, successive colonial and Dominion legislatures took steps toward creating a broad-based paternal relationship with the First Nations. Hence this period (1830-1867) oversees two common eras, that of “protection” and also “civilization.”

In 1867, under the auspices of section 91(24) of the British North America Act, the newly formed Canadian government assumed responsibility for “Indians and lands reserved for Indians.”⁴² Within the first two years of Confederation, the Canadian government began legislating for the First Nations—in apparent contradiction to the Royal Proclamation—and in 1869, passed the Gradual Enfranchisement Act which formalized the Canadian policy of assimilation.⁴³ In 1876, the Canadian government passed the Indian Act to consolidate and expand regulations affecting First Nations. Sections 114-123 of the Act dealt explicitly with the administration of education by the Canadian government to First Nations. These sections were obviously intended for the sole purpose of assimilation.⁴⁴

In conjunction with the Indian Act was the treaty making process. This process had begun with the Robinson treaties in 1850 and continued in the numbered treaties from 1871 until 1921. Education provisions were an integral part of many treaties, and can be understood from two perspectives. From the government’s perspective, the treaties were an inexpensive, and legally efficient method of extinguishing Aboriginal title in advance of Canadian settlement.⁴⁵ Olive Dickason describes the government’s purpose for the treaties

⁴² British North America Act quoted in Olive P. Dickason, *Canada's First Nations* 231.

⁴³ Milloy, *A National Crime* 20.

⁴⁴ Dickason, *Canada's First Nations*, 258-59. The entire Indian Act was designed for the sole purpose of assimilation

⁴⁵ A good overview of this period is found in Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens*, 103-124.

as a “...once-and-for-all means of opening up Indian lands for settlement and development.”⁴⁶ Education provisions, in this light, were most likely interpreted by the federal government to mean education for “civilization” and “assimilation.” A differing view of the treaties, however, emerges from the First Nations perspective. According to historian J.R. Miller, “to them the treaties were intended to be contracts of friendship, peace, and mutual support.”⁴⁷ In terms of the provisions, Dickason points out that “in their view, treaties were a means by which they would be able to adapt to the demands of the contemporary world within the framework of their own traditions.”⁴⁸ In short, First Nations viewed education provisions as they always had—as a means to balance the growing differences in power relations between the two groups. On the other hand, the federal government entrenched their paternalistic role by providing education.

In his article “Restructuring First Nation Education,” James Ryan, with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, argues that the education provisions in the Indian Act and treaties established a system of educational governance: a system of governance through which First Nations people could be manipulated and assimilated into Canadian society. “In particular,” according to Ryan, “the Indian Act, itself part of the hierarchical relationship between Natives and Non-Natives, further extends the right of Educators to establish other hierarchies and pedagogical practices that pass on messages of inferiority to Native Peoples.”⁴⁹ Initially, however, the Indian Act and treaties had little bite in terms of forcing First Nations to accept Eurocentric education. The policy, as it was in pre-Confederation

⁴⁶ Dickason, *Canada's First Nations* 250.

⁴⁷ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 219.

⁴⁸ Dickason, *Canada's First Nations* 250.

⁴⁹ James Ryan, “Restructuring First Nations’ Education: Trust, Respect and Governance,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 25.2 (Summer 1996): 118.

days, remained one of persuasion and not coercion. Change was quick to follow on the heels of both the Davin Commission report in 1879, and the perceived threat of Native unrest to the project of nation building in the 1880s.⁵⁰

Although industrial and boarding schools operated prior to the Davin Report, recommendations therein gave direct impetus to the introduction of a more formalized, systematic, and widespread application of what became known as residential schooling as a tool of assimilation.⁵¹ It was at this time that the Canadian government began a formal relationship with the churches which came to operate the schools. Victorian thinking dictated that good citizens could be created through the influence of a zealous Christian education.⁵² Milloy also argues that “the role of religion was key...” in the eyes of officials, “...in this process of cultural replacement...”⁵³ The RCAP, in addition, argues that the

...schools were more than a component in the apparatus of social construction and control. They were part of a process of nation building and the concomitant marginalization of Aboriginal communities.⁵⁴

The goal of residential schooling was “education in the service of assimilation.”⁵⁵ The salience of Christian and cultural assimilation as themes of education policy remained important during this era with the added theme of nation building. Placed under the aegis of federal education policy, First Nations children were to be removed, re-socialized, and then re-introduced as “civilized” members of the emerging Canadian society.⁵⁶

⁵⁰ Dickason, *Canada's First Nations* 293.

⁵¹ J.R. Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996) 102, and Milloy, *A National Crime* 32.

⁵² Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision* 102-03.

⁵³ Milloy, *A National Crime* 36.

⁵⁴ RCAP, 334.

⁵⁵ RCAP, 337.

⁵⁶ RCAP, 337.

Aside from the ever-present influence of Christian and cultural assimilation, the project of nation-building, by the mid 19th century, was increasingly defined by economic assimilation. Between the Bagot and Davin commissions, a move toward training First Nations children for participation in the Canadian workforce became a firmly established goal of Indian policy. According to Miller, the objective of education became the creation of “successful farmers and artisans.”⁵⁷ In some ways, this policy seems to have been related to an earlier French policy, adopted during the 17th century, that aimed to assimilate First Nations into a more sedentary way of life.⁵⁸ By the time of residential schools, however, the idea of turning First Nations children into good economic citizens was a firmly established discourse. The policy of the “Bible and the Plough,” as this discourse became known, was an attempt to prepare First Nations children for economic participation in the dominant society.⁵⁹ In fact, residential school curriculum was designed to reflect the importance of both a Christianity and an occupational work ethic. In this vein, schools operated on the “half day” system during which half of the day was supposed to be dedicated to religious and academic schooling, and the remaining half to farming and trades training.⁶⁰

The turn of the twentieth century witnessed a thorough extension of assimilative Indian policy masked in the guise of “protecting” First Nations. It is important to point out that the First Nations were widely held by non-Aboriginals to be a “vanishing race.”⁶¹ Where there had been some thought in the past that Christian-educated First Nations children

⁵⁷ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 132. Miller provides an excellent account of this era in Indian policy on pages 125-147.

⁵⁸ For additional information refer to Dicauxon, *The Myth of the Savage* 264.

⁵⁹ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 254-282.

⁶⁰ An excellent description of this system is provided by historians J.S. Milloy and J.R. Miller in their respective surveys on the topic *A National Crime*, and *Shingwauk's Vision*.

would bring “civilizing” values back into the Aboriginal community, the belief in this era was that children needed to be separated from the ill-influence of their parents’ dying culture.⁶² In 1920, schooling was made mandatory for all First Nations children. The ultimate goal of assimilation, and the assiduous use of segregated denominational education, was pursued officially until 1945. By WWII, residential schooling was used across most of Canada as the primary mechanism for assimilating First Nations children.

The pre-WWII environment was dominated by policies of Christianization, citizenship, and nation building in which First Nations people were considered to be “wards” of the state. Educational policies played a key role in this project. In the words of Dickason, “The intensity and duration of the campaign to capture Indian minds and hearts reflects the importance accorded to this aspect of nation building.”⁶³ Education continued to play an important role in Indian policy following WWII, and was pursued with no less an intensity. “For the government,” according to Dickason, “the goal continued to be assimilation, or as it was worded, transformation from the status of wards to that of full citizenship, but by encouragement as the original Act of 1876 had aimed for rather than the compulsion that characterized the amendments between 1880-1951.”⁶⁴ There are several influences in the post WWII political environment that brought about this shift in federal Indian education policy discourse.

⁶¹ An ethnocentric term used to describe the theory that First Nations were a primitive people doomed to extinction.

⁶² *RCAP*, 338.

⁶³ Dickason, *Canada's First Nations* 314.

⁶⁴ Dickason, *Canada's First Nations* 304.

Post-WWII Political Environment

One major influence on Indian education policy in the post-WWII period was the government's realization that the portents of so many officials had come true: residential education was wholly inadequate. Not only did it fail to meet its goal of assimilating First Nations children, it had contributed to the most horrible of human suffering and misery. In his aptly titled book *A National Crime*, John Milloy clearly illustrates how the dismal failure of pre-WWII policy finally culminated and forced the government to reconstruct Indian education.⁶⁵

Another important influence from the political environment revealed the irony of the government's ethnocentric assumptions about First Nations vitality. As it turned out, the "vanishing" Indian was not vanishing at all. Miller argues, "A growing Indian population meant that policies predicated on the eventual disappearance of Indian had become fatuous."⁶⁶ Indeed, following WWII, there was a dramatic Native population boom. This rise in population combined with a growing demand from First Nations peoples to remedy the failure of pre-WWII education policy. The rising cost of providing social services, such as education, was also compounded by the growing status Indian population. This forced the government to look for alternate methods of providing these services.⁶⁷

Growing public awareness of human rights, and the emergence of the idea of the "global village" also had important influences on this period of Indian policy. According to educator Jean Barman, this world-wide phenomenon created an environment in which Canadians would no longer tolerate the horrid treatment traditionally received by First

⁶⁵ Milloy, *A National Crime*.

⁶⁶ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 314.

⁶⁷ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 314.

Nations.⁶⁸ Shaped by the discourse on human rights, and also by the civil rights movements of the 1960's, Canadians became more aware of their social responsibilities.⁶⁹ "It was impossible not to notice", as Miller points out, "that the bases of Canadian Indian policy lay in assumptions about the moral and economic inferiority of particular racial groupings."⁷⁰ Later, amidst the turmoil of the American civil rights movement, "thoughtful Canadians" were forced to consider "how long Canada could continue treating native communities as internal colonies."⁷¹ This was an era when the liberal discourse of "equality" was echoing throughout the western world.

It is apparent that during the post-WWII period, the ideals of liberalism—liberty of opportunity, open-mindedness, moderation, and toleration—were informing the development of governance in a modern Canadian state.⁷² Examples of this influence include the Canadian government's criticism of apartheid in South Africa, and Prime Minister Diefenbaker's development of the Canadian "Bill of Rights."⁷³ Hand in hand with the discourse on fairness and equality, prominent in the liberal discourse, was the development of Canada into a more secularized, modern society. As Canada stripped its British colonial veneer, people began to search for ways to establish a Canadian identity. In this vein, the Canada Citizenship Act of 1947 extended true Canadian citizenship for the first time. In addition, the idea of creating a more tolerant Canada seemed to hasten the emergence of

⁶⁸ Barman et al., 1: 15.

⁶⁹ Weaver, 12-15

⁷⁰ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 324.

⁷¹ Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens* 328, and Weaver, 12-15.

⁷² Richard Sigurdson, "First Peoples, New Peoples and Citizenship in Canada," *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 14 (1996): 55. In addition, for a good explanation of liberalism in Canadian society see Whittington and Van Loon, 98-105.

multiculturalism as a “meaningful concept within Canada’s political discourse,”⁷⁴ according to sociologist Richard Sigurdson. This thesis will, therefore, evaluate the effect of liberalism on the construction of Canadian citizenship as it was extended to First Nations people in the post-WWII period.

There are other factors that influenced policy making during this period. No less than three major studies of Indian policy were conducted between 1946 and 1966—one every ten years. Special Joint Committees of the Senate and House of Commons met in 1947-49 and 1959-61 to discuss the restructuring of Indian policy. The former committee contributed to the major revision of the Indian Act in 1951. The term major revision may be somewhat misleading according to Miller, since:

The extensive revision of the Indian Act in 1951 left the inadequate education structures of the Indian Affairs Branch intact and the assimilative purpose of the school system unchallenged. The Special Joint Committee had recommended that the education clauses of the Indian Act be revised in order to prepare Indian children to take their place as citizens and that whenever and wherever possible Indian children should be educated in association with other children.⁷⁵

The most important thing to observe about the policy wording of this first Special Joint Committee is the transition in discourse from wardship to citizenship, and the change of assimilation to integration. Although assimilative practices clearly continued, something new seemed to emerge from Indian Affairs by the late 1940s.

⁷³ John Leslie, 320. In addition, an good overview of the post-WWII period is provided by J.M. Bumstead, *A History of the Canadian Peoples*, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1998) 303-362.

⁷⁴ Sigurdson, 55.

⁷⁵ Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision* 389.

A New Perspective

Although the federal government turned their attention towards an official policy of integration, assimilation seemed apparent in the new discourse on Indian education. This alteration in focus coincided with other important events. Integrated provincial schools, as Milloy points out, slowly replaced segregated residential schools as they signaled the end to residential education altogether.⁷⁶ Hand in hand with residential school closure was the termination of the long standing-relationship between church and state, addressed by both Miller and Milloy.⁷⁷ Clearly, as the federal government attempted to devolve responsibility of Indian education to provincially run schools, the churches were dealt a serious blow. In short, their role as administrators and educators of the Indian education system was in jeopardy from provincial jurisdiction. Evident from this short overview of the political environment should be that the traditional themes behind Indian education policy—Christianization, citizenship, and nation building—all appeared to undergo significant change during the post-WWII period. In fact, Christianization seemed to be completely dropped from official discourse while citizenship and nation building apparently assumed different meanings. Was there a new conception of assimilation emerging from these changes?

To date, very little historical study has been devoted to this era, other than the general surveys of Olive Dickason and J.R. Miller, and the recent dissertation by John Leslie. From a different perspective, sociologists Floras and Elliot use a slightly different periodization in order to argue that there have really been no changes over time in government Indian policy because a relationship of internal colonialism underlies the entire period. Since Confederation, Floras and Elliot point to three periods: segregation, wardship, and protection

⁷⁶ Milloy, *A National Crime* 189.

(1867-1945); integration and “formal” equality (1945-1973); and limited autonomy (1973 to present).⁷⁸ More specifically, they call the 1945-74 period “Canadianization.”⁷⁹ Put simply, these scholars recognize the unique nature of the normative discourse of Canadian citizenship as it pertained to First Nations people in the post-WWII period. This thesis will evaluate the relative merits of the “Canadianization” model.

Although education theory was discussed above, it is useful to consolidate its importance to the study of “Canadianization.” Educational discourse is a revealing site to study the vicissitudes of federal Indian policy. According to educator David G. Perley, “mainstream educational institutions are sites for the cultural transmission of hegemonic ideologies and knowledge in the structuring of society along race/ethnic, gender, sexuality, ability, and class lines.”⁸⁰ By analyzing educational discourse, one pries at the very root of social construction. Changes to federal Indian policy and the relative discourse of wardship to citizenship should, therefore, be particularly noticeable here. In the same vein, evidence of change to the social construction of citizenship in post-WWII Canada should also be evident because as Manzer points out,

Public education can be designed as civic education to serve the formation of political nationality and the preservation of political order. Especially under the liberal democratic conception of political order based on representative government, public education is assigned the vital task of teaching the moral standards of the community and the rights and duties of democratic citizenship.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Miller, *Shingwauk's Vision*, and Milloy, *A National Crime*.

⁷⁸ Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliot, *The Nations Within: Aboriginal-State Relations in Canada, the United States and New Zealand* (Toronto: University of Oxford Press, 1992) 39.

⁷⁹ Fleras and Eliot, 42.

⁸⁰ David G. Perley, “Aboriginal education in Canada as Internal Colonialism,” *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 20.1 (1999): 56.

⁸¹ Manzer, 96.

From this perspective, education can be understood as an important tool in the process of “Canadianization”: the process of creating Canadian citizens. The question to be answered, then, is whether or not Indian education had this purpose.

Prior to WWII, Indian education was carried out primarily in denominational residential schools. Its purpose was to assimilate First Nations children into the dominant white, western cultural, political, and economic order. In the words of Sigurdson:

Historically, government policy reflected the opinion of the majority that its values and institutions were superior to all others. At the federal level, government-minority relations were structured along lines of assimilation and absorption into the British North American/Anglo Canadian identity.⁸²

This evaluation of Indian education policy during the 1945-1969 period will attempt to understand whether integration signified a shift in purpose from pre-WWII assimilationist policies. Is there evidence in federal Indian education policy discourse of a transition from wardship to citizenship, characterized by a project of civic education, serving the formation of a specific Canadian identity? If so, how did this affect the preservation of the established white, western order?

⁸² Sigurdson, 55.

CHAPTER 2

Citizens Both Now and In The Future: Civic Education for First Nations Children— 1945 to 1958

In 1956, a regional inspectors conference was held by Indian Affairs in Ottawa. The topic of the meeting, chaired by the Director of Indian Affairs, H.M. Jones, was the “aims of the Branch with respect to education.” In relation to education, Jones spoke at length on the matter of integration versus assimilation. At one point, he attempted to explain the difference between the two policies.

The Director explained that the Department did not consider the term “integration” to be synonymous with “assimilation.” It is the aim of the Branch to assist the Indians in the matter of education, health, earning a living, social development, etc., until the Indians reached a comparable standard with the rest of the population in Canada in order that the Indian may take his place as an Indian with other citizens of this country.¹

What did he mean by “take his place with other citizens of this country?” The answer to this question is as integral to the definitions of assimilation and integration as it will be to the findings of this thesis.

Immediately following WWII, the federal government began to re-think and re-formulate Indian policy. At the heart of this process was the Special Joint Committee of Senate and House of Commons that met to discuss revising the Indian Act, leading to the eventual revision of the Act in 1951. For all intents and purposes, however, very little changed about the Act. In fact, it was almost identical to the original legislation passed in 1876. Its intended purpose remained the termination of Indian status and enfranchisement of

¹NAC RG 10, vol. 8576, File 1/1-2-2-21, MR C-14215103, Regional Inspectors Conference Minutes, November 23, 1956, 4.

First Nations people. Jurisdiction over education stayed under federal control, and mandatory schooling for First Nations children 16 years of age and under continued as official policy. Despite a relatively unchanged Indian Act, however, the winds of change were sweeping through the hallways at Indian Affairs.

In January of 1950, the Indian Affairs Branch was switched from the Department of Mines and Resources to the newly created Department of Citizenship and Immigration. From 1945 to 1958, the Department underwent no less than seven changes of leadership including Ministers J.A. Glenn, J.A. MacKinnon, C.W.G. Gibson, W.E. Harris, J.W. Pickersgill, E.D. Fulton, and E.L. Fairclough. The Department had a change of directorship as well when B.F. Neary was replaced by H.M. Jones. Education, which started out under the Superintendancy of B.F. Neary in the Welfare Division, was quickly given its own mandate under R.F. Davey in 1953.

While on one hand Indian Affairs was undergoing significant administrative change, on the other, the policy discourse was also shifting. Although the bread and butter of the policy, assimilation, seemed to remain an integral part of Indian Affairs philosophy, it was officially ended in favour of integration. In particular, for the first time since the Davin report, segregated educational policies were dropped in favour of integrated education. For example, the practice of isolating First Nations children in residential schools was eliminated to make room for a practice of incorporating First Nations children into provincial schools. The Department, as a result, turned toward the provinces with the expectation that they would shoulder some measure of the integration burden. In the realm of education, as with social services in general, the federal government began to develop strategies for providing joint services. First Nations children were not only encouraged, but also forced, to attend

provincial schools. The policy signaled the beginning of the end for the egregious residential school system, and also seemed to hasten the breakdown of the church-state relationship in regards to education administration. Finally, as discussed in Chapter 1, the integration era was regarded as a time when the focus on First Nations people as wards was quickly turning to the percept of citizenship. Therefore, the discourse surrounding integrated education seemed to emerge after WWII into a policy community fresh with new ideas.

In light of these developments, some questions must be tackled to establish if the post-WWII period in Indian policy truly constituted a unique era in the Canadian and First Nations state-relationship. Is there evidence of a significant change to Indian policy involving the discourses of assimilation, wardship, and citizenship? Does a specific vision of Canadian citizenship arise from this discourse? This chapter will attempt to answer these questions by evaluating relevant documentation from the immediate post-WWII era from 1945-1958.

In 1946, the Minister of Mines and Resources—the person responsible for Indian Affairs—J.A. Glenn, promised a “New Deal” for Aboriginal people.² To develop this so-called “New Deal,” Glenn surveyed Indian Agents from across Canada, and solicited their advice on how to proceed with Indian Affairs in the post-WWII world. There was “a steadily awakening interest on the part of the general public...” according to Glenn, that demanded First Nations be given “...the rights, duties and responsibilities of democratic citizenship.”³ This consultation process foreshadowed the changes that lay ahead for Indian Affairs. In fact, it set the tone for the next 30 years of Indian policy. The pressure to create a more just

² NAC RG 10, vol. 6811, File 470-3-7, MR C-8534, J.A. Glenn to Indian Agents, 1946.

³ Ibid.

and democratic Canada, as well as the call for citizenship are clearly evident in Glenn's language, and became essential new components in the discourse on Indian policy.

Judging from their responses, it was the first time in many years that the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs had initiated direct dialogue with the Agents. In his letter to the Agents, Glenn revealed that the discourse on First Nations people was changing from one of wardship, to one of citizenship. Glenn's letter seemed to indicate that the long-time goal of cultural assimilation was changing. But changing to what end? The letter asked the Agents to comment on three particular areas: i) the distrust between Indians and the Indian Affairs branch; ii) the possibility of "self-help" for Indians; and iii) the possibility of extending provincial services to Indians.⁴

Glenn's initial letter seemed to foster an air of confidence between the distant Agents and Ottawa, and therefore, the Agents' responses to the Minister's queries were likely reasonably candid. Overall, the responses to the Minister seem to indicate that the Agents supported the new policy of integration and extension of provincial services, particularly in education policy. According to R. Howe, an Indian agent from Vanderhooft, BC, carrying out "...a successful programme for their welfare and advancement" was still an important goal of Indian policy. In terms of education, he continued: "I would also suggest, whenever possible, that Indian children attend white day schools. Despite some opinions to the contrary, I find that contact with whites hastens progress and greatly improves their mode of living."⁵ The words "advancement" and "progress" clearly illustrate an attitude of cultural intolerance commonly associated with assimilationist discourse. Although Howe clearly

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ NAC RG 10, vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, R. Howe to J.A. Glenn, February 4, 1946.

argues in favour of physically integrating First Nations, his tone seems to suggest that the goal of cultural assimilation be maintained. Noticeably absent from Howe's remarks is the pre-WWII emphasis on religious instruction. Howe, instead, seems particularly interested in the physical and economic welfare of First Nations.

Others were more cautious in their support of the idea of extending provincial education to Aboriginal children. In his letter to Glenn, Agent A.C. Smith recommended, "The extension services operated by the province could be utilized on the Reserves providing only the most simple courses were used."⁶ Weighing heavily in his commentary was the opinion that "Teaching the duties of citizenship should be stressed in all Indian schools."⁷ Once again, the pre-WWII focus on Christian instruction is absent from this Agent's letter. Unlike Howe, though, the remarks made by Smith focus on citizenship. It is not surprising, although it is of some importance to note, that this particular focus, at this particular time was cutting edge—The transition from wardship to citizenship in Indian policy is well documented.

The shift from wardship to citizenship is also illustrated by those agents, like T.J. Orford from Moose Factory, Ontario, who disagreed with Glenn's suggestion to extend provincial services. Orford warned that the Department had special responsibilities to First Nations people regardless of the benefits of provincial integration and added that "While I am aware of excellent Provincial extension services, I am more of the opinion that we should use them in advisory capacities rather than as active participants."⁸ Indian Agent N.J.

⁶ NAC RG 10, vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, A.C. Smith to J.A. Glenn, January 23, 1946.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ NAC RG 10, vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, T.J. Orford to J.A. Glenn, February 1, 1946.

McLeod from Duck Lake, Saskatchewan, was more forthcoming about his objections regarding the use of provincial extension services such as education. McLeod warned the government that the Indian education system needed to be

...entirely free from the supervision of Provincial Public School inspectors who invariably have no experience or proper knowledge of Indian ways and capabilities to absorb the teachings imparted to them under Provincial Department of Education regulations.⁹

Although they disagreed with Glenn's plan for joint-education, their correspondence reveals the debate over the changing nature of Indian policy during the post-WWII period. What clues do the Agents leave with regards to how they perceived this so-called citizenship? How was citizenship defined?

McLeod's letter provides evidence of how at least one Agent saw the transition from wardship to citizenship. His response reveals a conflict over how Indian policy should change. Judging from his comments on provincial school inspectors, McLeod appears to recognize the inability of a provincial education system to meet the curricular or pedagogical needs of Aboriginal children. A later remark uncovers an additional concern with regards to this transition:

...they [Aboriginal people] are definitely of the belief and knowledge that the Provincial government of any province is not in a position to arrange for their welfare nor assist them in needy circumstances.¹⁰

McLeod seems to be concerned about the financial ramifications of devolving services such as education to provincial control. In some respects, McLeod appears to argue in favour of maintaining a paternalistic relationship so as to ensure the provision of specialized social services to First Nations.

⁹ NAC RG 10, vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, N.J. McLeod to J.A. Glenn, January 20, 1946.

It is unlikely, however, that McLeod was interested in maintaining a policy of wardship. From the following comments, it seems that he was only arguing in favour of moderating a potentially rapid transition to citizenship. In his words: "We must bear in mind that our Indians are still in a transitory stage..."¹¹ Apparently, this Agent was not convinced that First Nations people were ready for the full responsibilities of Canadian citizenship. It could also indicate that this Agent was unsure if travelling the road from wardship to citizenship would require any cultural baggage. In other words, was cultural assimilation to play a role in the development of a Canadian political identity?

It is not clear whether McLeod knew the answer to this question. Although he seemed preoccupied with slowing the transition from wardship to citizenship he also wrote that nothing must cloud "...the viewpoint of Indians towards their rightful place as citizens of this great Dominion."¹² The phrase "rightful place" suggests an underlying tone of justice while the phrase "citizens of this great Dominion" suggests that citizenship was analogous to becoming Canadian in a political sense—the same as other citizens. Of particular interest about McLeod's correspondence is that it seems to reveal quite nicely an awkward transition in policy discourse at Indian Affairs: a transition from wardship to citizenship.

Just as the education sector was a key area for the assimilation policy of the Canadian government, education remained a key focus during the early discussions on integration policy—a policy thus far defined by its move toward extending citizenship to First Nations. What seems to change in this process is the perspective that Indians were like children in need of special care—wards. At the heart of this change were Indian agents like J.E. Daly

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

who argued that, “The Indian in order to survive must become a self supporting reliable Canadian citizen...”¹³ Daly concluded that the best way to achieve this outcome was to deliver an integrated education system similar to the one proposed by Glenn. Much like Daly, Agent A.D. Moore from Deseronto, Ontario stated that it was time for Aboriginal people to make the transition from wardship and “...accept their full responsibility as citizens, paying their own way.”¹⁴ Daly and Moore saw the “modernizing of schools”¹⁵ and the extension of provincial services as an effective means to this end. Moore went on to say that withholding integrated education “...is retarding their advance to obtain qualifications which will fit them for enfranchisement and full Canadian citizenship.”¹⁶ Their vision for education policy, as Moore put it, was to accept First Nations with “full citizenship rights as Canadians.”¹⁷ The attitudes of these Agents show apparent support for the extension of citizenship to First Nations, and the use of education as a means of instilling citizenship. What also seems to break through in their comments is an emphasis on citizenship that is defined as much by democratic and political parameters, as it is by the herald of economic self-sufficiency.

On one hand, the pre-WWII discourse that devalued First Nations cultures seemed to persist in the post-WWII period. On the other hand, the dialogue between the Minister and his Agents indicates two new themes related to citizenship. Judging from their correspondence, there seemed to be a particular emphasis on so-called democratic Canadian

¹³ NAC RG 10, vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, J.E. Daly, Indian Agent to J.A. Glenn, February 19, 1946.

¹⁴ NAC RG 10, vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, A.D. Moore to J.A. Glenn, January 25, 1946.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

participation in society. The language of this discourse seemed to position First Nations within the scope of normal Canadian citizenship—citizens like all others. The other significant theme seems to be economic self-sufficient participation in society. The language of this discourse apparently focused on the belief that citizenship is governed by the individual's ability to become gainfully employed. Absent from the discussion on citizenship, moreover, was the prevalent pre-WWII theme of Christianity. Combined with the political and economic themes, the absence of a Christian discourse seems to indicate that the nature of the proposed citizenship was secular, or civic. In addition, it seems clear that the men agreed with the use of joint-education to foster this civic identity. Just how extensive were the themes of political and economic identity in the Indian education policy discourse?

The Special Joint Committee of Senate and House of Commons: 1947-1949

When the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons (SJC) first met in 1947, it undertook the responsibility of searching out ways to reform the Indian Act. Testimony from Committee members and key witnesses appears to parallel the correspondence between Indian Agents and Minister Glenn. B.F. Neary, Superintendent of Welfare for Indian Affairs, testified that “in seeking to *improve* [my emphasis throughout] Indian education we are also seeking to *improve* the economic condition, the philosophy of life, the health and physique of the Canadian Indian.”¹⁸ Simply put, First Nations cultures continued to be perceived as something that was limiting their “development.” But “development” into what? What was the focus of this “development?”

¹⁸ Canada, Parliament, Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Indian Act [SJC], *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence 1947* [*Minutes 1947*], 330. (no. 7)

First, “development” was clearly bound to the extension of Canadian citizenship. Neary, in line with his contemporaries the Indian Agents, advocated the need for extending citizenship. “Worthy citizenship should be inculcated and good social customs should loom large during the school day.”¹⁹ By including “good social customs,” Neary seems to imply a very narrow definition of citizenship. In context, it is obvious that Neary was prioritizing the social customs of non-Aboriginal society, and possibly advocating their use as a tool of assimilation. Neary’s recommendations appear to preclude the very legitimacy of First Nations social practices. At the very least, his bias indicates what he saw as the acceptable social influences on the emerging ideal of Canadian citizenship. Furthermore, whereas the pre-WWII emphasis was on preparing First Nations students for eventual enfranchisement, post-WWII policy seemed to focus on the immediate establishment of citizenship. In the words of Neary, “Pupils should be taught to train themselves to the utmost of their abilities and to be prepared to accept their full responsibilities as citizens both now and in the future.”²⁰ What Neary seems to suggest, and what appeared in the Agents’ correspondence, is that First Nations children should be treated as all other children—as citizens both now and in the future. Also of interest is the fact that these men did not seem to envision a First Nations cultural, or political contribution to the building of Canadian citizenship.

What lay behind this move to extend Canadian citizenship? Neary’s testimony reveals an attempt to reconcile citizenship with the post-WWII liberal discourse on democracy and human rights. Whereas pre-WWII Indian policy was in line with cultural assimilation and the preservation of a white, western cultural order, the post-WWII period seemed more concerned with creating a political state of affairs in which all individual

¹⁹ *SJC, Minutes 1947*, 332. (no. 7)

members of society were inherently equal. The type of cultural conservatism associated with the pre-WWII period seemed to give way to a philosophy that sponsored liberty of choice in terms of cultural affiliation. As stated by Neary:

In a modern democracy it is readily agreed that everyone should be able to read, write, spell fairly well and do simple arithmetic. It is fundamental that the principles of morality should be firmly established...Pupils must be taught to be open minded, tolerant, co-operative, respect constituted authority and learn to become good citizens.²¹

As presented in the sensitive language of tolerance and practical educational theory, Neary seems to indicate that the primary focus of post-WWII “citizenship” was on preparing First Nations students to be literate and numerate members of society. Noticeably absent from his comments is any attention to religious indoctrination or outright cultural assimilation. In addition, and with even greater subtlety, his testimony seems to reveal an attempt to position First Nations within a new conception of the state-relationship. With reference to “modern democracy,” “constituted authority,” and “good citizens,” Neary seems to imply that integrated education would help to establish First Nations people as full equals, without the need for special treatment or consideration.

Neary repeatedly used this friendly language. “Co-operation” and “mutual understanding” are key phrases used by the senior bureaucrat in describing the ideal educational system:

Yet, we are firmly convinced that it is to the benefit of all concerned that the Indian child should take his secondary education *along with* [my emphasis throughout] the white child. We feel that he should sit in the *same* classroom, play on the *same* teams and engage in all school activities *along with* the boys and girls who will later become the merchants, doctors, nurses, etc., of the community in which the Indian

²⁰ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 333. (no. 7)

²¹ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 333. (no. 7)

will live. It is felt that only by *mutual understanding* will come *mutual co-operation*.²²

These comments also highlight the influence of a liberal discourse on equality, as evidenced in the excessive use of the terms “same” and “along with.” Yet, Neary’s commitment to “mutual understanding” and “co-operation” was diminished by the inadequacy of post-WWII liberal theory to account for its inherent proclivity toward protecting white, western culture. In short, Neary was unable to recognize that First Nations children were not the “same,” and that any attempt to integrate them without considering the relative cultural power relationship would result in a culturally assimilative educational experience. On a further note, the fact that Neary does not assign the roles of “merchants, doctors, nurses, etc.” to First Nations children, might suggest that he envisioned a vertical strata to citizenship; nonetheless, he does appear to place emphasis on participation in the workforce as a prerequisite to good Canadian citizenship.

Further evidence supports the supposition that cultural assimilation remained as an underlying goal of Indian policy. For example, Neary advocated that First Nations children should follow a Canadian way of life. “We are now encouraging in our schools” according to Neary,

extra –curricular activities of all kinds and descriptions, including the formation of athletic teams, Boy Scout and Girl Guide troops, student councils for self government, Cadets, Junior Red Cross Societies and similar organizations. These extra curricular activities offer to our Indian pupil training and develop his power of leadership and provide him with practice in developing the habits of “followership.”²³

Note that Neary neglects the possibility of a First Nations contribution to this project. This may indicate a white, western bias in his perception of a political Canadian citizenship. He

²² SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 334. (no. 7)

then ties this comment in with the post-WWII liberal discourse on equality by stating that, “A properly organized system of extracurricular activities enables a pupil to develop the habits of getting along with people as a member of a democratic society.”²⁴ Neary seems to outline a liberal individualist notion of universalist citizenship. In short, he seems to advocate a form of Canadian citizenship, based in western culture, that transcends First Nations cultures and establishes the citizen as a functional economic and political member of society. In this light, Neary seems to paint a picture of Canadian citizenship that excludes First Nations cultures and positions First Nations people as workers within the national economy.

Discussing the transition from wardship to citizenship was also an important element of the SJC's agenda. The prevailing committee attitude, regardless of witness testimony, was that First Nation's “development” could only be achieved through the extension of full and equal citizenship to Indians. According to Mr. Reid, an MP and committee member: “In assimilation there is too much paternalism. They are being treated as children all the time. No one can *develop* when he is treated that way and you will never *develop* Indians into normal citizens through that method.”(My emphasis)²⁵ Treat them as normal citizens is the recommendation that reads between the lines of Reid's comments. Under this context, the development of joint-schools, where First Nations students would literally receive the same treatment as other Canadians citizens, seems to fit with an agenda of terminating Indian status.

Although integrated education was supposedly the focus of post-WWII Indian education policy, there appears to be very little evidence that integration referred to anything

²³ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 336. (no. 7)

²⁴ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 336. (no. 7)

²⁵ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 692. (no. 13)

more than the physical process of moving First Nations children into provincial classrooms. In fact, the Special Joint Committee made very little effort to conceal assimilation as a goal of Indian education policy. An open exchange between the Chair of the SJC and Chief Lightening of the Alberta Indian Association illustrates this point:

Mr. Lightening: I looked at the Indian Act. You are given to understand, of course, that the Indian Act protects the Indian everywhere he turns. While that continues, and as long as we are talked about as wards of the government, we shall never be able to run our own business anyway.

The Chairman: You realize this, you have read the minutes and proceedings of this committee, but what we have been trying to do ever since we started has been to devise some scheme whereby we may have the Indians help themselves.

Mr. Lightening: Yes.

Chairman: We are most anxious to see that all Indians, that the entire Indian population of Canada is assimilated. You see what we are trying to do is revise the Indian Act so that it may lead to that end.

Mr. Lightening: Yes.²⁶

Assimilation is certainly the prominent focus of the preceding remarks; however, the focus on cultural and Christian assimilation from the pre-WII period does not appear in these comments. Instead, the reparté seems to provide further evidence that the nature of proposed citizenship was seen in terms of an economic identity, and in this case, such an identity appears to be based on the individual's ability to maintain economic self-sufficiency.

The SJC was the first official government study that actually made an effort to involve First Nations. Aboriginal participation, however, was limited largely to testimony. They were not involved as committee members, nor could they participate in the final recommendation process. It is difficult to speculate how the government's involvement in

selecting First Nations witnesses skewed the testimony. Band chiefs were heard but their authority was derived from the Indian Act. Indian associations were heard but their authority was questionable. Looking at the “Minutes of Proceedings” and the “Final Report,” though, one can make some general comments about Aboriginal participants. In no particular order: (1) Without First Nations participation, education would not have prevailed as a key point of the SJC’s discussion; (2) First Nations participants represented a country-wide cross section of nations and bands; and (3) Testimony and recommendations seemed to be split between those who were asking for better education, and those who wanted to use education for citizenship training.

The schism between the participants is interesting because it was so sharp. Especially important to this thesis is the testimony of First Nations representatives who advocated citizenship training. Regardless of their personal political agendas, or their legitimacy as spokespeople for their communities, the testimony of these men can be used to paint a clearer picture of how the policy community envisioned citizenship. Testimony from this group seems to support the interpretation of citizenship—exclusive of First Nations culture—hereto described. For example, Chief Teddy Yellowfly, from the Blackfoot Reserve in Gleichen, Alberta stated:

If the object is to educate and develop the Indians into good and useful Canadian citizens—that, I hope is the object—then you must think in broader terms than the three R’s. The spiritual, intellectual, moral, physical and recreational life of the Indian must be included and should be an essential part of any program designed to educate him.²⁷

By comparing the three R’s with the “spiritual, intellectual, moral, etc.” of Indian life, Yellowfly seems to argue that the white western paradigms of provincial education were

²⁶ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 702. (no. 13)

insufficient for the establishment of good citizenship. His recommendation, therefore, appears to be that effective citizenship training should incorporate a First Nations cultural perspective. By comparison, it suggests that the earlier interpretation of Neary's bias—that he did not envision a First Nations cultural contribution to Canadian citizenship—was correct. Whether or not Yellowfly was pointing to an underlying agenda of cultural assimilation in the provincial curriculum is not obvious; however, his comments clearly indicate what was not present in joint-schools: First Nations cultures.

Another of these witnesses was the Reverend Peter R. Kelly from the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia. Kelly began by outlining what he saw as three categories of Aboriginal people. The first was comprised of people who do not want "any advancement from the past" and "insist on being wards." The second was comprised of people "who want to be carried along on 'flowery beds of ease'," with privilege such as education but without the responsibilities of citizenship. Finally, the third group, in Kelly's words, could "appreciate all the advantages of civilization and realize that progress has its price." It was this third group that Kelly ultimately envisioned as the Indian of the future. "Obviously," according to Kelly,

it should be the objective of the Indians as well as the government by all means at their disposal by way of education and otherwise to bring all the Indians within the third category to the realization that to every right there is a corresponding duty. Then a beginning can be made towards citizenship followed by a transitional period of probation towards ultimate citizenship.²⁸

Kelly's comments seem to support the dominant view that First Nations needed to be developed. He uses the term "progress" to postulate that First Nations were culturally,

²⁷ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 551. (no. 12)

²⁸ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 777. (no. 16)

politically, and economically backward societies, and then concludes as did the Agents and other witnesses, that First Nations must be responsible with the same rights and duties as other Canadian citizens. Judging from his statements, progress must certainly be understood in terms of attaining and maintaining a degree of economic self-sufficiency adequate for participation in the dominant Canadian society. At the same time, Kelly's focus on progress, civilization, and liberal democratic values suggests that he saw economic and political citizenship within a dominant western cultural context.

The language of economic-self sufficiency and political participation continued to define Canadian citizenship. Evidence of this assertion appears from both governmental and non-governmental members of the policy community. The Committee on Indian Affairs for Eastern Quebec and the Maritimes submitted a report to the SJC calling for the government to create the conditions "so that the Indian can develop himself morally and economically and fit himself for eventual assimilation into full Canadian citizenship."²⁹ This same recommendation was submitted on the opposite coast by the Vancouver branch of the civil liberties union who wanted the government "to establish a state of affairs in which the Indians will stand in the same relationship to the government as do Canadian citizens in general."³⁰ Language such as this contributed to the normative definition of citizenship based on economic and political positioning within Canadian society. More specifically, the committee seems to emphasize Canadian citizenship within a political—rights based—and economic framework as opposed to culturally or religiously.

A new language to emerge from the SJC was found in the liberal discourse on choice. It was theorized that education should serve First Nations children by providing them with

²⁹ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 2013. (no. 41 Appendix)

the choice between accepting their traditional culture or adopting Canadian culture. This idea was expressed by the Vancouver Branch of the Civil Liberties Union. They recommended:

To educate, train and condition all Indians in such a manner—(1) That they shall be equipped adequately to maintain themselves in their own traditional economic activities or in new and modern ones, under the conditions of white competition. (2) That they shall both welcome and be equipped adequately to accept the rights, conditions and responsibilities of citizenship.³¹

Once again, citizenship figures prominently in the discourse but in this case, so too does the idea that First Nations could choose to live life based on their cultural traditions. This is a particularly good example of the discourse on choice because it is framed in terms of progress. In short, traditional life was viewed as backward. As opposed to real choice, it appears that the actual recommendation is for education to be used to show First Nations children a doorway to the future—the only logical doorway for them to take. Although First Nations culture does not come under formal attack, it certainly seems to be devalued by the recommendation. Also framed here is a definition of citizenship based on a paradigm of rights, conditions, and responsibilities to the greater Canadian society including both economic and political fealties.

Noticeably absent from the testimony in the “Minutes of Proceedings” and the “Final Report,” as far as education is concerned, is a Christian discourse. In fact, this once-dominant force behind Indian education policy was also absent from the prevailing descriptions of proposed Canadian citizenship. A final recommendation of the 1947 session, and the only one regarding education, appears to spell the end to co-operation between

³⁰ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 2021. (no. 41 Appendix)

³¹ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 2020. (no. 41 Appendix)

church and state. At the very least, it sets the stage for Indian Affairs to centralize control of education under the aegis of a federal-provincial relationship. The Committee recommended "...that all educational matters, including the selection and appointment of teachers in Indian schools be placed under the direct and sole responsibility of the Indian Affairs Branch."³² The Department seemed to be moving toward a more secularized approach to Indian policy: an approach that focussed much more attention on the political nature of citizenship.

The "Minutes of Proceedings" for the 1947 sessions of the SJC capture the changing nature of Indian policy in post-WWII Canada. Evidence presented in 1948, the final year of the SJC meetings, clearly demonstrates the depth to which the Canadian citizenship discourse had penetrated Indian education policy thinking. In the words of the "Final Report":

Your committee recommends the revision of those sections of the Act which pertain to Indian education, in order to prepare Indian children to take their place as citizens. Your committee, therefore, recommends that wherever and whenever possible Indian children should be educated in association with other children.³³

With this statement, the committee formally recommended the end to segregation and endorsed, with full-fledged support, integrated education policy. The subsequent adoption of this recommendation as official policy would seem to suggest that the new political view on citizenship was to be an integral component of Indian education policy.

This recommendation provided credibility to the Department's newly created policy of joint-schooling begun immediately following WWII. In fact, Dr. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, had testified to this during the hearings. While responding to the question "Is the building of Indian Day schools interfering with possible integrated education?" Keenleyside said, "We are not building Indian schools in any place where it is

³² SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 2004. (no. 41, Fourth Report)

possible for the Indian children there resident to go to an existing white school.”³⁴ The Department of Indian Affairs had already begun the process of integrated education before the SJC had even been convened. The recommendations of the SJC, in this light, seem to endorse, rather than create, the new policies of Indian Affairs. One sees, therefore, that very early on, Indian Affairs dominated the discourse on Indian education policy. In addition, the Department seems to have been responsible for identifying and developing the discourse on Canadian citizenship.

It is not surprising that the recommendations of the SJC were so closely allied with the new policies of the Department. The whole point of the SJC was to amend the Act so that Indian Affairs could more easily solve the so-called Indian problem. In short, its focus was on amending the Indian Act, not on amending Indian Affairs. In that vein, the preamble to the final recommendations is very telling: “All proposed revisions are designed to make possible the gradual transition of Indians from wardship to citizenship and to help them advance themselves.”³⁵ The purpose of the SJC was to recommend revisions to the Indian Act that would help the Department in reaching their apparent goal of terminating Indian status.

Also seen in the 1948 recommendations is the advent of a discourse on formalizing First Nations provincial citizenship.³⁶ In some ways, this move was foreshadowed by the notion of extending provincial services to First Nations on the same basis as other citizens. Up until WWII, the federal government maintained a significant degree of legislative

³³ SJC, *Minutes 1947*, 2004. (no. 41, Fourth Report)

³⁴ SJC, *Minutes 1948*, 47. (no. 2)

³⁵ SJC, *Minutes 1948*, 187. (no. 5, Report)

jurisdiction over First Nations. The delivery of social services, such as education, were carried out exclusively by the federal government.³⁷ In a move to end this practice, the committee recommended that education should top the list of

...certain aspects of Indian Affairs administration which perforce, require co-operation between Dominion and Provincial officials, to bring about the future economic assimilation of Indians into the body politic of Canada.³⁸

It is apparent that some in the policy community were attempting to break down the barriers that separated Indians from other citizens. Certainly, by extending provincial citizenship, First Nations would be one step closer to the full economic and political Canadian citizenship described hereto.

The final recommendations relating to dominion-provincial co-operation suggest that the transition from wardship to citizenship, and the extension of provincial citizenship was underscored by the transition from a cultural and religious Canadian identity to a political Canadian identity. The SJC's proposal for a new structure of governance stated that it should

...bring Indians within the scope of such provincial legislation, in order that there might be mutual and coordinated assistance to facilitate the Indians to become, in every respect, citizens proud of Canada and of the provinces in which they reside.³⁹

These final words must be seriously considered. Although ethnocentric attitudes may lie at the heart of the recommendation, the committee seems to rely on the power of civic pride, duty, and responsibility to qualify Canadian citizenship. Additionally, use of the term

³⁶ Although provincial citizenship does not exist in a strictly legal sense, this thesis proposes that provincial citizenship may be viewed as a Canadian social or regional construct.

³⁷ Except in Newfoundland where the Canadian government did not assume control until 1949.

³⁸ SJC, *Minutes 1948*, 189. (no. 5, Report)

³⁹ SJC, *Minutes 1948*, 190. (no. 5, Report)

“coordinated assistance” seems to suggest that the government saw the extension of provincial citizenship as a means of distributing the cost of Indian Affairs with the province; however, the emphasis of extending citizenship in “every respect” would apparently indicate the importance attached to the political ramifications of making First Nations into full Canadian citizens via their provincial citizenship.

Evidence found in the SJC documents and evaluated in this chapter suggests that there was an emergence of a post-WWII Canadian identity based on liberal discourse, equal rights, economic self-sufficiency, and provincial citizenship. In addition, the evidence also seems to show the decline of Christian influence on the policy community's perception of Canadian identity. During this time period, the nature of Canadian citizenship seems to be increasingly defined through parameters associated with the state. It was suggested, for example, that the discourse surrounding provincial citizenship added further complexity to the idea of a political identity based on the extension of provincial rights. At the same time, cultural assimilation seemed to become a less formal element of the Indian policy. As time progressed, is there evidence of whether one of these themes became dominant in Indian policy discourse?

Beginning in the 1950s, the federal government organized a series of dominion-provincial conferences to facilitate the emergence of the welfare state, and to broker initial consensus over impending issues of shared governance. An important area of these discussions was Indian Affairs. Considering the apparent importance of extending Canadian citizenship to First Nations, the federal government seemed to begin negotiating the administration of such citizenship with the provinces. A letter from the Director of Indian

Affairs in 1949 clearly demonstrates the Department's attitude toward the nature of a proposed First Nations citizenship. It adopted verbatim the language of the SJC Report:

There are certain aspects of Indian Affairs administration which, perforce, require co-operation between Dominion and Provincial officials, to bring about the future economic assimilation of Indians into the body-politic of Canada.⁴⁰

Falling at the top of his list of "certain aspects" was education.⁴¹ Director MacKay's letter underscored the importance accorded to integrated education, with a particular emphasis on its role of inculcating Canadian citizenship. What does not seem evident is why "co-operation" between the federal and provincial government was so important to this matter.

Another dominion-provincial conference was held in 1955. Attached to the Director of Indian Affairs itinerary was an appendix outlining federal policy on the future of Indian Affairs. In part, the document read:

The complete integration of Indians as citizens of the respective provinces is the objective of the Branch. Insofar as provinces increasingly recognize these people as citizens, they are assisting the integration process. Various welfare measures might be considered in this connection.⁴²

Based on the evidence, there is not enough room to speculate whether the reference to "welfare measures" was an indication that the extension of provincial citizenship was move toward cost-sharing in Indian administration. It does seem evident, however, that the extension of provincial citizenship was an important step on the road to full Canadian citizenship. In fact, the document appears to verge on an outright admission that the

⁴⁰ NAC RG 10, vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, D.M. MacKay to Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, November 30, 1949.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² NAC RG 10, vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, Appendix to the Director's itinerary for Dominion Provincial Relations, 1955.

devolution of Indian Affairs to the provinces was a move to terminate Indian status and replace it with the same provincial citizenship as held by other Canadian citizens.

It should not be surprising that the federal government seemed to be pursuing the objective of terminating Indian status. After all, it had been searching for an effective method of extinguishing the so so-called Indian problem since Confederation. Seemingly, the government had found it in the policy of integration. In a memo to the chairman of the preparatory committee of the 1955 dominion-provincial conference, Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Laval Fortier wrote: "A delusion exists that Indians are wards of the crown..."⁴³ What he seems to imply is that Indians are actually citizens, who under Canadian law have the same rights and responsibilities as all other Canadians. Taken in context of the dominion-provincial conference, Fortier seems to suggest that the importance of extending provincial citizenship involves its relevance to full Canadian citizenship. After all, if Indians are not wards, why do they receive their social service, such as education, from the federal government? Could the extension of provincial citizenship be viewed as means to terminate special Indian status?

In 1950, Indian Affairs was transferred to the jurisdiction of the newly created Department of Citizenship and Immigration. A speech given by Prime Minister Diefenbaker on December 12, 1955, highlights the underlying significance of this transfer:

In 1949, when I introduced in Parliament the Bill to establish the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, I expressed the hope that the new Department would make a special effort to help the Indians of Canada to share more fully with their fellow citizens in the national life of our country.⁴⁴

⁴³ NAC RG 10, vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, Laval Fortier to K.W. Taylor Esq., September 16, 1955.

⁴⁴ NAC MG 32 B34, vol.24 IA12, Prime Minister's Opening Address at Indian Conference, December 12 1955.

Considering the direction of the Indian Affairs toward Canadian citizenship, this move was, at the very least, a symbolic step. In fact, giving jurisdiction of Indian Affairs to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, appears to have formalized the project of turning Indians into Canadian citizens. Citizenship and Immigration, after all, would have been the perfect place for those who thought, as did Minister Ellen Fairclough, that "...Canadian Indians have responsibilities and duties in the same way as do other Canadians."⁴⁵ In this vein, Fairclough was continuing with the characterization of Indians as citizens. With this in mind, it is possible to speculate that some in the government saw integration as a way to terminate Indian status. Conversely, the termination of Indian status could be viewed as a method of extending a Canadian political identity to First Nations. The termination of Indian status, however, was once the domain of assimilation policy and its goal was the termination of First Nations cultures. Is there any indication that assimilation continued to be at work during the 1950s?

In the winter of 1954, a reference paper on Indian policy was prepared for Department officials. Clear references were made therein, regarding the aims of Indian Affairs' policy. Most striking, was an admission that

...since confederation the underlying purpose of Indian administration has been to prepare the Indians for full citizenship with the same rights and responsibilities as those enjoyed and accepted by Other members of the community.⁴⁶

This statement clearly illustrates the questionable nature of the so-called integration policy. Was it actually integration, or was it some form of economic or political assimilation? The

⁴⁵ NAC MG 32 B1, vol. 95, Ellen Fairclough to the Reverend J.H. Wilkie, June 10, 1958.

answer must lie in determining the meaning of full citizenship. This definition may well be found on the first page of the paper in question where it makes reference to the “Canadian Indian” and his ability “to assume a place beside his fellow Canadians of non-Indian status.”⁴⁷ Determining how the government intended to extend “full citizenship,” and what it meant by “a place beside his fellow Canadians” might shed some light onto the nature of the policy discourse.

In 1954, various members of the Indian Affairs policy community, including Prime Minister St. Laurent, toured the country to promote their Indian education policy. Several variations of the same speech were used in numerous Canadian cities. One such speech was delivered by H.M. Jones, Director of Indian Affairs, to the Welfare Council of Greater Winnipeg. In it, he emphasized the importance of the new integrated education policy to the “...heart of the matter from a long range point of view.”⁴⁸ He continued, “I know it is not necessary for me to explain to this group the advisability of having Indian youngsters attend secondary schools alongside non-Indian students.”⁴⁹ “Let me assure you that we in Indian Affairs are cognizant of the fact that education is the key to the door leading to a better future for the Canadian of the Indian race.”⁵⁰ Considering that educational expenditures had risen by \$9 million since 1944,⁵¹ there is very little doubt that they were “cognizant!” The phrase “Canadian of the Indian race” suggests—or perhaps foreshadows—the liberal view that

⁴⁶ NAC RG 10, vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C-14216, Reference Paper prepared for E. Acland by the Immigration Branch, February 7, 1954, 4.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 1.

⁴⁸ NAC RG 10, vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C-14216, Speech by the Director of Indian Affairs to the Greater Winnipeg Welfare Council, October 6, 1954, 4.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 6.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 6.

⁵¹ NAC RG 10, vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C-14216, Reference Paper prepared for Eric Acland—Immigration Branch, 1954, 6.

Aboriginal people were one piece to a multi-ethnic Canada but were individually Canadians. This would seem to indicate that the Department perceived the “place” of First Nations within a political context of universal citizenship.

It would be difficult to proceed without first stopping for the moment to qualify what appears to be the emergence of a liberal discourse on multiculturalism. In the mid- 1950s, official multicultural policy was still 15 years away. When looking at this period, however, it seems that the liberal notion of citizenship, where individuals are free to express their ethnicity within the boundaries of a single universal citizenship, was beginning to take hold. In order to differentiate this particular idea from official multiculturalism, this thesis will refer to it as “liberal multiculturalism.” In addition to the previous example, the government did seem ready to apply a liberal multiculturalism to the goal of extending citizenship to First Nations. According to the speech given by Jones in Winnipeg,

The future of Canada’s Indian population is the future of Canada and of his new fellow Canadians. Provided his fellow Canadians, recognizing his rightful heritage, make room for him in the family circle with understanding, patience, and brotherly pride in his accomplishments.⁵²

Although the language of liberal multiculturalism grows stronger during the next decade, evidence suggests that it begins to take root in Indian policy as early as the 1950s. The quotes “recognizing his rightful heritage” within the boundaries of “the family circle” are a good example of this possibility. This seems to demonstrate a turn away from an official discourse on cultural assimilation.

Returning to the extension of full citizenship, in 1955, the Minister of Indian Affairs, J.W. Pickersgill, spoke at service clubs across Canada. His speeches detailed government

⁵² NAC RG 10, vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C 14216, Speech by the Director of Indian Affairs to the Greater Winnipeg Welfare Council, October 6, 1954, 8.

policy on Indian Affairs and bore the Department's hope for the speedy integration of First Nations. "I believe", he said,

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.⁵³

This urgency abounded within the Department. In the same year, a memo to the Deputy Minister from H.M. Jones paralleled Pickersgill's optimism: "...the present policy is to integrate the Indians into the life of the community at large in all respects as soon as this may be possible."⁵⁴ These comments illustrate an Indian Affairs Branch, seemingly reinvigorated by the determination to integrate First Nations into a common Canadian citizenship.

In his speech to the Kiwanis Club, Pickersgill outlined the importance of common Canadian citizenship and the role of Indian education policy in this process. Through education, it was the aim of the Department to "...make our common Canadian citizenship so much more attractive to the Indians than their special status that they will some day *prefer*[my emphasis] to share the ordinary status of Canadian citizenship with the rest of us."⁵⁵ Once again, note how this bureaucrat framed the discourse on choice in terms of a preference toward Canadian citizenship. He continued, "The real hope of the future lies in the young. That is why we are convinced that the most important of all our activities, so far

⁵³ NAC RG 10, vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9 pt.2, MR C 14216, Speech by J.W. Pickersgill MP, to the Kiwanis Club of Edmonton re: The Future of the Canadian Indians, November 21, 1955, 2.

⁵⁴ NAC RG 10, vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, Memo from H.M. Jones to the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, February 22, 1955, 8.

⁵⁵ NAC RG 10, vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9 pt.2, MR C 14216, Speech by J.W. Pickersgill MP, to the Kiwanis Club of Edmonton re: The Future of the Canadian Indians, November 21, 1955, 2.

as the future is concerned, is education.”⁵⁶ This latter statement demonstrates the importance that this senior official accorded to integrated education in achieving the goal of terminating Indian status.

Evident in the phrase “the ordinary status of Canadian citizenship” is a liberal discourse of equality. By making reference to First Nations as the “same,” “ordinary,” and “equal,” Indian Affairs keeps more in line with a policy to assimilate—not integrate—First Nations. The cozy language of liberalism creates a false sense of fairness that ignores the validity of a separate First Nations cultural identity whilst attempting to cultivate a feeling of kinship between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. This is illustrated by Pickersgill’s reference to the use of “ordinary schools,” and then by his following statement: “if we want the Indians to regard themselves, and to be regarded, as an integral part of the population, there is no question in my mind about the importance of having this attitude developed in the early years of school.”⁵⁷ He concluded the discussion on education, furthermore, with the statement: “...education appears to be the main key to a better future for the Canadian Indians as ordinary Canadian citizens like the rest of us.”⁵⁸ This liberal discourse on equality, present in at least some respect during the SJC meetings of the late 1940s, certainly seems to continue as a strong influence on Indian education policy by the late 1950s.

The terms assimilation and integration seem to be used interchangeably during the early post-WWII period. Most evidence, however, seems to suggest that the senior bureaucrats at Indian Affairs believed that some form of assimilation was the desirable outcome of Indian education policy. In 1957, Acting Minister of Indian Affairs E.D. Fulton

⁵⁶ Ibid., 11.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 13.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 15.

wrote to Donald Fleming, the Minister of Finance, lamenting that Alberta and Ontario were the only provinces not yet funding Aboriginal students on par with non-Aboriginal children.⁵⁹ He went on to say that “assimilation” would be achieved only through provincial education and therefore “it must be agreed upon.”⁶⁰ Assimilation, as is evident from Fortier’s statement, was still very much a goal of Indian education policy in 1957. Although it was not the official policy, it is still seen to be used in private to describe the goals of Indian Affairs. The question remains: was assimilation to be political, economic, or cultural?

A 1958 letter written by E.S.W. Cole, a residential school principal in Alberni, BC, suggests that the nature of assimilation was closely linked to the discourse on political and economic citizenship:

A lot has been written, and as much said, about ‘Integration for the Indian.’ It is, in this writer’s opinion, very stupid of us to talk about integrating the Indian as, by no stretch of our imagination, can we do this. Integration will come from the Indian himself and will come quietly and permanently when we have finished our job of education. When our natives are qualified for professional jobs, or seek their role in life as tradesmen, and responsible farmers, and soon integration will be an accomplished fact and they will fall into their place side by side with us.⁶¹

Cole seems to conceive of education as a process for transforming First Nations into citizens—citizens equal with all other Canadians. Like his contemporaries, moreover, Cole appears to define citizenship in association with holding occupations valued by the dominant society. Although framed in terms of integration, the apparent goal was political and economic assimilation.

⁵⁹ He was actually wrong. All provinces were committed to full funding by this time.

⁶⁰ NAC RG 10, vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, E.D. Fulton to Hon. David Fleming, October 18, 1957.

⁶¹ NAC RG 10, vol. 7180, File 1/25-1 pt.6, E.S.W. Cole, to Erin Nielson Esq., November 25, 1958.

How different were the goals of political and economic assimilation from those of cultural assimilation? The government did not appear entirely interested in just economic assimilation but rather, as was suggested by Cole, a policy that would encourage First Nations children to abandon their communities and assimilate into non-Aboriginal society on-the-whole. In short, the goal was to use joint schools, institutions conveniently located in non-Aboriginal centres, to channel young people away from the reserve and into urban life. Evidence of this goal is supported by the concern expressed in September 1958, by Director H.M. Jones. At this time, Jones sent a memo to the Deputy Minister stating "...there is a danger that segregated education will produce the 'professional Indian,' whose outlook does no reach beyond the boundary of the reserve."⁶² This type of discourse reveals a tenuous relationship between the goals of political, economic, and cultural assimilation. Apparently the Department was interested in having First Nations people look to the dominant community, not just as an economic or political environment, but as their home.

Jones was very much involved with the establishment of joint schools, and he certainly realized that they were a functioning model of the apparent expectation of First Nations children to leave their communities and adopt Canadian political and economic identities. He must also have realized the ramifications of these identities on First Nations culture. In a memo to the Deputy Minister, in fact, Jones attempted to clarify whether or not the continued establishment of joint education was to be the standard practice. What he asked, more precisely, was whether or not the Deputy Minister agreed with the "benefits of socialization" to "the non-Indian ways of life."⁶³ By August, the memo had reached Minister

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ NAC RG 10, vol. 7180, File 1/25-1 pt.6, Memo from H.M. Jones, July 18, 1958.

Fairclough's desk. On the memo itself she personally inscribed "I agree."⁶⁴ Although the policy was called integration, its obvious purpose was to break down Aboriginal socio-cultural norms and replace them with Canadian values. From these documents, it seems that mere education was insufficient because it contributed to the so-called "professional Indian." What was apparently envisioned, and indeed implemented, was a joint civic education programme that attempted to simultaneously educate and socialize Aboriginal children to Canadian life.

Did the adoption of integration policy signal a true change to the policy of cultural assimilation as alluded to by H.M. Jones in his 1956 speech? Although evident to some degree, cultural assimilation seemed to be displaced as the most important, formal and active agenda of the federal government in regards to Indian policy. Whereas during the pre-WWII period the termination of Indian status was equated to full cultural assimilation, the post-WWII policy community appeared to refocus the termination of Indian status within the scope of political assimilation. In short, the policy community appeared poised to focus their attention on making Indians into good political and economic citizens. In this vein, the emergence of a liberal rights-based political identity is certainly a new development during this period.

The focus on economic assimilation or economic self-sufficiency appears to be a hold-over from pre-WWII Indian education policy. Certainly the theoretical focus on farming in the residential schools is evidence of this claim. What seems different, however, is that occupational training appears in the post-WWII period as a prerequisite for participation in society as opposed to the pre-WWII focus on its agency as a formal method

⁶⁴ Ibid.

to indoctrinate First Nations children with white, western culture and modes of living. Certainly occupational training, biased by white, western cultural norms continued as an informal method of cultural assimilation. During the post-WWII period, however, economic citizenship seems to have been more in line with an agenda to create citizens who were able to participate and compete in society on the same basis as all other citizens.

The agenda of extending provincial citizenship to First Nations people also seems to emerge in the post-WWII period as method of developing a liberal democratic society. Undoubtedly there were many reasons why the federal government turned in this direction. Certainly, one could argue that the devolution of Indian governance to the provinces was in the best financial interests of the federal government; provincial co-operation obviously involved a degree of financial co-operation. The evidence suggests, however, that the federal government was less influenced by the cost of education than it was by its preoccupation with delivering services to First Nations on the same basis as other Canadians. In other words, their main concern seemed to be with devolving control of Indian administration so as to eliminate the special treatment of First Nations. Based on the evidence, there are two prominent reasons why this seems to be the case. The federal government appears to have been very concerned with the immediate establishment of political citizenship. For all other Canadians, political citizenship involved municipal, provincial and federal participation. It was from their provinces, for example, that other Canadians received social services such as education. By contrast, First Nations education was provided through special arrangement with the federal government. With the elimination of special Indian status, who would become responsible for administering social services, such as education, to First Nations? The only logical response to this question, given the liberal context of the period, is that the

provinces would have to assume command. In short, provincial citizenship would replace special Indian status. Such a move would certainly address the prominent agenda of creating a political citizenship in which all people would stand in the same relationship to both the state and to each other. In this sense, everybody would be treated as normal citizens.

Although there is little hard evidence, it also seems logical to deduce that the developing federal-provincial relationship was connected to the deterioration of the Church-state relationship. It must be remembered that the Churches had dominated Indian education since the mid-19th century. Who else was capable of administering the large scale project of Indian schooling other than the provincial governments? In addition, it seems pertinent to question whether the provincial joint-schooling project was not a microcosm of the ideal function of provincial citizenship on-the-whole. After all, provincial joint-schools, like society at large, were locations where primarily white students and First Nations students could share the same rights and responsibilities, learn the same information and receive the same training, and learn how to function in Canadian society.

It seems then, that there was a significant degree of change in the works of Indian policy. It would not be accurate, however, to claim that this change was leading away from the traditional agenda of cultural assimilation. Although the active policy of cultural assimilation appeared to be dissipating, it was slowly replaced, seemingly, with an inactive or informal agenda as discussed with regards to economic self-sufficiency. There is little evidence to suggest that the policy community envisioned a First Nations cultural contribution to the emerging definition of either Canadian economic or political citizenship, nor in the development of integrated education. There is little evidence to suggest, for example, that First Nations cultures were slated for integration into the joint-school

curriculum. In fact, the evidence seems to suggest the opposite: that curriculum was geared towards the established white, western paradigm. Although the official discourse appeared to give the impression of cultural tolerance and integration, there is certainly room to speculate that cultural assimilation continued to be at work, if only in an unofficial capacity. Such a speculation works well with the standard criticism of liberal policy which points to its downfall in protecting the collective rights of minority groups.

Looking at the evidence presented in this chapter, it seems as if the policy community was developing a civic education programme with the formal intent of promoting a Canadian civic identity in First Nations children based on political and economic citizenship. This project emerged, furthermore, during a time when the formal vestiges of the pre-WWII cultural assimilation policy appeared to be losing their grip. Certainly, the influence of the Christian Churches was in dramatic decline. As seen thus far, the transition from wardship to citizenship was also accompanied with a greater emphasis on provincial citizenship: an identity seemingly influenced by a liberal discourse of equality. If one clear message was sent during this period, it was that First Nations were to become equal, Canadian citizens: The same as all other Canadians with respect to their participation in the state.

CHAPTER 3

Side By Side With Us? Formalizing the Canadian Identity— 1959 to 1968

In 1958, a Canadian citizen wrote to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration asking: “What does the government consider the ‘ideal relationship’ between Whites and Indians?”¹ The Minister, Ellen Fairclough, responded:

The relationship between non-Indians and Indians should be based on mutual understanding, respect and trust. It is bred in integrated education which brings the children of both groups together in a variety of activities. It involves such attitudes as acceptance, tolerance, friendliness, a willingness to help each other, a belief in the democratic approach to common problems and respect for each other’s cultural heritage.²

Surely her answer seemed informative; however, was Fairclough’s response an accurate description of Indian policy?

Her response appears to reflect the political atmosphere of the day. Such an atmosphere is also illustrated by Indian Affairs’ response to the “Declaration on Human Rights.” In 1958, H.L. Keenleyside delivered the opening speech at the Conference on Human Rights held in Winnipeg where the Declaration was being discussed. “We live in a world of fantastic, of almost incredible, contradictions,” were his introductory remarks. He continued:

It is my conviction, as I am sure it is yours, that in the years to come we can protect and extend the observance of human rights in Canada. We have already come a long way. Our weaknesses and failures, our sins against our professions and our ideals, are fewer than they were. As a

¹ NAC RG 10, vol. 7188, File 475/25-1, Edward Clifford Esq. to Ellen Fairclough, nd. 1958.

² NAC RG 10, vol. 7188, File 475/25-1, Ellen Fairclough to Edward Clifford Esq., September 11, 1958.

people we are more widely concerned than ever before with the injustices and inequalities that still afflict us. More Canadians than at any time in the past do realize that as long as one among us is unjustly treated all of us suffer with him.³

This quotation seems to indicate that Canada, and Canadians, were caught firmly in the grip of the post-WWII discourse on liberalism. As apparently seen here, both Fairclough and Keenleyside had adopted a language of respect and tolerance with particular emphasis on the observance of justice and equality. The question remained, however, how did this discourse filter into Indian education policy?

By 1959, public criticism of Indian Affairs appeared to be mounting. Apparently, the Canadian public felt that the liberal ideals of human rights and equality were not making their way into Indian policy with enough haste. A letter to Agency Superintendents in Nova Scotia, from Regional Director F.B. McKinnon, illustrates this point in no uncertain terms:

Any responsible field officer who fails to recognize the changing times, the exploding interest from a multitude of quarters and the increasing ability of Indians to capitalize on publicity through the various media of communication now open to them is in my opinion either stupid or looking for trouble.⁴

In the same vein, the Indian Commission of British Columbia talked extensively about the “awakening of public interest in Indian Affairs.”⁵ Unfortunately, there does not seem to be much evidence to suggest exactly what the public was interested in: were they concerned about the extension of equal rights, or were they calling for a greater respect and tolerance of First Nations cultures?

³ NAC RG 10, vol. 8568, File 1/1-2-2-1 pt.3, Speech delivered by H.L. Keenleyside to a Conference on Human Rights in Winnipeg re: The Declaration of Human Rights, 1958, 6.

⁴ NAC RG 10, vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, F.B. McKinnon to J.D. Matheson, April 10, 1959.

Judging from the response of Indian Affairs, the extension of equal rights might have been the greatest public demand. Despite the senior bureaucrat's words, respect and tolerance were certainly not priorities of the Department. In September of 1959, Minister Fairclough indicated her support for a recommendation of British Columbia's Royal Commission on Education that, "Wherever possible, the Indian children attend provincial public schools where they may mix freely with their fellow Canadians."⁶ In itself, this was nothing new. It reflected the primary Indian education policy in effect since WWII. When understood in the context of Fairclough's perspective on Indian Affairs, however, the policy seems to take-on a larger meaning.

Such a context is provided in a November 1959 letter written by the Minister. In it, she states that, "There is a great deal of resistance on the part of some Indians to any alteration at all in their method of living. That is why I think that education of the young is the solution to the problem."⁷ Fairclough seems to perceive the maintenance of a First Nations way of life as a "problem," and then comes to the conclusion that the only way to solve this "problem" is to target children with joint education. In a sense, she advocates the use of education to assimilate, not integrate, First Nations children and culture into Canadian life. More importantly, Fairclough's statements lack evidence of the attitudes of "acceptance" and "tolerance" which she had previously used to describe Indian policy.

The apparent contradiction between tolerance for cultural heritage and the perception of the First Nations way of life as a "problem" seems to indicate that some at Indian Affairs

⁵ NAC RG 10, vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, W.S. Arneil to All Superintendents, April 14, 1959.

⁶ NAC MG 32 B1, vol. 95, Excerpts from the Royal Commission on Education, August 14, 1959.

⁷ NAC MG 32 B1, vol. 95, Ellen Fairclough to Richard Good, November 19, 1959.

were, in fact, conflicted about the future of integrated education policy. Or perhaps, it indicated a conflict of vision regarding the role of First Nations in Canadian society: how was First Nations culture to be integrated into the emerging Canadian identity? Regardless of the answer to this question, the government appeared to be constructing an Indian policy that combined two seemingly opposite discourses to attain a single goal: the termination of Indian status. How the government proceeded with education policy in the 1960s would ultimately determine how, or if, the policy of assimilation was changed from the pre-WWII period.

In order to expand upon the evaluation in the previous chapter, Chapter 3 will examine policy during the 1960s. The proceedings of the second Special Joint Committee, the Hawthorn Report, and Indian Affairs' policy documents, internal memoranda, and correspondence will be studied in order to elaborate on whether or not integration policy signified a shift in purpose from assimilation policy. Furthermore, this chapter will address the role of education in the formation of a Canadian identity for First Nations children. Did a civic identity, defined by political and economic components of citizenship, finally emerge as the primary goal of Indian policy or did the assimilation of First Nations children into white western culture continue to define the actual policy of Indian Affairs?

The Special Joint Committee of Senate and House of Commons: 1959-61

From 1959 to 1961, a second Special Joint Committee of Senate and House of Commons was convened to meet and discuss Indian policy. Its mandate was to make recommendations on the operation of Indian Affairs. Once again, many witnesses appeared before the committee, and once again, Indian Affairs bureaucrats provided key testimony. There were some differences, however, in these new rounds of discussion. Education

prevailed as a major focal point for the committee's attention. As a result, the Churches made a greater contribution to the testimony. There was First Nations representation on the committee: the Joint Chair of the committee was Senator James Gladstone, a First Nations person and the first Canadian senator of First Nations ancestry. Probably the most important difference, in terms of this thesis, was a cleavage that seemed to emerge in the policy community concerning the discourse on Indian education policy. While Indian Affairs officials seemed to persist with the drive towards civic education at the expense of First Nations cultures, others seemed to advocate for the provision of a relevant First Nations cultural curriculum.

The first to testify on behalf of Indian Affairs was Deputy Minister Laval Fortier. In the language of ethnocentrism, he framed the discussion on the future of Indian education policy in terms of progress. Fortier alluded to modernity and its impact on First Nations. For him, the "reality" of the 20th Century was that First Nations would have to adopt a Canadian way-of-life.⁸ It was inevitable, according to Fortier, that the Canadian population boom and the growth of resource development in the hinterlands would overrun First Nations. "In order to prepare Indians to meet this new type of life, it is of course, necessary to provide the best education possible to his children."⁹ He continued: "It is also interesting to note that an increased number of Indians are receiving their education with non-Indian children. This should facilitate greatly their adaptation to the new life which they will have to live."¹⁰ Fortier seems to assume that First Nations could survive only if they adopted a Canadian lifestyle. The language, moreover, which suggests that First Nations children should

⁸ Canada, Parliament, Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Indian Affairs[SJC], *Minutes of Proceedings* 1959 [*Minutes* 1959], 12. (no. 1)

⁹ SJC, *Minutes* 1959, 12. (no. 1)

abandon their “life” and adopt a “new” one, appears to be in line with assimilationist discourse as it stresses the need for First Nations to leave their way-of-life behind. Progress seems to be defined in terms of a perceived set of cultural, political, and economic standards.

It should be noted that Fortier did not conclude with these classic assumptions about progress—that the Canadian way-of-life was better than a First Nations model. He continued by explaining that it was insufficient to be merely prepared for the future. Fortier seemed to indicate that only by becoming equals could First Nations survive in the 20th Century. In his words: “I am sure that if Indians were given similar chances in becoming educated and trained in trades and professions, and were treated as equals, they would, as any member of other ethnic groups in this country prove that they are equally fit and able to achieve success.”¹¹ At once, Fortier is able to legitimize the federal Indian policy by using the language of equality, and devalue Aboriginal culture by positioning it in the light of progress. Furthermore, he defines equality with the language of economic self-sufficiency as seen in chapter 2. Also of some importance is Fortier’s description of First Nations as analogous to “any member of other ethnic groups.” This description would appear to expand on a liberal multicultural language in the longtime Departmental goal of terminating Indian status.

Fortier’s intentions are contextualized by the emergence of Canadian citizenship in the language of education policy discourse as discussed in chapter 2. Does this trend continue after 1959? While Fortier was proclaiming the benefits of education, he surely understood that the primary aim of the Education Division was “The education of school age children as a preparation for them to take their place in Canadian society as socially and

¹⁰ SJC, *Minutes 1959*, 13. (no. 1)

¹¹ SJC, *Minutes 1959*, 13. (no. 1)

economically competent citizens.”¹² Therefore, Fortier’s attempt at justifying the use of education to prepare First Nations children for the modern world could be viewed as a Trojan Horse for the objective of civic nation building. In this particular case, citizenship is clearly defined by a set of social and economic variables constituting civic competency.

As discussed in chapter 1, colonial and Dominion governments had always been involved with some project of nation building. In the past, territorial expansion and protection had often justified assimilation policies destructive to First Nations cultures. In terms of the imminent nation building project that seemed to emerge following WWII—a project hereto described in terms of its attention to the development of liberal equal rights—did the policy community consider if joint schooling was adequate for the pedagogical reproduction of First Nations cultural and social needs? Mr. McQuillan MP, a SJC member, sparked the following discussion with the Chief of the Education Division, R.F. Davey. Their remarks reveal an apparent schism in the policy community on how to proceed with integrated education:

Mr. McQuillan: I was wondering what is being done in the case where Indian children are attending non-Indian schools, to preserve some of the Indian culture and art?

Mr. Davey: We have no established program for maintaining various aspects of Indian culture, because we feel that this is a matter that the Indian himself should decide, as to what he wishes to preserve and what he wants to discard.

Mr. McQuillan: Perhaps it might not be part of their school program, but do you not think it might be worthwhile on the part of your department to pursue that?¹³

On one hand, from Davey’s testimony, it seems that Indian Affairs recognized and were content with the inability of joint-schools to provide a culturally relevant curriculum to First

¹² SJC, *Minutes 1959*, 1. (no. 2)

¹³ SJC, *Minutes 1959*, 41. (no. 2)

Nations students. On the other hand, it appeared obvious to McQuillan that developing a curriculum relevant to First Nations cultures was worthwhile.

What seems to have occurred here is a shift from a deliberate and planned attempt at cultural assimilation to a process of education formally called integration. As opposed to a truly integrated process through which white, western and First Nations cultures would combine, the actual process appears to have been dominated by the established cultural order. Given that this was allowed to occur with the knowledge of Department officials, it could be said that cultural assimilation is seen to shift from an active to an inactive policy of the federal government. The debate between Davey and the second SJC member, in this light, reveals not only this shift, but a growing concern outside the Department that cultural assimilation was not an appropriate goal of Indian policy.

Further evidence of the schism, and that the Department was aware of problems associated with culturally relevant curriculum, appeared in an exchange between Mr. Hardie MP, and the Education Chief. Hardie inquired, "...I wonder if your branch officials ever interpret particularly to the teachers the cultural background of the native Indians, and ways and means of adapting teaching methods in the schools to that background." Davey's response was simple: "We have not made representations to any provincial department of education that they exchange their curriculum to meet our requirements."¹⁴ Why did Davey seem so adamant about withholding a culturally relevant curriculum from First Nations students? Considering that, as Fortier said, "it is the ambition of the branch to have Indians

¹⁴ SJC, *Minutes 1959*, 56. (no. 3)

as much as possible educated in non-Indian schools,"¹⁵ the answer might be found in a policy of inaction to further the goal of assimilation.

Again and again, R.F. Davey was hammered by the SJC about the Department's policy to withhold culturally adequate education. In a final round of questioning, Judy LaMarsh MP, elicited a very telling response from the bureaucrat. Put simply, LaMarsh asked whether or not any adaptations to the policy were being considered to accommodate the needs of First Nations. To this Davey responded:

It is my opinion—and this is a personal opinion—that the three R's are basic to being able to make a livelihood today, whether you make that livelihood on a reserve or off of it. Consequently, we are placing emphasis upon academic instruction. Many of these people, of necessity, will find employment away from the reserves and they must be equipped to compete with non-Indians.¹⁶

Davey did not seem to envision much of a future for independent First Nations communities. In addition, he hypothesized that First Nations would "find employment away from reserves." Why did he assume that First Nations communities did not need skilled trades-workers and professionals? If Davey was pushing for an education policy that ignored First Nations cultures, perhaps it was because his vision for the future of Canada did not include independent First Nations cultures. This type of vision would certainly account for a policy of inaction towards including relevant First Nations curriculum to Indian education policy.

Others in the policy community were more forthright about their vision of Canada. The testimony of the Indian Advisory Committee from the Ontario Department of Public Welfare spoke directly to the themes of citizenship, equality, and assimilation. "Of course

¹⁵ SJC, *Minutes 1959*, 64. (no. 3)

¹⁶ SJC, *Minutes 1961*, 497. (no. 12)

we appreciate the fact that the ultimate goal of our Indian people is full citizenship,”¹⁷ said their representative. She continued, “I am pleased that our department is now advocating very strongly the matter of incorporation and assimilation.”¹⁸ In the vein of equality she concluded:

I would say, in conclusion on this part of our brief, that we appreciate the work of the department; and we would advocate that wherever and whenever possible, certainly integration should be introduced on a large scale because, after all, we are all Canadians, we are all hoping and aiming to make this country what it should be, and that is the only way it can be done.¹⁹

Their vision appears to be consistent with the language of equality and Canadian political identity discussed in chapter 2. More importantly, it seems to delineate a discourse on political assimilation separate from cultural assimilation.

The language surrounding liberal multiculturalism also appeared to continue in policy community discourse. Evidence of this assertion is found in the testimony of those who proposed to protect First Nations cultures. Father André Renaud, a renowned educator and influential member of the “knowledge élite,” gave testimony illustrating how the age-old discourse on protection was apparently transformed into a discourse on liberal multiculturalism. As a member of the Indian Education Association, he warned:

We feel that, unless we give them, as a group particularly the school children, a chance to identify their culture, and to know where they come from, what they are, and so on, and including what made them what they are, they will just mark time before proceeding to become something different.²⁰

¹⁷ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 308. (no. 4)

¹⁸ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 308. (no. 4)

¹⁹ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 319. (no. 4)

²⁰ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 397. (no. 5)

This seems to be a warning about the adverse effects of integration. As the delegate from the Canadian Catholic Conference, however, he later explained that in order to prepare, "...the present generation of school children effectively, economically and socially for life as Canadians; the process must start in school but has implications after they leave school."²¹

This process, according to Renaud, involved

assisting people of Indian background to learn about their past and present conditions objectively, and inviting them to plan their future within the Canadian commonwealth so as to contribute the best of their cultural heritage to the common society of Canada.²²

Renaud appears to argue for the establishment of a First Nations culturally relevant curriculum based on the desirability of integrating First Nations into a multicultural citizenship that he called the "common society of Canada." If accurate, this interpretation also provides evidence of the growing rift in the policy community. Regardless, Renaud still seems to advocate the use of education in the service of creating a Canadian political identity—albeit one based on a multicultural influence.

Support for this sentiment can be found throughout the second SJC's "Minutes of Proceedings." The Anglican Church of Canada (ACC), for example, was very much in favour of integrating First Nations into a multicultural type of citizenship. Speaking of social services such as education, the Rev. H.H. Clark, a representative from the ACC, testified that the aim of Indian policy should be "...the gradual and complete integration of the Indian as a person entitled to the rights and privileges of full Canadian citizenship, ready to accept all the responsibilities which pertain to that citizenship." He continued,

We see integration as one aspect of the total process by means of which a Canadian people and culture is being developed by Indian and non-

²¹ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 725. (no. 8)

²² SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 725. (no. 8)

**Indian Canadians (recent immigrants and Canadians of long standing)
all bringing their heritage to a common Canadian life.²³**

Clark seems to argue for the establishment of multicultural agenda in conjunction with integration policy while supporting the demand for a universal Canadian citizenship. Thus, there appears to be mounting pressure from within the policy community to accept the validity of First Nations cultures within a new conception of the cultural order.

Although there were indications that cultural integration was emerging in the discourse on Canadian identity, the classic undercurrent of cultural assimilation also continued as a prominent theme. In addition to his comments on the “common Canadian life,” Clark also said that the ACC would “heartily endorse” integrated education because it “...affords an opportunity for the Indian to adjust to the social and economic environment in which in all probability he will be more and more involved.”²⁴ This belief was also forwarded by the Province of Saskatchewan:

The more rapid development of integrated educational facilities is another important improvement that can be made in the educational system. It has been found that Indians benefit by attending school with non-Indians. This tends to break down their feelings of being different and prepares them for competition with non-Indians in their adult life by making better known to them the attitudes and morals of the dominant society.²⁵

Neither statement seems to recognize the possibility of First Nations actually contributing to the “attitudes and morals” of society. In light of this, it is clear that the classic assumptions about the inferiority of Aboriginal culture persisted in at least some quarters of the policy community. These comments also suggest that the nature of a multicultural citizenship would take the form of a vertical mosaic: a multicultural society where First Nations would

²³ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 795. (no. 9)

²⁴ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 799. (no. 9)

continue as subordinate players. On a final note, these remarks also appear to focus on the ability of First Nations to become economic participants in society. In this way, Canadian citizenship continued to be defined in terms of the individual's ability to maintain economic self-sufficiency within a white, western cultural context.

Dr. Munro, a witness sent by the Presbyterian Church, also contributed to the discourse on liberal multiculturalism. His recommendation was quite explicit, and it speaks largely for itself:

...to develop their own communities as communities of Canadian people within the nation...we feel that in Canada the Irish society, the Scotch society, these people—Hungarians and the rest, I think—contribute to our culture and our way of life. Indians also have a contribution to make. This does not put them in a separate group anymore that it does the Scottish, but they should be encouraged to develop those things which are part of their tradition—but as Canadian citizens.²⁵

Munro's testimony added to the discourse on multiculturalism that normalized the state-relationship with First Nations under the banner of Canadian citizenship. While Munro seems to recognize the validity of Aboriginal culture, he also appears to argue for the termination of Indian status. It is apparent, therefore, that the growing rift within the policy community was centred partly on the debate over whether or not the termination of Indian status could be achieved without the need for full cultural assimilation.

Termination of Indian culture certainly seemed to be the goal of Department officials, and by no means was this lost on First Nations organizations. The Catholic Indian League of Canada, representing Indians from Alberta, condemned the integrated education policy as a tool of assimilation. In the words of its brief:

²⁵ SJC, *Minutes 1960*, 1058. (no. 12)

²⁶ SJC, *Minutes 1961*, 48. (no. 2)

So many grievances have come up at each of our annual meetings, in this regard, that they can but stem from our not seeing eye to eye with the policy of the Department in this matter, a policy which would promote assimilation of our youth into the common white element almost at any cost.²⁷

Judging from this quotation, and the previous commentary of Department officials, Indian Affairs' policies were clearly in line with an informal project of cultural assimilation. What effect did this attitude have on the integration policy adopted following WWII?

The second Special Joint Committee of Senate and House of Commons culminated with its "Final Report" in 1961. The results were both different from, and the same as its predecessor in 1949. The overwhelming opinion of the committee was, in the words of its report, that "The time is now fast approaching when the Indian people can assume the responsibility and accept the benefits of full participation as Canadian citizens."²⁸ In this sense, the discourse was largely unchanged from 10 years earlier. The idea that First Nations could be made into Canadian citizens seems to persist in the language of the report. Canadian citizenship, from this perspective, had most certainly emerged as an important post-WWII theme in the Canadian and First Nations state-relationship.

Coinciding with the focus on Canadian citizenship was a new and prevailing discourse on liberal multiculturalism. It is apparent throughout the testimony, as well as in the final report, that a new method for tackling the problem of separate Indian status was emerging in Indian policy discourse. The harsh language of ethnocentrism did not appear in the final report. It was replaced with the gregarious language of cultural acceptance:

Your committee believes that the advancement of the Indians towards full acceptance of the responsibilities and obligations of citizenship

²⁷ SJC, *Minutes 1961*, 251. (no. 7)

²⁸ SJC, *Minutes 1961*, 605. (no. 16, Final Report)

must be without prejudice to the retention of the cultural, historical and other economic benefits which they have inherited.²⁹

The change in language obscured the attitudes of Department bureaucrats that seemed to be more in-line with the classic assimilationist agenda. In making this statement, however, the second SJC seemed to move beyond the banal recommendations of senior bureaucrats like R.F. Davey, who persisted with culturally insensitive theories of citizenship education. Regardless of whether or not this was a subtle hint to the bureaucrats on how to proceed with policy or a sign of change in all quarters will be discussed in the pages that follow.

As far as the second SJC was concerned, the entire future of Indian policy rested in the hands of integrated education. According to its report "...the key to the full realization by Indians of self-determination and self-government and mutual self respect for the heritage and culture of Indians and non-Indians will be found in the field of education."³⁰ On the same note, the future of the policy was clearly marked with the undertones of terminating Indian status. In the words of the report:

For some years now there has been a move toward education of Indian children in schools which are under the jurisdiction of provinces. Your committee is in full accord with the program and would strongly urge and recommend that it be continued and expanded. We look forward to the day, not too far distant, when the Indian Affairs Branch is not engaged in the field of education, except insofar as sharing the costs.³¹

The report later concludes that "Education is necessary if Indian people are to be able, properly and competently, to fit into our economic and social structure."³² In conjunction

²⁹ SJC, *Minutes 1961*, 605. (no. 16, Final Report)

³⁰ SJC, *Minutes 1961*, 610. (no. 16, Final Report)

³¹ NAC MG 32 B1 IA-12K, Second and Final Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, 1961, 9.

³² *Ibid.*, 10.

with the language of “respect for culture,” the committee seems to establish that the termination of Indian status—not culture—should be the goal of Indian education policy.

The recommendations of the 1961 SJC reinforced education as one of the primary components of Indian policy. By 1961, furthermore, education policy appeared to emerge as the cornerstone for a formal policy of civic education in the service of creating a Canadian political and economic identity. According to Minister Fairclough, “The importance of education in preparing Indians to become self supporting and responsible members of the Canadian community is recognized and every effort is being made to improve the educational facilities available to Indians.”³³ This very fact was not lost on Bert Mason, an interested member of the CCF party, who wrote to Fairclough in 1961. In part, he argued that education would show both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people that the Indian was “...just another Canadian citizen.”³⁴ Her response to Mason’s letter was positive and straightforward. She agreed that in joint-schools “they can receive recognized training in association with the young men and women with whom they will work.”³⁵ The impetus for extending Canadian citizenship came, seemingly, from the influence of a discourse ripe with the language of liberal equality and economic self-sufficiency.

A final observation about the 1961 SJC was regarding the treatment of the Churches. Indeed, representatives from the Christian Churches were invited to give testimony. Their testimony was significant because of their expert knowledge as experienced educators. Father André Renaud, for example, was well known for his expertise and experience in the field of education. An analysis of the final report, however, reveals that the SJC did little to

³³ NAC MG 32 B1, vol. 95, Ellen Fairclough to Bert Mason, November 22, 1961, 5.

³⁴ NAC MG 32 B1, vol. 95, Bert Mason to Ellen Fairclough, April 25, 1961, 1.

³⁵ NAC MG 32 B1, vol. 95, Ellen Fairclough to Bert Mason, November 22, 1961, 5.

re-evaluate the declining role of the Churches in education. In fact, the report's solitary focus on integrated education suggests that segregated denominational education was approaching its final day. In the words of one angry residential school principal: "I really feel the Department should rename its policy—for it's certainly not integration, possibly the new name should be something like 'Kick the Churches out of Indian Education'."³⁶ Based on its disregard for a renewed church-state partnership in Indian education, the 1961 SJC "Final Report" could be considered further evidence of the declining role of Christianity in defining citizenship.

The Protestant Churches gave mixed support to the policy of joint-schooling.³⁷ The Roman Catholic Church, on the other hand, was clearly against the move toward a policy of integrated education. The brief of the Catholic Conference to the second SJC stated:

...we do not endorse the present policy of immediate, universal and unqualified enrolment of Indians in non-Indian schools. While we acknowledge the principle that Indians like all other citizens integrate to some extent within the fabric of the nation and eventually into our schools, we are convinced of the need for special schools.³⁸

The recommendations of the Roman Catholic Church raise as many questions as answers. Were they fighting to keep control over their educational empire? Were they fighting to ensure that Catholic Indians received a Catholic education? These are not questions of this

³⁶ NAC RG 10, Accession #1984-85/112, Box 102, File 494/25-11-101, Eric Barrington to Superintendent of School Administration, September 7, 1960.

³⁷ The evidence evaluated for the purpose of this essay seemed to indicate that the Protestant churches gave mixed support to integrated education. Certainly, further research should be done on this topic. In that vein, historians J.S. Milloy and J.R. Miller come to the same conclusions in their respective books on residential schools, *A National Crime*, and *Shingwauk's Vision*.

³⁸ NAC MG 32 B1, 89 IA-12J, A Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Affairs from the Canadian Catholic Conference, May, 1960, 8.

thesis. What can be gathered from its brief, however, is a sense of how the discourse on integrated education was challenged.

The Catholic Conference seems to focus its attack on the government's agenda of liberal multiculturalism. Apparently out of concern, it warned that,

...they have not yet been recognized as an ethnic minority meriting existence. They are neither expected nor encouraged to express their "Indianness" as a contribution to our evolving Canadian culture; on the contrary, it is their common impression that Canada does not desire their cultural survival.³⁹

Considering, for example, the attitudes expressed by Indian Affairs officials, there is little doubt that there was an "impression" that Canada did not "desire First Nations cultural survival." Pinpointing the Department's primary stumbling block in this regard, the Indian-Eskimo Association claimed: "...we lack evidence that much is being attempted which takes account of Indian history, folklore, song and other such expressions."⁴⁰ Put simply, the Catholic Conference, and others, asserted that any integration strategy, omitting Aboriginal culture, amounted to cultural assimilation. The contrast of opinion within the policy community seems to reveal the unfolding of two distinct visions for Canadian citizenship: one inclusive of First Nations cultures, and one exclusive of First Nations cultures.

Much like its predecessor did, the second SJC set the tone for Indian policy discourse in the decade that followed its final report. One of the most interesting developments to come out of the second SJC is the rift that apparently formed between those, particularly at Indian Affairs, who advocated integrated education without cultural integration, and those who advocated integrated education but wanted to recognize the validity of First Nations

³⁹ NAC MG 32, IA-12J, A Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Affairs from the Canadian Catholic Conference, 1960, 2.

cultures within a Canadian framework. This debate apparently boiled down to a question of how the so-called Indian problem was going to be solved. Was the termination of Indian status to come with the price of cultural assimilation, or would the extension of a Canadian civic identity, within a multicultural framework, be able to terminate Indian status while accepting First Nations as vital contributors to the Canadian cultural order?

In speeches delivered during the early 1960s, Indian Affairs officials seemed to firmly attach the discourse on Canadian citizenship to Indian education policy. R.F. Davey, in a 1961 address, stated that, "Unless education is preparing Indian youth to assume full citizenship status either on or off the reserve, it is not fulfilling its proper function."⁴¹ The focus on citizenship, as opposed to cultural assimilation, seems to be indicative of the approach recommended by the second SJC in 1961. But what was his definition for citizenship? Davey's focus on citizenship as the only "proper function" of education, appears to ignore the demand by others in the policy community who wanted to incorporate Aboriginal culture into the curriculum. Could this be considered significant of an informal Department policy to stymie the use of a First Nations relevant curriculum? Before this question can be tackled, it is important to examine what other bureaucrats were saying on the subject of policy goals.

Other senior bureaucrats at Indian Affairs appeared to focus more on the goal of terminating Indian status than what type of curriculum to use. An address given by Director Jones shed some light on the goals and objectives surrounding Indian status. "We should now," he said, "look forward to the day when our fellow Canadians of Indian status extend

⁴⁰ NAC MG 32, IA-12-J, A Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Affairs from the Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada, March, 1960, 11.

the hand of friendship and say, ‘Thank-you for the help—but we can go it on our own.’”⁴² In the context of this address, Jones seems to imply that education policy would lead to a day when First Nations would join their so-called “fellow Canadians,” as Canadian citizens themselves—without the need for special status. Formally, the policy is seen to focus on the extension of Canadian citizenship at the expense of Indian status. Notice, though, that Jones made no mention of how this would be achieved. How would citizenship be extended?

One way to terminate Indian status was to replace it with provincial citizenship. To this end, the discourse surrounding the extension of provincial citizenship—discussed briefly in chapter 2—continued in the early 1960s. Eric Acland, a senior administrative officer at Indian Affairs provided a clear basis for this conclusion in his memo entitled “*The Law and Civic Conscientiousness—Development of Reserves as Communities of Provincial citizens.*” The notion of transforming First Nations into Canadian citizens vis-à-vis their role as provincial citizens is apparent in the articulation of this memo’s title. Acland’s memo appears to show a link between civic education and the policy of terminating Indian status where it states, “...the facts of Indian citizenship must be disseminated as widely and quickly as possible.”⁴³ In the context of the memo, Acland seems to argue that the goal of Indian education policy should be to influence First Nations to view themselves as normal provincial citizens without Indian status. But why? The title of the memo suggests that Acland was pursuing this agenda for legal and political reasons in the vein of creating a civic conscientiousness in which all citizens presumed equal status.

⁴¹ NAC MG 32, IA-12K, Address to the National Superintendents Conference by R.F. Davey, September 17, 1961, 11.

⁴² NAC MG 89, IA-24, Address to the National Superintendents Conference by H.M. Jones, September 18, 1961, 19.

In 1961, the Indian Affairs Branch published a policy document entitled *The Indian in Transition: The Meeting of the Ways*. Choice discourse, discussed in chapter 2, weighed prominently in the publication, and it certainly pertained to the extension of citizenship. The language of the discourse suggested that First Nations were to be given a choice in becoming citizens. In doing so, it seems to have disguised an ulterior agenda of cultural assimilation. Speaking of their future life on the reserve, Ellen Fairclough said, “Some elderly ones, born and brought up there, can obviously never leave, but their children can, and their grandchildren will.”⁴⁴ Certainly, these comments indicate that Fairclough did not foresee any significant choice for First Nations children at all. In fact, she clearly stated that First Nations “will” one day leave their reserve communities. In light of this, what really was the choice to which the policy document referred?

In reality, Indian Affairs’ policy seemed to stifle choice while insisting that First Nations students become Canadian citizens. In support of this assertion is the official government policy which stated:

Indian Affairs policy is to give the Indian as much schooling as he can absorb—or wants. ‘Some Indians think we are forcing them off reserves’, one senior official told me. We must, if integration means anything, but only if they want to leave voluntarily.⁴⁵

We must force them but only if they want seems to be the rhetorical message of the official policy. One certainly must ask if the so-called choice of First Nations children to leave their communities was corrupted by the policy to “force them” into such a decision. While on one

⁴³ NAC RG 10, vol. 8570, File 1/1-2-2-5 pt.7., Memo from Eric Acland to Chief of Agencies Division re: “The Law and Civic Conscientiousness,” August 23, 1961.

⁴⁴ Canada, Government of, *The Indian in Transition: The Meeting of the Ways—Learning for Earning* (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1961) no page number.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 18.

hand, the Department's policy stated choice, on the other hand, it stated that: "Our big job is to educate the youngsters. If they want to return to the reserves, that's up to them."⁴⁶ One can only speculate how a curriculum geared entirely toward influencing Aboriginal children of reserves, and pointed at creating Canadian citizens could have influenced the choice of these young people to leave their communities and surrender their Indian status. Whether or not this was a choice to adopt Canadian culture is another question. Was the purpose of joint-schooling truly to promote integration?

The policies first developed in the late 1940s and 1950s around equal civic participation and economic self-sufficiency seemed absent in *The Indian in Transition*. In the words of the document: "The government is realizing at last that simply educating an Indian is not enough. If he goes to a white school he has taken one step towards accepting a white, Western culture."⁴⁷ This apparent attempt to normalize "white, Western culture" in the curriculum must certainly have presented an obvious hurdle to the choice making process. In addition, it seemingly contradicted the language of cultural respect found in the liberal multicultural discourse. Furthermore, it appears to abandon the focus on an integrated Canadian identity in favour of a renewed discourse on cultural assimilation.

Also evidenced in both the *Indian in Transition: The Meeting of the Ways*, and its successor *The Indian in Transition: Indian Education*, was the seemingly contrasting discourse of liberal multiculturalism. Of particular interest here is the emphasis on First Nations as just another ethnic group. This is illustrated the most basic goal of Indian Affairs' policy: "The fundamental aim of the government's policy towards Indians is the gradual

⁴⁶ Ibid., 18.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 19.

integration of our country's fastest growing ethnic group into the Canadian community."⁴⁸ In conjunction with this view, education was seen as the perfect place to begin the process of integration. As stated by the Department: "The ways of life of the Indians and non-Indians are as basically different as their cultures and viewpoints...In the cases of other ethnic groups, association of children in schools fostered rapid integration."⁴⁹ Schools seem to be portrayed as locations where cultural and political differences could be broken-down, and students could be taught to accept their place in the Canadian community. By postulating that First Nations were just another ethnic group, furthermore, Indian Affairs apparently validated the termination of Indian status.

The combined use of multicultural and assimilation discourses in the official government policy on Indian education, seems to parallel the apparent cleavage in the policy community. Certainly the Department's assimilation language, evident in the first policy document, seems to obscure the focus on building a new and inclusive Canadian cultural identity. Then again, the discourse on provincial citizenship seems to broaden the discussion on political identity. The only thing that can be said about the policy with any certainty is that the ultimate focus seems to have been on terminating Indian status. This is seen with particular clarity in the previous discussion on multicultural discourse, where the government seemed willing to entertain liberal multiculturalism but only insofar as it served to extinguish claims to special Indian status.

The Indian in Transition: Indian Education, published in 1962, also provides ample evidence of the discourse on choice. Once again, choice was framed in terms of education:

⁴⁸ Ibid., no page number.

⁴⁹ Canada, Government of, *The Indian in Transition: Indian Education* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1962) 16.

“It is the aim of the Indian Affairs Branch to raise the standard of living of Indian people and to furnish them with skills and education to enable them to integrate fully, if they so desire, in off reserve life.”⁵⁰ The document continued very specifically: “Integration of Indians and non-Indians is a voluntary process. It cannot be forced. It can not be hurried.”⁵¹ An interesting statement considering the ample evidence to the contrary. What does the use of these words suggest about the policy to extend Canadian citizenship?

Evidently, “forcing” and “hurrying” the integration process was not officially considered to be a viable option by policy makers. It is important to understand, however, that the terms “force” and “hurry” probably did not preclude the possibility of “influence.” The government was by no means a neutral participant in this regard. In its words, the educational programme had to “persuade and to encourage”⁵² the proper direction of First Nations children. Lamenting the fact that some children chose to remain in their communities, the document stated: “If children are to progress satisfactorily, they need to develop an appreciation of their opportunities.”⁵³ While it is apparent that First Nations children were given a choice, it can also be said that the decision to make a choice other than integration was attacked by the bias of federal policy makers. The use of the term “progress,” for example, seems to devalue the option of staying and/or retaining Indian status.

The thrust toward extending provincial citizenship was back on the front burner during a federal-provincial conference in 1963. The conference priorities were to evaluate the success of the integration policies adopted in 1951, and to devise strategies for the

⁵⁰ Ibid., 2.

⁵¹ Ibid., 6.

⁵² Ibid., 6.

wholesale conclusion of any remaining segregation oriented policies. According to the conference minutes, the goal of the meeting was to ensure the extension of "ordinary regulations," to First Nations "on the "same basis" as all other Canadians.⁵⁴ A key element of this goal was "the organization of Indian communities and the training of Indian leadership capable and prepared to assume and discharge community responsibilities within the normal framework of provincial-municipal relationships."⁵⁵ Apparently, the two tiers of government were attempting to extend the "...same rights as citizens of the provinces and of Canada..."⁵⁶ Judging from the conference minutes, it seems that civic education was to play a very important role in the creation of full Canadian citizenship. This Canadian citizenship seemed to be defined very specifically in the language of liberal equality, and within the context of a Canadian political identity. In short, the extension of provincial citizenship was to turn First Nations people into residents of a municipality, citizens of a province, and citizens of Canada, with all the rights, responsibilities, and privileges afforded to other Canadians.

There is little doubt that education policy was the linchpin in the government's plan to mold First Nations students into good Canadian citizens. The objective of Indian Affairs in 1963, as outlined at the federal-provincial conference, is a testament to this claim:

The basic objective of Indian administration is the voluntary integration of Indian individuals and Indian communities into the general social and economic life of the country. Related to the basic objective are the aims of the departments' specific programs in the field of education...⁵⁷

⁵³ Ibid., 20.

⁵⁴ NAC RG 10, vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, Federal-Provincial Conference Minutes, 1963, 2.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 3.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 3.

Judging from this statement, the importance of Indian education policy to the process of what one official called “citizenship building”⁵⁸ appears unmistakable. That these statements were made during a federal provincial conference, furthermore, suggests that the federal government saw the extension of provincial citizenship as an important part of Canadian citizenship in general.

The discourse of ostensible liberal equality, evident throughout the proceedings of both Special Joint Committee proceedings, also infiltrated the discourse on provincial citizenship. An aim of Indian Affairs’ policy, for example, called for the “Extension of provincial services and programs in order that needs in Indian communities are met on the same basis as for other Canadians.”⁵⁹ The use of the term “same basis” suggests the theme of equality, and the term “other Canadians” suggests that First Nations were Canadians just as everyone else. Additionally, Indian Affairs argued that First Nations “should have access to normal local and provincial services as do other provincial citizens and communities.”⁶⁰ Based on this, it seems that the extension of provincial citizenship was an adequate means by which First Nations could be brought to full equality with other citizens, and their Indian status terminated. Apparently, provincial status and services were the logical replacement for Indian status and special provisions under the Indian Act. It also suggests that, in at least some respects, citizenship was continuing to be defined by civic participation.

It was no secret that education was one in a menagerie of other policies, the aim of which was the extension of provincial citizenship. It was clearly stated at the conference that “...it should be possible with the active co-operation of the Indians to accelerate the

⁵⁸ Ibid. (The term citizenship building is used extensively throughout this document)

⁵⁹ Ibid., 3.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 9.

withdrawal of special supports and protection which are now required.”⁶¹ It was also obvious that this withdrawal would be based on the success of Indian education policy to “help” First Nations “...reach the same social and economic level as their non-Indian neighbours...” It was only then, according to the conference minutes, that “a corresponding reduction in the need for special programs on their behalf”⁶² could be achieved. In this sense, the extension of provincial citizenship seems to be hailed as means for transforming First Nations into equal Canadian citizens. Additionally, the conference minutes appear to suggest that the nature of this citizenship was to be in line with the same political and economic definitions envisioned since WWII.

In 1963, however, the discourse on cultural assimilation was once again at the forefront of policy discussion. At a symposium on Indian education, R.F. Davey wrote that “The influence of the integration program on Indian life has been far reaching, and if its accultural aims are valid, has also been beneficent.”⁶³ Davey appears to be admitting that cultural assimilation continued to play a role in Indian education policy. At the very least, his questioning of “acculturation” suggests that the discourse on cultural assimilation continued to exist informally.

Much more subtle was a memo sent by R.F. Battle to the Deputy Minister in December of 1963. It stated that:

Progress was made during the year in assisting Indians to participate more fully in Canada’s social and economic life. The importance of education in this respect was underlined by the expenditure of more than half of the Indian Affairs budget for academic and technical training.⁶⁴

⁶¹ Ibid., 3-4.

⁶² Ibid., 7.

⁶³ R.F. Davey, *The Indian Superintendent 1965*, 68.

⁶⁴ NAC RG 10, vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, Memo from R.F. Battle to the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, December 31, 1963.

Half of the Departmental budget was spent “assisting Indians to participate more fully.” Surely, given the evidence, this was a euphemism for assimilation. If not, then it certainly indicates the importance of education in what J.M Thibault, Chief of Resources and Industrial Division, described in 1965, as the “Department’s policy of *complete* acceptance [of Indians] into the Canadian economy and *way of life*[my emphasis]...”⁶⁵ In conjunction with the speeches and policy documents from the early 1960s, it would appear that cultural assimilation was still considered by some to be an appropriate agenda for Indian education policy.

Albeit in conjunction with the discourse of political identity, the classic assimilationist language of progress apparently survived into the mid-1960s as well. Illustrating this point, G.K. Gooderham, a Regional School Superintendent with Indian Affairs, asked an interesting question for the 1963 symposium on Indian education. His question: “By what means can we best assist the metamorphosis from welfare recipient to productive citizen, from primitive to contemporary, from dependent to independent?”⁶⁶ The question appears to describe what this bureaucrat saw as the aims of Indian policy: to transform First Nations into economically self-sufficient citizens; to culturally modernize a primitive people; and to move Indian status from wardship to citizenship. Certainly the language of modernization implies a degree of intolerance for cultural difference while the language of economic self-sufficiency and citizenship fit into the post-WWII definition of a civic identity. Regardless, Gooderham’s answer appears to reveal the apparent goal of the

⁶⁵ NAC RG 10, vol. 8836, File 1/1-16 pt.6, Memo from Chief, Resources and Industrial Division to J.M. Thibault, June 30, 1965.

policy that was to terminate Indian status: “they must be treated as others are treated.”⁶⁷ It seems therefore, that Gooderham’s remarks reflected all of the essential themes of 1960s Indian policy discourse. With such a confusing mélange of policy directions, which one was dominant?

By the mid-1960s, it appeared as if the normative discourse of economic and political Canadian citizenship would continue to permeate Indian education policy. Education, it seems, was the most expeditious way to speed up the process of changing First Nations children into Canadians. According to a 1966 policy document prepared by Jules D’Astous, Director of Administration for Indian Affairs, “One of the most important means of providing a brighter future for Indians is through improved education, an education which will enable them to compete on an equal basis with other Canadians.”⁶⁸ If these few short lines can be taken as an indicator, the push to use education to instill a civic identity in First Nations children showed little sign of subsiding.

On the same note, senior department officials also continued to perceive First Nations people as Canadian citizens. In response to a letter from a private citizen concerned about discrimination, the Deputy Minister wrote: “My government will continue to support and advance measures to maintain the good relationships which exist between the Indian peoples and the rest of the Canadian population.”⁶⁹ Responding to a similar letter, the Prime Minister’s Office demurred that “Indians are received by their fellow citizens with warmth

⁶⁶ G.K. Gooderham, “Prospect,” *The Indian Superintendent 1965: The Education of Indian Children in Canada*, ed. Indian Affairs, Education Division (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965) 95.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ NAC RG 10, vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.3, Jules D’Astous to Ruth Gordon re: ‘Bridging the Gap’ policy document, July 7, 1966.

and friendship.”⁷⁰ As opposed to talking about a day when the benefits of education would transform First Nations people into Canadian citizens, these responses seem to suggest that this change had already occurred. In effect, some in the policy community apparently moved beyond their earlier lament for the inadequacy of integrated education. What do these few examples actually suggest? Were the barriers to so-called “full citizenship” actually gone?

To declare the apparent citizenship objectives of post-WWII Indian policy a success by the mid-1960s would be erroneous. Some in the policy community, however, certainly seemed to have adopted a more aggressive approach to citizenship extension by the mid-1960s. Agency Superintendent Gooderham, for example, declared that: “The education of registered Indian pupils is a Federal responsibility. The education of other Canadians is a provincial responsibility. Indians are Canadians and this division must end as soon as possible.”⁷¹ Clearly Gooderham perceived a continued barrier to the complete acceptance of First Nations people as full citizens. Meanwhile, he appears to use a much stronger language than previously used—especially by the proponents of the transition in the early post-WWII period. On a further note, Gooderham appears to view the extension of provincial citizenship as an important method for achieving the goal of making First Nations into equal citizens, with the same political and legal rights as other Canadians.

It was not only influential superintendents like Gooderham that spoke in these terms. This language originated from the top of Indian Affairs itself. In a memo to the Deputy Minister in 1965, R.F. Battle listed the “extension of normal provincial services to reserves

⁶⁹ NAC RG 10, vol. 7186, File 274/25-1 pt.1, John H. Nicholson (representing Indian Affairs on behalf of Rt. Hon. Lester B. Pearson) to Frances Carlisle, May 7, 1965.

⁷⁰ NAC RG 10, vol. 7186 274/25-1 pt.1, L.S. Marchand to Margaret M. Bulger, May 7, 1965.

⁷¹ Gooderham, *The Indian Superintendent*, 100.

as quickly as possible and encouragement of Indians to look to Provincial and other agencies for more of the resources they need,”⁷² as an important agenda of the Department. The language used here certainly seems to have a much more forceful tone than found in the *Indian in Transition*—the policy document claiming that the transition to Canadian citizenship could not be “hurried.” In addition, this document raises questions about alternate reasons for the government’s interest in having First Nations look to the provinces for “more of the resources they needed.”

The Hawthorn Report

In 1966, a group of researchers was assembled at the behest of the federal government. Its mandate was to conduct a study of “the contemporary Indians of Canada.” The subsequent report became known after research director H.B. Hawthorn. The researchers considered the economic, political, and educational needs of First Nations. The Hawthorn Report was published in two volumes: the first in 1967 and the second in 1968. To some extent, it complimented the second SJC’s attention to protecting First Nations cultures. The researchers, for example, claimed that they did “...not think that the Indian should be required to assimilate.”⁷³ The report continued in a vein of respect for Aboriginal culture by stating that “ordinary respect for what values and institutions, languages, religions and modes of thought, persist in their own small societies, which were once fully viable and to varying extents are so today, calls for maintenance of this principle.”⁷⁴ The report seemed to take an interest in the cultural needs of First Nations. The same needs that Indian Affairs

⁷² NAC RG 10, vol. 8836, File 1/16-1 pt.8, Memo from R.F. Battle to the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, November 18, 1965, 2.

⁷³ H.B. Hawthorn, ed., *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: A Report on Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*, 2 vols. (Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch, 1967) 1: 6.

appeared to ignore. In the words of the report, “The research group consider it important that cultural autonomy not be directly lessened by any proffered political, educational or economic changes.”⁷⁵ In short, there seems to be substantial support for the acceptance of First Nations cultures in the report’s recommendations.

The findings in Volume I, however, were not entirely clear. In fact, they consisted of a highly contradictory set of recommendations to the federal government. One of the chief problems causing this was the researchers’ use of the discourse on choice. Much like the discourse of the 1950s and early 1960s, the Hawthorn Report did not seem to postulate a dynamic set of meaningful options from which a choice could be made. For example, Volume I states that:

It is equally important that individuals be given the capacity to make choices which include the decision to take jobs away from the reserve, play a part in politics, and move and reside where they wish...—in separate cultural communities or to leave them temporarily or permanently.⁷⁶

In this particular instance, the so-called “choices” appear to be framed with a single option in mind. The choice to leave the First Nations community is the apparent focus of the recommendation. Thus, the researchers are seen to prioritize the range of options, and hence validate the relevance of a predetermined option. In this case, the researchers do not appear to account for the validity of one’s choice to retain Indian status, or live in a separate cultural community.

Volume I also contains a report on the capacity to make choices. In this vein, the researchers seem to keep in line with others from the policy community who failed to

⁷⁴ Ibid., 1: 6.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 1: 10.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 1: 10.

critically consider the effect of outside influences, such as education, on an individual's ability to make decisions. The report speaks of "cultural autonomy," for example, and insists that the "...retention of these identities is up to the Indians."⁷⁷ This may have had some merit if, as stated in the report, cultural autonomy was not "directly lessened" by the influence of education. In fact, the report argues that education inherently changes "the Indian's view of himself and the world."⁷⁸ To claim that the retention of cultural identity is up to the individual, and then to claim that mandatory state imposed education has a major influence on building one's cultural identity, seems somewhat short-sighted. Who is responsible for maintaining one's culture: the community or the individual? What happens to an individual's capacity to choose this culture when she is given only a single, limited option from which to choose? These seem to be questions that the researchers failed to consider. Nonetheless, the report apparently shows that cultural assimilation remained an underlying goal of integrated education policy.

Volume II of the report deals specifically with education. Whilst apparently avoiding any substantial recommendations, the report delivers a trenchant criticism of Indian education policy. Speaking about the integration project the report states:

This philosophy, however, displays several flaws or omissions and ambiguities. The government's policy on the preservation of the Indian languages and cultural traditions, for example, is not clear. As a general rule, they are not assigned importance. This makes it difficult to distinguish between a policy of integration and a policy of assimilation, which allows the loss of the basic cultural values of the integrated ethnic group.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Ibid., 1: 10.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 1: 10.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 2: 41.

Looking back at the proceedings of the second SJC, it seemed as if a rift had formed in the policy community over which direction to proceed with Indian policy. Would education be used for cultural assimilation or would there be a greater respect for First Nations cultures in the project of building a Canadian identity? In the years that followed, it appeared that a project of assimilation might still have been at work in Indian policy. The Hawthorn Report appears to strike at the very core of this question. In its view, integrated education policy did continue as an affront to the cultural survival of First Nations people. By questioning if integration and assimilation were synonymous, furthermore, the report seems to show the continuation of assimilation as an unofficial policy of the federal government. It also lends credibility to the assertion that there was, indeed, a rift in the policy community over how to proceed with Indian policy.

According to the report's analysis, the official edge of Indian policy continued with the post-WWII agenda of civic education in the service of building Canadian political and economic identities. According to the report, the government's policy was to "re-socialize such groups of children so that they become functioning adults in the social milieu of the majority."⁸⁰ Note the usage of "social milieu" over the use of cultural or religious "milieu." In doing so, the report seems to suggest that the aim of the Department was to socialize First Nations to a specific identity—to an identity that would allow them to interact socially as Canadians and with other Canadians. In terms of defining the nature of this interaction the report points specifically to the federal government's desire "to see the Indians integrate completely in the economic and social life of Canada and to live on an equal footing with

⁸⁰ Ibid., 2: 105.

other citizens of the country.”⁸¹ Therefore, the Canadian identity appears to be defined in terms of social equality, economic participation, and civic fellowship, and the project of creating this identity rested seemingly with education policy.

By the mid-1960s, the one clear goal of Indian policy seems to have been the termination of Indian status. The government certainly appeared, in their language anyway, to desire the extension of full citizenship to First Nations in order to ensure the equal treatment of all Canadians. Although the government seemed officially prepared to leave Canadian citizenship as a choice for First Nations, an analysis of the discourse appears to show that the government offered no real choice at all. In fact, education policy was apparently designed to influence First Nations children to accept Canadian citizenship while ignoring their own culture. It also seems clear that the theme of political participation was reinforced by the discourse surrounding the extension of provincial citizenship. Interestingly enough, cultural assimilation continued as an underlying goal of official integration policy. This seemed to be a goal perpetuated by Indian Affairs’ disregard for including First Nations cultures in Indian education policy discourse. Would this trend continue?

As argued earlier, the language surrounding integration had become much more forceful by the mid-1960s. This trend seemed to continue in the late 1960s, and reveals once again, that the policy of cultural assimilation was never too far from the official goals of Indian Affairs. In 1967, a guidance programme was designed specifically for First Nations high school students. A quotation from a relative policy document begins with the discourse of Canadian citizenship, and then seems to end with the discourse of cultural assimilation:

Indian young people should be academically, socially and emotionally prepared to look forward with confidence and anticipation to work and

⁸¹ Ibid., 2: 23.

live side by side with other Canadians. This means a new emphasis upon attitudes, values and goals from the day the child enters school until he graduates.⁸²

The same document stated that the government saw education as a tool to help First Nations children “better choose, train for and enter upon careers compatible with their personalities, interests and abilities”?⁸³ Surely by attempting to shape these “personalities, interests and abilities” to a Canadian norm of “attitudes, values and goals,” the education policy constituted an assault on Aboriginal culture? In this light, Indian Affairs seems to have aimed short of integrating First Nations culture into a new Canadian identity, and instead focused their attention, once again, on preserving the established white, western cultural order.

In order to argue that the purpose of this new guidance programme was to enhance the development of cultural change amongst First Nations students, one would need to account for its so-called “special objectives” which were clearly aimed at making First Nations into “responsible citizens.”⁸⁴ The primary goal, as stated in the document, was to develop a “wholesome attitude toward education and the opportunities which become available to the students through suitable training.”⁸⁵ This type of objective certainly seems to be a better fit to the goal of fostering a Canadian civic identity—especially one based on economic participation in society. Nonetheless, the document also contained objectives harping back to the hey-day of residential education. Expanding on the new policy, the document declared that “It will also involve learning to speak English or French fluently and

⁸² NAC RG 10, vol. 13037, File 401/25-17 pt.1, Revised Guidance Manual for Indian Schools, June, 1967, 1.

⁸³ Ibid., 1.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 2.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 5.

without accent so they will not feel conspicuous when associating with other Canadians.”⁸⁶

If not a policy of cultural assimilation, what was it? At the very least, this policy appears to contradict the basic principles of cultural respect outlined in the recommendations of both the second SJC and the Hawthorn Report.

This policy document is also a perfect example of how the discourse on choice served to disguise the goal of assimilation. The document states that “The ultimate aim of Indian education is to prepare Indian youth so that as adults they will actually be given a choice as to what they will do and where they will live.”⁸⁷ It would seem, therefore, that the purpose of education is not to assimilate students into the dominant culture but rather, to provide students with a choice of what culture they will choose to adopt. When examining the policy more closely, however, the discourse seems to reveal a glaring bias in the curricular objectives toward the choice of adopting Canadian culture.

Our real problem is how the youth of today may best be educated to make their way in the world of tomorrow—the world of their adulthood. To this end, we must be concerned with the learning of skills; the inculcation of desirable habits and attitudes; the growth of personality, and the development of leadership.⁸⁸

What type of skills? Habits and attitudes desirable to whom? What characteristics of personality were to be nurtured? Leadership to answer what calling? Based on the analysis of education policy thus far, the answers to all these questions clearly link education policy to a policy of cultural assimilation. Ultimately, how a child is influenced to make a choice reveals the actual choices she is given. In this case, despite a discourse to respect First

⁸⁶ Ibid., 5.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 7.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 2.

Nations cultures, Indian Affairs appears to pursue cultural assimilation through an official policy of integration.

Despite the findings of the second SJC and of the Hawthorn Report, Indian Affairs apparently continued to pursue a policy of cultural assimilation through civic education. The language of progress, for example, continued to emerge in the discourse on Indian education. Indians must be given “modern alternatives” to “ancient ways,” said the Minister of Indian Affairs Arthur Laing in a 1968 speech to the Canadian Association for Indian Education.⁸⁹ The Department, moreover, persisted in its efforts to extend the integrated education system. In the same speech, the Minister clearly stated that, “It is the objective of the Department to have 80% of the Indian students in provincially operated schools by 1973...”⁹⁰ Bearing in mind that the apparent purpose of education was to instill the values of Canadian citizenship at the expense of First Nations cultures, the objective of reaching an 80% attendance rate might indicate an increase in magnitude to the Department’s apparent agenda of cultural assimilation.

In the speech, Laing paraphrased a story from the famous West Coast Chief, Dan George. The story was an analogy about making a “perfect fit” by rubbing two sticks together. Laing made a clumsy attempt to relate this story to the Canadian and First Nations state-relationship. “...They must rub against one another until a perfect fit has been achieved. This is the primary reason for bringing Indian children into the same schools as their contemporaries attend. The two cultures can rub one against the other, neither having to

⁸⁹ NAC RG 10, vol. 13039, File 401/25-18-1, pt.2, Address by Arthur Laing to the Canadian Association for Indian Education re: the future of Indian and Eskimo Education, May 23, 1968, 1.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 7.

give more than the other, but each adapting to fit comfortably and well.”⁹¹ What Laing failed to account for, however, were the power relations shared by the two groups. Provincial schools were/are institutions of the dominant society, and the number of First Nations students who attended these schools, for the most part, represented only a fraction of the enrollment. Taking into account the nature of the education system—a matter discussed throughout this thesis—it would be difficult to argue that there was cultural equity for First Nations children in this environment. Perhaps, on the other hand, Laing’s speech can be viewed as an attempt to adumbrate his department’s goal of preserving the cultural order by continuing with a process of cultural assimilation.

Ironically, it seemed to be the discourse on choice that most revealed the relationship between education and the preservation of the white, western order. According to a 1968 speech on education policy prepared for the Assistant Deputy Minister:

The government’s policy is that every Indian shall have the right to choose for himself the type and kind of life he wishes to lead within his own individual capabilities and desires. Freedom of opportunity is the basis for much of the Department’s programs and policies.⁹²

This statement certainly seems to indicate that First Nations were to be given a choice. How this choice was framed by the discourse on education policy, however, appears to indicate that the government was attempting to provide and legitimize only a single option—the option of becoming Canadian. The Minister of Indian Affairs, for example, indicated which choice was better in a speech at the University of Western Ontario.

So these Indian people who wish to have the better things of life are facing the problem of acquiring the skills, gaining the training and

⁹¹ Ibid., 7.

⁹² NAC MG 32 B1, vol. 60, Speech by Arthur Laing at the University of Western Ontario re: The Indian people, the Government and the Canadian Community, February 16, 1968, 7.

adjusting to an urban world. Those who choose this new world must make the adjustment...in a matter of a few formative years of schooling.⁹³

At once, the Minister seems to legitimize both the decision of leaving the reserve, and the policy of education to facilitate this choice. In reality there seems to be no choice at all. Choice discourse was simply the sheep's clothing for the lion of assimilation. Of particular interest, furthermore, is the Minister's use of the words "skills" and "training" which indicate an association with the discourse on civic participation. He uses these words, however, within a discourse of progress. This seems to portray the adoption of a Canadian civic identity not as an economic benefit, but as a cultural benefit—as if the Canadian world was intrinsically better than the First Nations world.

In fact, the Minister's entire speech was loaded with subtle thrusts of assimilationist rancour. Regarding the matter of terminating Indian status, Laing indicated that the best way to solve the Indian problem was to continue with effective strategies of integrated education. "The younger people must be given a good education which fits them for a place in the world."⁹⁴ He continued, suggesting that the government only funds education "...because a better educated, better trained Indian group will assist the Indian people in their struggle for full equality in Canadian life."⁹⁵ Therefore, First Nation's so-called "place in the world," is revealed to be within a Canadian context. Why not a First Nations context?

During a similar speech in 1968, the Assistant Deputy Minister stated that full equality could only be achieved if "...their children go to the same schools as other

⁹³ Ibid., 3.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 5.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 8.

Canadians.”⁹⁶ In addition, he claimed that “they will be much happier...much more prosperous and they will have a central place in the Canadian mosaic”⁹⁷ if the policies of education are successful. The words of these senior Indian Affairs officials seem to reveal a discourse that reaches much further than just economic and political assimilation. Regardless of the friendly language of equality, the education programme appears designed to facilitate the assimilation of young First Nations students into a dominant cultural concept of Canadian life labeled “a central place.” In addition, neither the Minister nor Assistant Deputy Minister spoke to the issue of respecting First Nations cultures by integrating them into the curriculum.

Despite the possible hidden agenda for cultural assimilation, it is important to stress that Indian Affairs was also very much concerned with terminating Indian status through the building of economic and political citizenship. Words such as “skills” and “training,” and the term “competition,” continued in the discourse on Indian education, and seem to indicate that integrated education would train First Nations children to become good Canadian citizens within the context of economic participation in society. According to a 1968 publication from Indian Affairs:

...through education and training our Indian population can be brought to assume a more vital role in Canadian affairs. The educational services are seen as a means to an end, that of making it possible for the Indians to become economically self-sufficient over a period of time.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Ibid., 8.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 11.

⁹⁸ NAC RG 10, Accession 1984-85/112, Box 27, File 401/25-1, Education Services available to Indians through the Indian Affairs Branch, 1968, 1.

In the end, therefore, there still seemed to be a focus on citizenship as defined in terms of economic self-sufficiency—a definition of a citizenship which would seem to require the adoption of a civic identity rather than outright cultural assimilation. Or would it?

Citizenship meant many things to many different people during this era. Provincial citizenship, multicultural citizenship, political citizenship, and economic citizenship were the main foci of the policy community in the 1950s and 1960s. The extension of provincial citizenship seemed to be rooted in a desire to extend the same services on the same basis as received by all other Canadians. The policy discourse studied in this chapter pointed to a continued belief that full equality could only be achieved if everyone, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples alike, were treated the same. In order to achieve this, Indian status needed to be terminated. The termination of Indian status clearly required the extension of provincial services to replace the social support system outlined in the Indian Act. Special social programs such as education were to be replaced by provincial education on the same basis as for other Canadians.

The policy community also continued to promote the idea of developing a civic identity with political and economic components of citizenship. It was expected that integrated education would help assimilate First Nations children into economically competent citizens: people who would hold trades and professions and practice them as Canadians in an off-reserve setting. It was expected that education would assimilate First Nations children into good political citizens mindful of their rights and responsibilities under the law, and conscious of their duties to their fellow citizens. This was a discourse which continued to be influenced by the values of post-WWII liberalism.

The discourse surrounding choice clearly demonstrated the liberal influence on policy while it simultaneously worked to stifle the integration of First Nations cultures into the burgeoning Canadian identity. In terms of the economic identity, First Nations students were expected to take jobs in non-Aboriginal communities and jobs that were important to non-Aboriginal society. In addition, there was little evidence to demonstrate that First Nations cultures could actually influence the emerging definition of the components to civic identity—both political and economic. Instead, they were to be fostered in an education system that did very little to incorporate a First Nations culturally relevant curriculum. In every way, the meaning of political and economic citizenship seemed to be rooted in the established white, western tradition.

Apparently it was in this vein that a schism developed in the policy community over the issue of assimilation versus integration. On one side, the Department of Indian Affairs seemed content to ignore the cultural impact of political and economic citizenship training based on the white western norms of provincial education. These people seemed to advocate a universal citizenship without recognizing the dominant influence of white western culture. On the other side, the knowledge elite, and second special joint committee seemed to recognize that integration would require the acceptance of First Nations cultures in the school curriculum. These people seemed to advocate a multicultural citizenship based around the liberal idea of a universal Canadian citizenship with contributions from a multiple of cultural quarters.

In the end, both sides seemed to agree that the termination of special Indian status was essential to the development of the full and equal participation of First Nations in Canadian society. The question these factions seemed to grapple with concerned whether

equal status was achieved simply through the elimination of Indian status or if the termination of First Nations cultures was also required. The main change to Indian policy that becomes apparent while studying these issues concerns the nature of cultural assimilation. Whereas during the pre-WWII period the government made a deliberate attempt at the cultural assimilation of First Nations in residential schools, the post-WWII period saw a refocusing of attention on civic assimilation. Although the government's formal focus was on economic and political assimilation, they also continued in a vein of cultural assimilation. This however, was not a deliberate, active policy. Instead, by ignoring the implications of the white, western approach to education, and ignoring the ramifications of white western norms on the development of economic and political citizenship, the government seemed to adopt a policy of inaction toward the integration of First Nations cultures into the Canadian identity. Although Indian Affairs adopted the language of cultural tolerance and respect, they never seemed able to fully incorporate these concepts into the content of their policy.

This chapter began with a quotation from the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration Ellen Fairclough. In it, she proclaimed that Indian policy was concerned with respecting First Nations "cultural heritage." This comment was quickly followed by another from H.L. Keenleyside who proclaimed that "as long as one among us is unjustly treated all of us suffer with him." These words could have led Indian Affairs into the 1960s with a greater motivation to deal fairly with First Nations. Instead, the Department remained steadfast to the view of First Nations cultures as a "problem" and proceeded, albeit with some modification, to continue in a tradition that seemed to ignore the integration of First Nations cultures into education policy, and into Canadian society at large.

CHAPTER 4

Canadians of Full Status

I was once told that the most important work of an historian is the study of change and continuity. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this thesis is that it reveals the paradox of such a project. There were, indeed, some very obvious changes that occurred in Indian policy following WWII; for example, this thesis has discussed the changing discourse surrounding wardship, the emergence of liberalism as a major influence on Indian policy, the decline of the church-state relationship, the growth of federal provincial co-operation and Indian provincial citizenship, and the development of a liberal multicultural discourse on First Nations citizenship. Although these developments constituted significant changes in Indian policy, they also contributed to a seeming continuity: the project of assimilation.

Assimilation certainly continued following WWII; however, it would not be entirely accurate to conclude that this reflected a strict continuity—hence the paradox. Although assimilation continued during the post-WWII period, it was not the same deliberate, formal, active policy that it once was. Instead, assimilation transformed into an informal policy characterized by the federal government's inaction to effectively and critically respect First Nations cultures. In this regard, I have discussed the bias of choice discourse, the problems associated with universal and individual rights-based citizenship, and the proposed educational curriculum that was centred on a white, western paradigm. In the end, therefore, there was both change and continuity in the post WWII era of Indian policy. This chapter will now turn to a more detailed discussion on change and continuity in Indian education policy discourse during the 1945-69 period.

Conclusions

Throughout this thesis, Canadian citizenship is characterized in three distinct ways: political, economic, and cultural. It is clear that the formal goal of education policy was to integrate First Nations children into political and economic citizenship. This thesis has termed these two components of post-WWII citizenship as a civic identity because to a large degree, they represent a set of roles and responsibilities directly associated with the state. Unlike previous educational policies, where Canadian identity was to be assimilated through religious education, post-WWII policies focused on civic education. The Canadian civic identity was formally based upon exercising good Canadian citizenship. In that vein, the objectives of civic education were: to establish competencies of economic self-sufficiency in First Nations children so as to enable them to participate in the Canadian workforce; and to establish competencies of democratic citizenship that would allow First Nations to participate in the Canadian political environment. Based on these objectives, a civic identity was to be built around the conception of shared economic and political responsibilities within a democratic Canadian society.

Regardless of the formal discourse surrounding integration and civic identity, cultural assimilation seemed to persist as an informal policy of the federal government. This constituted a subtle yet important change from the pre-WWII period. Although assimilation was shown to continue, it no longer continued as the primary, formal focus of Indian education policy. Instead, cultural assimilation persisted as an informal element to Indian policy. The underlying goal of cultural assimilation revealed itself in many ways including the discourse on economic and political citizenship, the liberal language of equality, the

multicultural citizenship debate, the curricular goals of Indian education policy, and the discourse on choice. These discourses will be discussed below.

Economic and Political Citizenship: The discourse surrounding civic identity failed to evaluate the inherent dominance of white, western culture in the definitions of economic and political participation. The discourse on economic participation, for example, did not qualify occupations based in First Nations cultural traditions as suitable for economic self-sufficiency. In addition, the goal of economic participation was to relocate First Nations away from their cultural communities in the dominant cultural milieu of Canadian society. In the same way, the discourse on political participation was geared entirely toward the dominant paradigms of white, western culture with little indication that First Nations concepts of governance would be integrated into the Canadian political system. Although formally, economic and political participation did not seem to interfere with First Nations modes of cultural reproduction, certainly their inherent bias toward the dominant cultural paradigm did constitute an assault on First Nations cultures.

The Liberal Language of Equality: The liberal discourse certainly made it seem like First Nations would be treated with tolerance and respect, and that they would be given the freedom to participate on an equal basis with other Canadian citizens. However, the liberal discourse blurred the lines between “sameness” and equality by focusing on the rights and responsibilities of the individual. This created a situation in which First Nations cultures were ignored in the development of a Canadian identity. Those who seemed to dominate the policy discourse failed to recognize that First Nations people were not the same as other members of the dominant society. Although the liberal discourse was not a formal or

deliberate attempt at cultural assimilation, through its ignorance of First Nations collective rights, it certainly contributed to an informal discourse on assimilation.

The Multicultural Citizenship Debate: The debate over the nature of multicultural citizenship split the policy community during the 1960s. On one side were those at Indian Affairs who, by the 1960s, appeared unwilling to take an active role in integrating First Nations culture into the development of Canadian citizenship. On the other side were the knowledge elite and second Special Joint committee who recognized the importance of including Aboriginal cultures in the process of creating Canadian citizenship. This second group also argued that any policy which neglected First Nations culture would be detrimental to the cultural survival of First Nations people. The fact that Indian Affairs did not adopt this attitude suggests that they were proceeding with a policy of inaction towards the inclusion of First Nations culture in the development of Canadian citizenship.

Curricular Goals: The debate over how to proceed with integrated educational curriculum paralleled the debate over multicultural citizenship. By the late 1960s, there was a very clear division between the politicians and bureaucrats at Indian Affairs, and the other members of the policy community. The latter argued that the predominance of a white, western paradigm in education was harmful to First Nations cultural reproduction. Department bureaucrats, by contrast, denied that the *status quo* of provincial education was a problem in this regard. By ignoring the policy community, the Department was not only ignoring the recommendations of a Special Joint Committee report, but the Hawthorn report as well: a research project solicited and paid for by the Department itself. Although the official policy and formal goals of Indian Affairs did not advocate cultural assimilation, the denial of this problem certainly constituted an informal sanctioning of it.

The Language of Choice: The language of choice was thoroughly caught up in the discourse of liberalism; however, it was most apparent in the discourse surrounding educational curriculum. The policy community was interested in creating a political state in which all members of society were given equal opportunity to participate in both political and economic affairs. The main way to achieve this goal was through education. Education was seen as a method to extend the tools needed for participation in the Canadian state. It was often stated by various members of the policy community that through education, First Nations would be given a choice of either fully participating in Canadian society or remaining rooted in their cultural communities. The educational curriculum, however, was geared entirely toward influencing First Nations children to adopt white, western Canadian political and economic practices. This concept of choice was obviously very limiting and it certainly contributed to an informal discourse on cultural assimilation.

Continuity and Change

Prior to WWII, Indian education policy was geared toward the explicit purpose of cultural assimilation. First Nations children were given no choice in the matter of adopting white, western culture; the curricular goals were aimed at cultural assimilation through occupational and religious training; and white, western European culture was seen as the only meaningful paradigm for citizenship. Following WWII, these attitudes were dropped from official Indian education policy discourse and replaced by the gregarious language of cultural tolerance and respect. In addition, liberal equal-rights discourse appeared to redefine the established political and cultural order. This, however, is not an entirely accurate depiction of post-WWII Canada. Based on the analysis of Indian education policy discourse, the emergent discourse was never able to reach the actual content of Indian policy. In short,

cultural assimilation persisted as an underlying goal of Indian policy. It can be said, therefore, that there was both continuity and change in the discourse surrounding Indian assimilation.

One important change in the political environment seemed to be the growing rift in the policy community over the issue of cultural assimilation. By the late 1960s, it was apparent to some that cultural assimilation was persisting as an underlying goal of Indian education policy, and that it was no longer a desirable outcome. These people certainly seemed to be pushing toward a more critical vision of integration and multiculturalism. At the very least, they seemed to advocate the inclusion of First Nations cultures to the educational curriculum, thus suggesting that their vision for citizenship was multicultural.

An apparent continuity in general Indian policy discourse was the focus on terminating Indian status. Even this project, however, seemed to undergo some degree of change. Whereas in the pre-WWII period, the termination of Indian status was synonymous with the termination of First Nations cultures, the post WWII period applied a greater degree of attention to terminating Indian status through the extension of Canadian political citizenship. There is at least some evidence of a rough transition between these two philosophies beginning by the mid 1950s. In addition, the drive toward extending political citizenship was influenced by a growing public demand for the extension of equal rights to First Nations. The public demanded that First Nations be treated the same as everyone else: without special status. The extension of political citizenship as a means of terminating special Indian status is probably best illustrated by the development of a discourse surrounding provincial citizenship. Inherent in the idea to send First Nations children to provincial schools was the belief that extending provincial services to First Nations would

normalize their relationship to the state so that they would function in the same relation to Canadian governance structures as all other Canadians. Joint education appeared to be a microcosm of this vision.

It is possible that the federal government saw the extension of provincial citizenship as a means of reducing the cost of Indian administration. This thesis did not deal with the impact of economic influences on Indian policy. Certainly further research should be done in this area. While researching this topic, however, I did come across some information suggesting that the federal government was having a difficult time acquiring and enumerating qualified teachers. In addition, both Miller and Milloy allude to the government's failure to properly fund education during the residential school era.¹ The research in this thesis, however, clearly demonstrates that the government was driven by a determination to extend the same rights, responsibilities, and privileges to First Nations children as enjoyed by other Canadians. To this end, the termination of Indian status required the government to seek alternate ways of administering such social services as education to First Nations. Considering the influence of a liberal discourse, and the public demand for "sameness" of treatment, the extension of provincial citizenship seemed to be a logical response to both demands.

Another potential reason for the federal government to turn to the provinces for co-operation in Indian administration was the deteriorating role of the Christian churches in Indian education administration. There did not appear to be another organization prepared to assume the monumental task and the demanding responsibility of providing Indian education.

¹ Historians J.R. Miller and J.S. Milloy discuss this topic with great detail in their respective monographs, *Shingwauk's Vision*, and *A National Crime*.

In fact, the evidence evaluated for the purpose of this thesis revealed no other alternatives to either provincial or church administered Indian education. The emergence of civic Indian education as the primary *modes educatus* was a major change from the religious education of the pre-WWII period. Although denominational residential schooling continued in the post-WWII period, and in some locations it actually expanded, provincial joint schooling replaced religious residential schooling in most of the provinces by the 1960s. Once again, there are likely many reasons why this was the case. Some scholars have suggested that the churches' failure to effectively administer Indian education in the pre-WWII period led to this change. The evidence presented in this thesis does not contradict that argument; however, it is clear that the influence of liberalism and the secularization of Indian policy discourse played an important role in the deterioration of the church-state relationship in Indian education policy. In a society that was growing more liberal-rights based and state-centred, the transfer of Indian education to provincial administration must certainly be considered as a logical progression.

Why were policies premised on wardship changing to policies based on citizenship? This thesis has attempted to show that post-WWII Indian policy was heavily influenced by an emergent liberal discourse: a discourse that spurred the development of a Canadian society based theoretically on liberties and responsibilities equally distributed to all individuals. As liberal rights became the standard against which citizenship was judged, the ethnocentric basis that cast First Nations as wards slowly lost its grip on policy discourse. Clearly, the ethnocentric political, economic, and cultural ordering of society did not end with this transition. The extension of Canadian citizenship was loaded with the paradigm of white, western culture. As official policies of cultural assimilation were dropped, they were

replaced with policies that contributed to an unofficial policy of cultural assimilation. This unofficial policy was packed in a discourse advocating a Canadian civic identity.

Perhaps, as suggested in chapter 1, “Canadianization” would be a term better used to characterize the process of assimilation that began in the post-WWII period. Surely this term would help distinguish the difference between a project of formal assimilation based entirely on white, western culture and religion, and a project of assimilation ensconced in a Canadian civic identity discourse. Whereas the pre-WWII period of assimilation was characterized by Christianity and ethnicity, the post-WWII period of assimilation was based in the development of a secular Canadian society. More attention needs to be focused on the subtle differences between pre and post-WWII Indian policy. I hope that the term “Canadianization” will help in this regard.

Epilogue and Suggestions for Future Research—1969 to Present

In 1969, the federal government released the infamous White Paper on Indian policy. The document was largely a product of backroom dealings between the Department of Indian Affairs and the Prime Minister. It was greatly influenced by the liberal ideals of the day, and in this vein, it proposed the immediate abolition of the Indian Act and all special Indian status. The goal of the proposed policy was to extend full and equal Canadian citizenship to Indians as quickly and certainly as possible. In all respects, it seems to have been a culmination to Indian policy discourse during the post-WWII period.

In many ways, an analysis of the White Paper lends credibility to the conclusions of this thesis. Just as the policy discourse of the 1950s and 1960s, the White Paper focused particular attention on extending political and economic citizenship to First Nations people. Quoting the document, Olive Dickason states: “The government announced it was going ‘to

enable the Indian people to be free—free to develop Indian cultures in an environment of legal, social, and economic equality with other Canadians.”² With particular regard to political citizenship, then-Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau seemed interested in extending provincial citizenship as a means of normalizing the relationship between other Canadians and Indians. In his words:

We have set the Indians apart as a race. We’ve set them apart in our laws. We’ve set them apart in the ways the governments will deal with them. They’re not citizens of the provinces as the rest of us are. They are wards of the federal government. They get their services from the federal government rather than from the provincial or municipal governments. They have been set apart in law. They have been set apart in the relations with government and they’ve been set apart socially too.³

Trudeau was surely concerned about the extension of full individual and equal rights to Indians. The tone of his comments, in addition, clearly indicates that the driving force behind the termination of Indian status and the extension of Canadian citizenship were the ideals of liberalism. More specifically, Trudeau seemed concerned with creating a political state in which all members of society were given equal opportunity and liberty.

Also in comparison to the discourse of the post-WWII period, the goals of the White Paper seemed to challenge the survival of First Nations cultures. At the very least, the proposal’s focus on individual rights apparently endangered the protection of First Nations collective rights. Once again, according to Trudeau:

We’re at a crossroads, the time is now to decide whether the Indians will be a race apart in Canada or whether they will be ‘Canadians of full status.’ And this is a difficult choice. It must be a very agonizing choice to the Indian peoples themselves. Because on the one hand, they

² Dickason, *Canada’s First Nations* 363.

³ NAC RG 10, Accession 1984-85/112, Box 37, File 401/44-1 pt.1, Transcript of the Prime Minister’s Remarks to the Vancouver Liberal Association Dinner, August 8, 1969.

realize that if they come into society as total citizens, they will be equal under the law but they risk losing certain of their traditions, certain aspects of their culture and perhaps even certain of their basic rights.⁴

The fact that a universal Canadian citizenship threatened First Nations cultural survival was evident in the previous 20 years of Indian policy discourse. Also evident in both the White Paper proposal and the post-WWII discourse was the official, active focus on the extension of political citizenship. Once again, furthermore, a policy of inaction toward the protection of First Nations cultures reveals an underlying agenda of cultural assimilation. This fact was not lost on the First Nations political community who, recognizing the weight of the White Paper's recommendations, organized under the National Indian Brotherhood and elsewhere, and eventually forced the government to withdraw their proposal.

In 1973, Indian education returned to the forefront of policy discourse. The Ministry of Indian Affairs, led by Jean Chrétien, promised to terminate integrated education policy and replace it with *Indian Control of Indian Education* (ICIE)—a policy document prepared by the National Indian Brotherhood. This policy outlined what many First Nations people believed to be an appropriate system of schooling for their children. ICIE outlined the need for a culturally relevant curriculum, community-based schools, and community and parental control over education.⁵ In short, it recommended everything that integrated education had failed to consider. The principles of ICIE remain the official force behind the federal government's Indian education policy as of August 2001.

Several major research reports have studied the efficacy of ICIE since 1973. In 1988, the Assembly of First Nations produced *Tradition and Education*. This comprehensive

⁴ Ibid.

report condemned the government for not following through with its policy to provide culturally relevant educational services to First Nations children.⁶ A 1992 study conducted for the Canadian Education Association by education expert Verna J. Kirkness concluded that "...many more initiatives must be undertaken at all levels if the system is to be responsive to the needs of the First Nations children of today and tomorrow, as outlined in the ICIE document."⁷ Nearly 30 years after the federal government adopted ICIE, a report from the Office of the Auditor General concluded that

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada cannot demonstrate that it meets its stated objective to assist First Nations students living on reserves in achieving their educational needs and aspirations. For example, the Department does not have the necessary assurance that First Nations students are receiving culturally appropriate education. Moreover, the progress in closing the education gap for Indian students living on reserves has been unacceptably low. At the current rate of progress, it will take over 20 years for them to reach parity in academic achievement with other Canadians.⁸

The findings of these studies are clear: the government has remained inactive with regards to providing for ICIE. As a result, 40% of First Nations children living on reserve continue to attend provincial schools.⁹ Effectively, joint-schooling continues as a part of federal Indian education policy. In addition, it continues with the full knowledge of all involved that provincial education cannot provide an acceptably culturally relevant First Nations curriculum.

⁵ National Indian Brotherhood [NIB], *Indian Control of Indian Education: Policy Paper* 2nd ed. (Ottawa: NIB, 1977).

⁶ Assembly of First Nations[AFN], *Tradition and Education: Towards a Vision of Our Future—A Declaration of First Nations Jurisdiction Over Education* (Territory of Akwesasne: National Indian Brotherhood-AFN, 1988) see page 63 especially.

⁷ Verna J. Kirkness, "Foreword," *First Nations and Schools: Triumphs and Struggles* (Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1992).

⁸ OAG, 4.5.

Did the adoption of *Indian Control of Indian Education* signify a serious change to federal Indian education policy? The continuation of integrated education nearly 30 years after the adoption of ICIE certainly does raise this question. Further research on Indian education policy must examine the period from 1973 until present. Preliminary speculation might suggest that a project of Canadianization continues as an underlying goal of federal Indian education policy. If not, why has the government failed to provide culturally relevant education for all First Nations people? In addition to this question, it certainly seems pertinent to wonder if a significant degree of cultural assimilation continues to pervade the discourse at Indian Affairs.

Additional research should also be conducted on the idea of provincial citizenship in federal education policy. As stated earlier, more attention needs to be focused on the influence of economics in the process of provincial devolution. Also, the relationship between the growth in federal-provincial co-operation and the decline of the church-state relationship should be studied. More recently, several provinces have adopted a critical approach to Native Studies in their educational curricula. What is the impetus for this move? How, or does this relate to federal Indian education policy? What does this curricula reveal about the governments' vision for First Nations people within the context of the state-relationship?

There are certainly a number of questions that need to be answered in regard to federal Indian education policy. Unfortunately, this thesis does not have time to articulate each one. Recent developments in multiculturalism discourse, constitutional debates, and the

⁹ OAG, 4.7.

growth of a strong First Nations political sector are all issues that could be considered in relation to further research on federal Indian education policy.

From this survey of history, several specific trends in federal Indian education policy discourse are evident. The Canadian government failed to recognize the reciprocal nature of integration in their Indian policy: First Nations cultures were not included in the post-WWII construction of Canadian citizenship. The Canadian government also failed to adopt an education policy discourse that adequately addressed the growing demand to incorporate a First Nations culturally relevant curriculum in joint-schools. Although it was not the government's deliberate and stated policy to continue cultural assimilation, their denial of problems, and its inaction to address and to prevent issues of cultural assimilation clearly indicate that the government allowed an unofficial policy of cultural assimilation following WWII. Based on the brief survey of history following the White Paper, furthermore, one might also say that the federal government has remained hesitant to facilitate a critical degree of First Nations relevant education to date. Considering the obvious importance attached to education in the cultural reproduction of societies, the federal government must surely be taken to task over their record. That federal Indian education policy continues to fail its principle objective indicates that there is a fatal flaw in the Canadian and First Nations state-relationship. If ever this relationship is to be just, the non-Aboriginal public must ensure that the actual policy of the federal government is truly in line with cultural tolerance and respect for First Nations people.

It is often said that historians cannot predict the future—an axiom that could apply to anyone speculating on the future of the Canadian and First Nations state-relationship. When looking at our history, however, it is apparent that real change occurs quite slowly. In fact,

change sometimes occurs while supporting a certain degree of continuity. If one lesson can be taken from the study of Indian education policy in this thesis, it should be that we must continue to be critical of apparent change. We must question the nature of the unfolding relationship between our cultures. The road to a balanced relationship will undoubtedly be long; how we choose to travel this road will certainly determine the strength of our commitment to cultural respect and tolerance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Primary Sources

- National Archives of Canada [NAC] RG 10, Vol. 8576, File 1/1-2-2-21,
MR C-14215, Regional Inspectors Conference Minutes, November 23, 1956.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 6811, File 470-3-7, MR C-8534, J.A. Glenn to Indian Agents, 1946.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, R. Howe to J.A. Glenn, February 4,
1946.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, A.C. Smith to J.A. Glenn, January 23,
1946.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, T.J. Orford to J.A. Glenn, February 1,
1946.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, N.J. McLeod to J.A. Glenn, January
20, 1946.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, J.E. Daly, Indian Agent to J.A.
Glenn, February 19, 1946.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 6811, File 470-2-8, MR C-8534, A.D. Moore to J.A. Glenn, January
25, 1946.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, D.M. MacKay to Deputy
Minister of Mines and Resources, November 30, 1949.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, , Appendix to the Director's
itinerary for Dominion Provincial Relations, 1955.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, Laval Fortier to K.W. Taylor
Esq., September 16, 1955.
- NAC MG 32 B34, Vol.24 IA12, Prime Minister's Opening Address at Indian
Conference, December 12, 1955.
- NAC MG 32 B1, Vol. 95, Ellen Fairclough to the Reverend J.H. Wilkie, June 10, 1958.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C-14216, Reference Paper prepared for
E. Acland by the Immigration Branch, February 7, 1954.

- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C-14216, Speech by the Director of Indian Affairs to the Greater Winnipeg Welfare Council, October 6, 1954.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C-14216, Reference Paper prepared for Eric Acland—Immigration Branch, 1954.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9, MR C 14216, Speech by the Director of Indian Affairs to the Greater Winnipeg Welfare Council, October 6 1954.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8578, File 1/1-2-9 pt.2, MR C 14216, Speech by J.W. Pickersgill MP, to the Kiwanis Club of Edmonton re: The Future of the Canadian Indians, November 21, 1955.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, Memo from H.M. Jones to the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, February 22, 1955.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, E.D. Fulton to Hon. David Fleming, October 18, 1957.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 7180, File 1/25-1 pt.6, E.S.W. Cole, to Erin Nielson Esq., November 25, 1958.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 7180, File 1/25-1 pt.6, Memo from H.M. Jones, July 18, 1958.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 7188, File 475/25-1, Edward Clifford Esq. to Ellen Fairclough, nd.1958.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 7188, File 475/25-1, Ellen Fairclough to Edward Clifford Esq., September 11, 1958.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8568, File 1/1-2-2-1 pt.3, Speech delivered by H.L. Keenleyside to a Conference on Human Rights in Winnipeg re: The Declaration of Human Rights, 1958.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, F.B. McKinnon to J.D. Matheson, April 10, 1959.
- NAC RG 10, Vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, W.S. Arneil to All Superintendents, April 14, 1959.
- NAC MG 32 B1, Vol. 95, Excerpts from the Royal Commission on Education, August 14, 1959.
- NAC MG 32 B1, Vol. 95, Ellen Fairclough to Richard Good, November 19, 1959.
- NAC MG 32 B1 IA-12K, Second and Final Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, 1961.

NAC MG 32 B1, Vol. 95, Ellen Fairclough to Bert Mason, November 22, 1961.

NAC MG 32 B1, Vol. 95, Bert Mason to Ellen Fairclough, April 25, 1961.

NAC RG 10, Accession #1984-85/112, Box 102, File 494/25-11-101, Eric Barrington to Superintendent of School Administration, September 7, 1960.

NAC MG 32 B1, 89 IA-12J, A Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Affairs from the Canadian Catholic Conference, May, 1960.

NAC MG 32, IA-12J, A Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Affairs from the Canadian Catholic Conference, 1960.

NAC MG 32, IA-12-J, A Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Affairs from the Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada, March, 1960.

NAC MG 32, IA-12K, Address to the National Superintendents Conference by R.F. Davey, September 17, 1961.

NAC MG 89, IA-24, Address to the National Superintendents Conference by H.M. Jones, September 18, 1961.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 8570, File 1/1-2-2-5 pt.7., Memo from Eric Acland to Chief of Agencies Division re: "The Law and Civic Conscientiousness," August 23, 1961.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 8572, File 1/1-2-2-8 pt.1, MR C-14214, Federal-Provincial Conference Minutes, 1963.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.1, Memo from R.F. Battle to the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, December 31, 1963.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 8836, File 1/1-16 pt.6, Memo from Chief Resources and Industrial Division to J.M. Thibault, June 30, 1965.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 8567, File 1/1-2 pt.3, Jules D'Astous to Ruth Gordon re: "Bridging the Gap" policy document, July 7, 1966.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 7186, File 274/25-1 pt.1, John H. Nicholson (representing Indian Affairs on behalf of Rt. Hon. Lester B. Pearson) to Frances Carlisle, May 7, 1965.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 7186 274/25-1 pt.1, L.S. Marchand to Margaret M. Bulger, May 7, 1965.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 8836, File 1/16-1 pt.8, Memo from R.F. Battle to the Deputy Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, November 18, 1965.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 13037, File 401/25-17 pt.1, Revised Guidance Manual for Indian Schools, June, 1967.

NAC RG 10, Vol. 13039, File 401/25-18-1, pt.2, Address by Arthur Laing to the Canadian Association for Indian Education re: the future of Indian and Eskimo Education, May 23, 1968.

NAC MG 32 B1, Vol. 60, Speech by Arthur Laing at the University of Western Ontario re: The Indian people, the Government and the Canadian Community, February 16, 1968.

NAC RG 10, Accession 1984-85/112, Box 27, File 401/25-1, Education Services available to Indians through the Indian Affairs Branch, 1968.

NAC RG 10, Accession 1985-85/112, Box 37, File 401/44-1 pt.1, Transcript of the Prime Minister's Remarks to the Vancouver Liberal Association Dinner, August 8, 1969.

Published Primary Sources

Canada, Parliament of. *Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Indian Act, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence 1947*. Ottawa, Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1947.

Canada, Parliament of. *Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Indian Act, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence 1948*. Ottawa, Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1948.

Canada, Parliament of. *Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on the Indian Act, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence 1949*. Ottawa, Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1949.

Canada, Parliament of. *Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Indian Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence 1959*. Ottawa, Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1959.

Canada, Parliament of. *Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Indian Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence 1960*. Ottawa, Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1960.

Canada, Parliament of. *Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Indian Affairs, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence 1961*. Ottawa, Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1961.

Canada, Government of. *The Indian in Transition: The Meeting of the Ways—Learning for Earning*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1961.

Canada, Government of. *The Indian in Transition: Indian Education*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationery, 1962.

Hawthorn, H.B. ed. *A Survey of the Contemporary Indians of Canada: A Report on Economic, Political, Educational Needs and Policies*, 2 vols. (Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch, 1967) 1: 6.

National Indian Brotherhood[NIB]. *Indian Control of Indian Education: Policy Paper*. 2nd ed. Ottawa: NIB, 1977.

Secondary Sources

- Alfred, Gerald R. *Heeding the Voices of Our Ancestors: Kahnawake Mohawk Politics and the Rise of Native Nationalism*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Allen, Robert S. *His Majesty's Indian Allies: British Indian Policy in the Defence of Canada, 1774-1815*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1992.
- Assembly of First Nations[AFN]. *Tradition and Education: Towards a Vision of Our Future—A Declaration of First Nations Jurisdiction Over Education*. Territory of Akwesasne: National Indian Brotherhood-AFN, 1988.
- Barman, Jean, Yvonne Hebert, and Don McCaskill eds. *Indian Education in Canada: The Legacy*. 2 vols. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1986.
- Brooks, Stephen. *Public Policy in Canada*. 2nd ed. Toronto: McClelland&Stewart, 1992.
- Canada, Auditor General of [OAG]. "Indian and Northern Affairs Canada—Elementary and Secondary Education." *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2000.
- Canada, Indian Affairs Branch Education Division ed. *The Indian Superintendent 1965: The Education of Indian Children in Canada*. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965.
- Davey, R.F. "The Enrolment of Indian Children in Provincial Schools." *The Indian Superintendent 1965: The Education of Indian Children in Canada*. Ed. Indian Affairs, Education Division. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965.
- Dickason, Olive P. *Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples from Earliest Times*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Dickason, Olive P. *The Myth of the Savage: And the beginnings of French Colonialism in the Americas*. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 1997.
- Findley, Timothy. *The Wars*. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1996.
- Fleuras, Augie and Jean Leonard Elliot. *The Nations Within: Aboriginal-State Relations in Canada, the United States and New Zealand*. Toronto: University of Oxford Press, 1992.
- Gooderham, G.K. "Prospect." *The Indian Superintendent 1965: The Education of Indian Children in Canada*. Ed. Indian Affairs, Education Division. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1965.

- Hampton, Eber. "Towards a Redefinition of Indian Education." *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*. Eds. Marie Battiste and Jean Barman. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1995.
- Hookimaw-Witt, Jacqueline. "Any Changes Since Residential School?" *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 22.1 (1999): 171-182.
- Johnson, Darlene. "First Nations and Canadian Citizenship." *The Meaning and Future of Canadian Citizenship*. Ed. William Kaplan. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993 347-367.
- Kirkness, Verna J. *First Nations and Schools: Triumphs and Struggles*. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1992.
- Manzer, Ronald. *Canadian Public Schools and Political Ideas: Canadian Educational Policy in Historical Perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.
- Leslie, John F. "Assimilation, integration, or termination? The development of Canadian Indian Policy—1943-1963." Diss. Carleton University, 1999.
- Miller, J.R. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Miller, J.R. *Shingwauk's Vision: A History of Native Residential Schools*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996.
- Milloy, John S. "The Early Indian Acts: Developmental Strategy and Constitutional Change." *Sweet Promises: A Reader on Indian-White Relations in Canada*. Ed. JR. Miller Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 145-154.
- Milloy, John S. *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System—1879-1986*. Winnipeg, University of Manitoba Press, 1999.
- Perley, David G. "Aboriginal education in Canada as Internal Colonialism." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 20.1 (1999): 118-128.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Looking Forward, Looking Back*. Ottawa: Communications Group Publishing, 1996. Vol.1 of *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*.
- Ryan, James. "Restructuring First Nations' Education: Trust, Respect and Governance." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 25.2 (Summer 1996): 115-132.
- Sigurdson, Richard. "First Peoples, New Peoples and Citizenship in Canada." *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 14 (1996): 53-76.

Tobias, John L. "Protection, Civilization, Assimilation: An Outline History." *Sweet Promises: A Reader on Indian-White Relations in Canada*. Ed. J.R. Miller. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991. 127-144.

Weaver, Sally. *Making Canadian Indian Policy: The Hidden Agenda—1968-70*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Whittington, Michael S., and Richard J. Van Loon. *Canadian Government and Politics: Institutions and Processes*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1996.