

**The Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre and the Community
Liaison Committee: Laying the Groundwork for Self-Government, 1968-
1982**

A Thesis Submitted to the
College of Graduate Studies and Research
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Geography and Planning,
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Canada

By
Pamela Ouart

© Copyright, Pamela Ouart, June 2009
All rights reserved

Permission to Use

TITLE OF THESIS: The Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre and the
Community Liaison Committee: Laying the Groundwork for Self-
Government, 1968-1982

NAME OF AUTHOR: Pamela Quart

FACULTY: College of Graduate Studies and Research
University of Saskatchewan

DEGREE: Master of Arts
Geography and Planning

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Department Head
Department of Geography and Planning
University of Saskatchewan
Kirk Hall
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7N 5A5

SIGNATURE _____
DATE _____

Abstract

As Aboriginal peoples relocated to urban areas in the 1950s and 1960s they often found that the services they were offered did not suit their needs, to address this issue Aboriginal peoples began advocating for organizations of their own. Two such organizations include the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre and the Community Liaison Committee. This thesis will explore how Aboriginal peoples worked to create organizations that served their needs, rather than assimilating as was expected; how the status blind approach within organizations was resisted; and how these organizations had a strong desire and vision to become self-governing, often demonstrated by engaging in coproduction, even in the very early stages of organizational development. The data collected included archival documents and informant interviews and was analyzed using an adapted form of grounded theory. The research and analysis revealed waves of engagement in coproduction as a way to defy expectations that Aboriginal peoples would assimilate once moving to the city, and rather embrace Aboriginal cultures and practices in the city.

Acknowledgements

I would like to start by thanking my supervisor, Dr. Evelyn Peters for her patience, guidance, insight and support. I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with Evelyn. My committee members, Dr. Paul Hackett, Dr. Ryan Walker and Dr. Brenda Macdougall, as well as Dr. Roger Maaka who all provided advise and assistance which was greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank the external examiner, Dr. Gary Zellar for his contributions.

To the participants in this research study, I am extremely grateful for your participation. I owe a big thank you to the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre, who assisted me in identifying participants and provided me with assistance in gathering documents. A thank you to the archivists at the City of Saskatoon as well as the Saskatchewan Archives Board, your help was greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank Dr. Peters, the Department of Geography and Planning and the Department of Native Studies for financial support throughout this degree. I am very fortunate for the opportunities I have had, to work in the community as well as in the classroom. In addition the individuals in both of these departments made this experience enjoyable and for that I am thankful.

Finally, a thank you to friends and family who have always supported and encouraged me. To my parents Brad and Linda, my brother Tyler and extended family thank you for always standing behind me. To the amazing group of grad students I have had the pleasure of working beside, you made the day to day experiences memorable and enjoyable. To my Yorkton crew, thank you for keeping me grounded and reminding me where I come from.

Table of Contents

Permission to Use.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
List of Tables.....	v
Chapter One: Introduction and Rationale.....	1
<i>Thesis Map</i>	5
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	6
<i>Urbanization</i>	6
<i>Urban Aboriginal Service Organizations</i>	11
<i>Co-production</i>	19
<i>Conclusion</i>	23
Chapter Three: Methods and Context.....	24
<i>Research Setting</i>	24
<i>Research Design and Data Collection</i>	25
<i>Data Analysis</i>	27
<i>Positionality</i>	31
<i>Conclusion</i>	34
Chapter Four: Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre.....	36
<i>History of the Friendship Centre Program</i>	36
<i>The Early/Developmental Years of the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (1966-1972)</i>	40
<i>Growing Pains: 1972- 1976</i>	47
<i>Just the Friendship Centre, 1976-1982</i>	57
<i>Conclusion</i>	60
Chapter Five: Community Liaison Committee.....	63
<i>The Early Years 1976 to Intercultural Dialogue Conference (April 1978)</i>	63
<i>The Middle Years: Post Intercultural Dialogue Conference to Helen’s Departure (September 1980)</i>	70
<i>The Late Years: The Exit of Helen Hughes (October 1980) to the dissolution of the CLC after 1982</i>	80
<i>Conclusion</i>	83
Chapter Six: Conclusion.....	86
Works Cited.....	92

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Aboriginal People in Major Metropolitan Centres, 1951-2001.....	7
----------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Chapter One: Introduction and Rationale

Historically, reserves for First Nations¹ peoples were separate from urban centers. Reserves were initially meant to be temporary spaces where First Nations peoples would become prepared to enter Canadian society (Peters, 2002; Harris, 2002). Increasing populations and a lack of opportunities on reserves and in rural communities resulted in many Aboriginal peoples moving to urban areas during the 1950s and 1960s.² Non-Aboriginal peoples living in urban areas regarded the arrival of Aboriginal peoples as problematic. The non-Aboriginal population had negative beliefs about Aboriginal peoples by the time they began moving to urban centers due to a long legacy of discrimination and assimilation attempts by the Canadian government. To attempt to deal with the Aboriginal presence in urban areas, government agencies struggled to create programs to suit the government's goals of integration and assimilation (Peters, 1998; 2002).

The creation of reserves in Canada suggested that there were to be separate spaces for First Nations peoples and settlers in Canada. By relocating First Nations peoples to reserves, the land was cleared for settlers (Brealey, 1995; Tobias, 1983). Prior to the middle of the twentieth century governments worked to maintain separation between Aboriginal peoples and urban areas (Wilson and Peters, 2005). On the prairies, the pass

¹ I use the term 'Aboriginal' to refer to descendants of the Indigenous peoples in Canada, which include First Nations, Métis and Inuit. I use the term 'First Nations' to refer to people whom self-identify as such including those who are not registered under the *Indian Act*. I use the terms 'Indian' or 'Registered Indian' to refer to individuals who are registered under the *Indian Act*, and the term 'Non-Status' to refer to First Nations peoples who are not registered under the *Indian Act*. I use the term 'Métis' to refer to people who self-identify as such. I use the term 'Native' interchangeably with 'Aboriginal' because Native was more commonly used during my study period; therefore I use the term Native to be consistent with the terminology of the documents and transcripts that I am referring to.

² Although, the movement of First Nations peoples to urban areas is the best documented, other Aboriginal peoples such as the Métis and non-status Indians also had a presence in urban areas, the experiences of the Métis and non-status Indians is therefore more difficult to discuss. However, it is clear that Métis and non-status Indians also had similar goals and struggles in relocating to urban areas when compared to First Nations peoples.

system was implemented which required First Nations individuals to have permission from the Indian agent to leave their reserve. One of the objectives of this was to keep First Nations peoples away from prairie towns (Barron, 1988). This further suggested that urban areas were seen as areas that Aboriginal peoples were seen as out of place (Peters, 2002).

In 1951 the population of First Nations living in urban areas was only 6.7%, which suggests that until that point the government had been successful in separating First Nations peoples from urban areas (Kalbach, 1987: 102). The migration of Aboriginal peoples to cities in the middle of the twentieth century resulted in governments' having to reexamine their practices of keeping Aboriginal peoples and urban areas separate (Wilson and Peters, 2005). However, governments' attempts at policymaking for urban Aboriginal peoples were inconsistent and were based on the assumption that Aboriginal peoples were migrating to urban areas and leaving their cultures behind (RCAP, v.4, 1996; Peters, 2002).

Peters (2002: 79) adapting Cresswell's (1996) argument to apply to urban First Nations peoples, argues:

the debate and concern centering on First Nations migration suggests that the response to their presence was shaped in no small part by the sense that First Nations were "out of place" – that their presence in urban areas represented a transgression into what had been defined as a space for non-aboriginal peoples and cultures.

Early writing about Aboriginal people in cities shows the expectation that they would leave their Aboriginal cultures and beliefs on reserves or in rural settlements they lived at prior to moving into the city (Peters, 2002). As Aboriginal peoples moved into urban areas they resisted the assimilation that was expected. They created a space for

themselves in the city by advocating for, creating and becoming involved with organizations that served the needs of Aboriginal peoples. Over time Aboriginal peoples began to transform these organizations, making them permanent places that recognized Aboriginal peoples and their cultures can and do have legitimate spaces in urban areas.

Since the late 1950s, the Aboriginal population has been increasing in urban areas. Today there are a number of Aboriginal organizations within Canada's cities run by and for Aboriginal peoples. The first formal organizations in urban areas designed to serve Aboriginal peoples began to offer services about a decade after there became a sizable Aboriginal population in a particular centre. These organizations played a major role in providing Aboriginal peoples with a place in the city to come together to socialize, practice their cultures, organize politically, and get assistance adjusting to urban lifestyles. Rather than aiding in the assimilation policies of the federal government, these organizations, in many cases, allowed for Aboriginal people to organize and transform existing organizations to suit the needs of their communities.

This thesis will explore how Aboriginal peoples entered the city and worked to create organizations that served their needs, rather than assimilating as was expected. I collected my data from a variety of archival sources and by conducting informant interviews to give me an understanding of how the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (SIMFC) and the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) formed and operated from 1968 to 1982. I analyzed the data using an adapted form of grounded theory and thematic analysis. The coding revealed that initially these organizations struggled to resist assimilation and the status blind nature of these organizations. Status blind means that all Aboriginal peoples qualify for a certain service, regardless of their

legal status or cultural heritage (RCAP, 1996).³ However from the early days it was apparent that the individuals involved with these organizations had goals of creating self-governing organizations and they worked with various levels of government to push their self-government agendas.

I will argue that although emergence of self-government literature was limited during this timeframe, it was a goal in the minds of the Aboriginal individuals involved in creating, maintaining and expanding urban Aboriginal organizations in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. However this goal of self-government would take a back seat at times to resisting assimilation into non-Aboriginal society. Also, many Aboriginal peoples resisted a status blind approach to programs and services for Indian and Métis and preferred political and status oriented organizations, which created conflict within the CLC and SIMFC.

This research is important because it explores how two different organizations in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan worked to improve the situations many urban Aboriginal peoples faced. Almost nothing has been written about urban Aboriginal organizations in Canada, in comparison to work in the United States. This research presents urban Aboriginal people in a different light than they are usually presented. They are often viewed as problems in urban areas and this work demonstrates their active work in building community supports for themselves in urban areas. This perspective is especially important in the context of growing urban Aboriginal organizations. This research will add to the knowledge about Saskatoon's Aboriginal population as well as the larger area

³ Status oriented means that certain services would be reserved for only status Indians or only Métis peoples. There is a tension in the emphasis on cultural differences and the desire for separate organizations for Métis and First Nations people because the idea of status is not a part of Aboriginal cultures; it is a legal definition imposed by the colonial regime. Nevertheless these definitions have material consequences for First Nations and Métis people and are therefore reflected in urban politics.

of Aboriginal urbanization, organizations and self-government.

Thesis Map

My thesis is organized into six chapters. Following this introductory chapter, chapter two will review the literature, which provides context for this thesis. The areas of literature focus are: Aboriginal urbanization, Aboriginal service organizations and working with outside governments and agencies to meet the community's needs. Chapter three provides a context and it also explains the methods of data collection, analysis and interpretation. Chapter four is the first of two data analysis chapters, and focuses on the case study of the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (SIMFC). Chapter five, the second analysis chapter, focuses on the Community Liaison Committee (CLC). Finally, chapter six will conclude the thesis by summarizing significant contributions and implications for the future. Throughout this thesis I will argue it was expected that when Aboriginal peoples moved to Saskatoon they would assimilate; instead the Aboriginal community worked to create their own organizations to serve their community's needs. Public expectations about urban Aboriginal peoples created a particular environment within which these organizations worked. This thesis will explore the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (SIMFC) and the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and the challenges they faced in resisting assimilation, resisting being status blind and working towards self-government.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter I draw on a number of bodies of literature to frame my analysis of the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (SIMFC) and the Community Liaison Committee (CLC). The first section reviews how the urbanization of Aboriginal peoples was understood and responded to in Canada by Aboriginal peoples; federal, provincial and municipal governments; and non-Aboriginal peoples living in urban areas, post World War II. The second section explores the development of Aboriginal service organizations and how these institutions worked to create and maintain a place for Aboriginal peoples in urban areas. This section also explores the beginnings of Aboriginal self-government in the city. The final section on co-production provides a framework for evaluating how these organizations were able to work with governments to negotiate programming that would suit the needs of their clientele. Combining these bodies of literature provides an important context to examine these two organizations, to understand how they were able to create their organizations, how they attempted to engage in negotiations with various levels of governments to further their programming agendas, and how this can be seen as the emergent stage of self-government.

Urbanization

Reserves were set up with the objective of administering services for, and assimilating First Nations people, as well as representing a way to clear them from the land for settlement (Brealey, 1995). Reserves were seen as a place where First Nations peoples could “catch up” in terms of behaviors, values and skills to the rest of Canadian society (Peters, 2002). There was a limited Aboriginal population in urban centres until the 1950s when Aboriginal people increasingly began to move to urban centres. In 2006 fifty-four percent of Aboriginal peoples lived in urban areas (Statistics Canada, 2008).

There is considerable research documenting the migration of First Nations peoples into urban areas, however there is not the same consistency of documentation for Métis and non-status peoples. The following table shows the increasing numbers of Aboriginal peoples living in urban areas from 1951-2001:

Table 2.1: Aboriginal People in Major Metropolitan Centres, 1951-2001⁴

	1951	1961	1971	1981	1991⁵	2001
Halifax	-	-	-	-	1185	3525
Montreal	296	507	3215	14450	6775	11275
Ottawa-Hull	-	-	-	4370	6915	13695
Toronto	805	1196	2990	13495	14205	20595
Winnipeg	210	1082	4940	16570	35150	55970
Regina	160	539	2860	6575	11020	15790
Saskatoon	48	207	1070	4350	11920	20455
Calgary	62	335	2265	7310	14075	22110
Edmonton	616	995	4260	13750	29235	41295
Vancouver	239	530	3000	16080	25030	37265

(Source: Peters, 2005: web atlas)

This table demonstrates the growing Aboriginal population in urban areas. However, Métis and non-status Indian peoples may have been living in urban centres earlier than First Nations peoples and their populations are more significant in terms of numbers (Norris and Clatworthy, 2003). There were reasons for Aboriginal people moving to urban centres. Métis and non-status Indian peoples did not have a land base set out specifically for them; so many people found themselves living in urban centres. For many First Nations peoples it was a lack of opportunity on reserves that drove them to relocate

⁴ To illustrate the complexities of the definitions of who was Aboriginal according to the census, Peters 2005, notes some of the differences that have been evident in the census. In 1951 and 1961 and 1971 the Métis were excluded. In 1971 only patrilineal descent was counted, and the Métis were excluded. In 1981 ambilineal descent (both parents) and the Métis were counted. Also starting in 1981, multiple ancestral origins were tabulated, if they were written in and the ethnic origin question allowed for identification of Inuit, Status or Registered Indian, Non-Status Indian or Métis (Peters, 2005). In 1991 multiple responses were encouraged which resulted in a phenomenal growth in the number of Aboriginal peoples since the early 1970s (Goldman and Siggner, 1995; Kerr, 2002). Therefore the census does not provide a number for urban Aboriginal peoples that includes Métis peoples prior to 1981.

⁵ “Montreal, Calgary and Vancouver had, within their boundaries, reserves that were incompletely enumerated in either 1991 or 2001 or both, affecting the counts for those years and cities” (Peters, 2005).

to urban centres (Peters, 2002).

There were additional factors involved in the decision to relocate from reserves and rural areas to the city. Researchers identified a number of reasons First Nations peoples left reserves including difficult social conditions, poor economic conditions, marriage and family formations, boredom, quality of life, lack of housing (or poor quality of housing), health facilities, educational opportunities, social service and band politics (Norris & Clatworthy, 2003; Friederes & Gadacz, 2001; Peters, 2002). It is evident that many people, especially young adults, were not happy on reserves because of the lack of opportunities. Many people may not necessarily have wanted to leave the reserve or rural community however; they wanted to achieve goals of careers, which were typically not available there. As a result many people relocated to urban areas to search for employment, for family reasons and housing, and for education (Norris & Clatworthy, 2003).

Once Aboriginal peoples reached urban areas they were faced with a number of challenges. Dosman (1972) noted that in Saskatoon not all Aboriginal peoples were necessarily poor and destitute. He stated that there were some success stories and some professionals who were middle class people, but that most Aboriginal peoples in the city were poor. Krotz (1980) argued that the major issues Aboriginal peoples faced moving into the city were associated with poverty. Urban Aboriginal peoples often ended up living in the historic areas of cities in the cheapest and worst housing. Levels of education were often low, in part because school systems were ill equipped to deal with Aboriginal peoples. Unemployment was very high which resulted in a reliance on social assistance (Krotz, 1980). Reeves and Friederes (1981) noted that because many of the people who

migrated to urban areas were unable to secure employment or understand and use government and other agencies' services, many of these people were transient or commuted into the city for short periods of time. Law enforcement was a challenge because of cultural barriers. Social services were not preventative but rather they worked to treat problems. Therefore, a problem had to take place before help could be granted. Finally, newcomers to the city often faced language barriers, a lack of money, few industrial skills and a lack of experience in an urban setting, which set urban Aboriginal peoples up for failure (Krotz, 1980).

To challenge Krotz's (1980) assertion that the issues Aboriginal peoples faced in the city were associated with poverty, Silver (2006: 29) argued that the situation of Aboriginal peoples in urban areas could not be simply attributed to poverty. Instead, it was related to socio-economic factors such as low education levels and high unemployment. He argued that social exclusion, racism, and colonialism were all factors that distinguish the Aboriginal situation, even though the issue was repeatedly treated as one of poverty. Aboriginal cultures were often viewed as an obstacle to success in the city. Non-Aboriginal peoples and organizations believed that in order to succeed Aboriginal peoples would need to assimilate and integrate into mainstream culture leaving behind their Aboriginal cultures (Silver, 2006; Peters, 2000). More recent research has shown that in fact the opposite seemed to be true and that the promotion of Aboriginal cultures in cities was important to the success of Aboriginal peoples in urban areas (Peters, 1996; Peters, 2000; Cairns, 2000; Newhouse, 2000; Newhouse & Peters, 2003).

The growing urban Aboriginal population was a reason for concern for the non-

Aboriginal population already living in urban centres. However, all three levels of government were slow to act on new programs and policies for urban Aboriginal peoples (Peters, 2002; Hanselmann, 2001). Therefore, the Aboriginal population was in urban areas without adequate programming until the mid 1970s, and even then early policies were often misguided due to the lack of understanding of an urban Aboriginal population. As Peters (2002: 76-77) discussed, “as government agencies struggled to make sense of First Nations urbanization, they were influenced by a colonial history that relegated First Nations people and cultures to spaces separate from modern and, particularly, urban society.” Basically, the policies developed during this time period still had similar goals of the early 1900s, goals of assimilation and integration.

However, defining these policies was difficult due to jurisdictional issues. The federal government did not want to admit responsibility for First Nations peoples off reserves or for Métis people. The provincial government argued that all Aboriginal peoples were the responsibility of the federal government. The municipal government, like the provincial government, provided services for all people without distinguishing cultures (Silver, 2006). Despite the lack of jurisdictional clarity, the federal government did manage to create funding for some programming for urban Aboriginal peoples including the Placement Program (early 1960s – 1975) through the Indian Affairs Branch and the Migrating Native Peoples Program (1970s) through the Citizenship Branch. These programs were initially designed to act as referral agencies to mainstream agencies (Peters, 2002). The goals of these programs remained assimilative with the assumption that Aboriginal peoples had moved to urban areas to leave their traditional beliefs behind and integrate into mainstream society.

Urban Aboriginal Service Organizations

Urban Aboriginal service organizations played a large role in working to develop programming in urban centres. These organizations were initially set up to assist those who were new to the city to adjust and then be somewhere that Aboriginal peoples could go for a variety of services, including recreation, social events, cultural events and a number of other programs that could help to make the lives of urban Aboriginal peoples better. Like Rosenberg and Jedwab (1992), I argue that ethnic⁶ institutions are important and necessary because they do not simply offer a service that is parallel to the service of the mainstream institution. Instead, they offer solutions for specific community concerns that were not addressed at the mainstream institution and therefore, filled the gaps in the services available to an ethnic community. Most of the research on urban Aboriginal organizations has focused on American cities. There is very little available that explores the situation in Canadian cities. Due to differing cultures, geographies and government policies, it is difficult to evaluate the degree to which issues for urban Aboriginal service organizations were similar to those of the United States and those that differed.

When Aboriginal peoples began migrating to urban areas in the 1950s and early 1960s, there were no formal urban Aboriginal service organizations, only mainstream organizations. These organizations were foreign to First Nations peoples, as a majority of the services in urban areas were provincial and municipal services; on reserves their relationship was with the federal government. Although Métis and non-status peoples had relationships with provincial and municipal governments, these governments expected that Aboriginal peoples in urban areas would have their needs met by mainstream

⁶ In using the definition from a paper on ethnic institutions I am not saying that Aboriginal peoples are ethnic groups; however this definition shows that in many ways their organizations work in the same ways.

organizations already in place. While there were no initial Aboriginal organizations in urban areas, Aboriginal peoples worked very quickly to form networks of Aboriginal peoples when they found that the mainstream organizations did not suit the Aboriginal communities needs. These networks would be vital to the creation of Aboriginal organizations (Price, 1972; Fiske, 1979; Frideres & Gadacz, 2001; Liebow, 1991; Danziger, 1991; Trush, 2002; Weibel-Orlando, 1999).

Many Aboriginal organizations were initially designed by non-Aboriginal peoples to suit non-Aboriginal needs (Price, 1972; Liebow, 1991; Mucha, 1983; Dosman, 1972). Government officials saw many organizations as being key for urban integration and assimilation of Aboriginal peoples; therefore, government favored assimilative organizations over others early on (Dosman, 1972). The goal of the organizations supported by governments was to help Aboriginal people in urban areas become familiar with urban life and have them assimilate into mainstream society. It was often assumed by non-Aboriginal people that when Aboriginal people moved into cities they were not interested in maintaining their cultures and it was, therefore assumed that the assimilation of this population would be relatively easy. This was the initial case with the Friendship Centers, the main organization that the Citizenship Branch of the federal government used to help transition Aboriginal peoples into urban areas and to refer Aboriginal peoples to provincial and municipal agencies (Peters, 2002). However, even though the Citizenship Branch had the Friendship Centre program, it was not automatically established in urban areas. Often Friendship Centres were not implemented until community members campaigned for them. Community members would advocate for these organizations to be created for a number of reasons including: wanting to address

the issues of the urban Aboriginal community (Price, 1972), wanting to express their ethnicity and as an attempt to create an Aboriginal community in an urban setting (Fiske, 1979; Liebow, 1991; LaGrand, 2002).

Often the Aboriginal individuals who became involved in working to create Aboriginal organizations were from diverse cultural backgrounds themselves (Price, 1972; Dosman, 1972; Danzier, 1991; Jackson, 2002; LaGrand, 2002). Although this was not seen as ideal by community organizers, Silver (2006: 13) points out that Aboriginal peoples were forced to become creative in creating organizations that served their communities'. This often meant organizations that were status blind, meaning that the services and programs are available to all Aboriginal peoples regardless of their legal status or ancestry.

It was necessary to have early organizations be status blind because there were so few organizations for urban Aboriginal peoples. The organizations available felt they had a responsibility to serve all Aboriginal peoples in the city they were located in. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, or RCAP (1996) noted that a status blind service delivery approach was effective because it fostered the development of the urban Aboriginal community and it used scarce resources more efficiently than status specific organizations. However, RCAP cautions that policies need to acknowledge the historical and geographical realities that have resulted in the creation of distinct organizations as well. Straus and Valentino (2001) argue that initially in the city people rallied around their 'Nativity' rather than their status specific rights and beliefs. However, as time passed and the population grew in urban areas, services that were initially only offered in rural settings were finding their way to cities to maintain the connection between rural

communities and the city. Straus and Valentino (2001: 91) note that initially urban Aboriginal organizations were in cities to help aid in the transition from rural to urban life. As time went on these organizations began to serve the role of “sustaining and enhancing” various Aboriginal identities for urban Aboriginal people.

Once the Aboriginal community made it clear that they intended these organizations to be permanent fixtures in urban areas, and once they had gained some support from government which no longer had expectations of assimilation, differences of opinion on how these status blind organizations should operate came to the surface. Over time many of these organizations became more mature and goals of self-government and cultural awareness emerged (Liebow, 1991; Mucha, 1983; Jackson, 2001; Jackson, 2002; Danziger, 1991; Trush, 2002).

Legal and cultural distinctions influenced urban Aboriginal organizations. Some Aboriginal people are registered under the *Indian Act*, those who are eligible for band membership, residence on reserves, tax exemptions and special federal programs reserved for status Indians (Wherrett and Brown, 1995). Non-status Indians in many cases have Indian ancestry and cultural affiliation but are not registered under the *Indian Act* for a number of reasons (see Wherrett and Brown, 1995). There is also the distinction between having treaty rights or not. There are also the Métis who are broadly defined as people of mixed Indian and non-Indian blood, who identify as Métis and are accepted by Métis communities. The Métis have distinct cultural practices that are different from both Indians and non-Indians. Finally, the Inuit of Canada who traditionally inhabited Canada’s Arctic region and “comprise the majority of the northern population and have remained culturally and geographically distinct” (Wherret and Brown, 1995: 88) need to

be considered. Dosman (1972) observed that there were difficulties in uniting people within organizations because the Aboriginal community in the city was made up of people with a variety of different backgrounds; they had cultural and language differences, people involved came from different bands or Métis communities' and therefore had different concerns and rights based upon their legal status. These cultural differences are often celebrated, but they have also been a source of conflict in urban Aboriginal organizations. Falconer (1985) suggests that fragments within the urban Aboriginal population result because the federal government does not admit responsibility for Métis and non-status Indians. As a result, organizations increasingly focused on separate Métis and First Nations organizations, which is where they believed that self-government could begin to take shape.

Before self-government can be explored in more contemporary contexts, it is necessary to examine what self-government for Aboriginal communities' means in a traditional context. Alfred (1999) argues that Aboriginal communities' today are faced with two opposing value systems: one that is rooted in traditions and the other imposed by the colonial state. These often-conflicting systems are both present in Aboriginal communities' quest for self-government, as Aboriginal peoples wish to stay true to their traditions while working in a world that is compatible with mainstream political and social systems. Alfred (1999: 6) states that traditional Aboriginal communities' had developed systems of conscience and justice, which promoted humans and nature living in harmony for hundreds of generations. Good Aboriginal leadership recognizes Aboriginal political philosophy, which is rooted in tradition and remains consistent with the cultural values of the community (Alfred, 1999).

To traditional Indigenous societies “self-government” meant prioritizing the communities “values, the rigorous consistency of its principles with those values, and the patterns and procedures of government, as well as the common set of goals (respect, balance, and harmony)” (Alfred, 1999: 24). Traditionally, decision-making was a collective task where leaders worked to achieve consensus within the community while respecting individual autonomy. Alfred (1999: 25) said “the Indigenous tradition sees government as the collective power of the individual members of the nation; there is no separation between society and state.” Therefore, it must be recognized that the traditional forms of self-government that community members talk about and the colonial versions of self-government that appear to be the norm over the last number of decades are two different visions of self-government.

Nevertheless, current approaches do have the potential to provide urban Aboriginal communities with more control over important aspects of their lives. Self-government as defined by Cassidy (1991) is the ability of people to make important choices regarding their political, cultural, economic and social affairs, without sovereignty. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996: vol. 7, 45) argued that when Aboriginal organizations were “directed and administered” by Aboriginal peoples it could be seen as a form of a community of interest model of self-government. Examples could be Aboriginal controlled educational facilities or health services clinics. This approach could include sectoral Aboriginal institutions such as education and health, and could extend to broader administrative and political bodies (Wherret and Brown, 1995). According to RCAP, this approach to self-government could work for groups of Aboriginal peoples with ties to different nations that shared common needs and interests

that arise out of their Aboriginality. In addition to governance through single organizations, RCAP also contemplated “a self-governing, city-wide body with political and administrative functions, exercising self-government in a range of sectors and through a variety of institutions” (RCAP, 1996: vol. 7, 80).

RCAP (1996) felt that self-government through urban organizations provided urban Aboriginal peoples, who would not have access to other sources of self-government, for example through band councils. RCAP (1996) stated that the benefits of this type of self-government were that it provided opportunities for small, diverse communities’ to enjoy some of the benefits of self-government even though they were too small to form other forms of self-government. This form can also allow for the expansion to self-government with multiple functions in the future while allowing for the communities’ needs to be met in the present (RCAP, 1996). RCAP’s recommendations were that these organizations should have:

more secure forms of funding than the short-term, project-dependent funding of existing institutions. While services are an important component of this model, these governments and their associated structures and institutions could also assume gradually a broader range of government features and functions (RCAP, 1996: 168).

This model would build on existing organizations to give organizations more control over their programming and services, and in time could gradually allow for broader control in terms of governance.

This model is not without its problems. Although there are a number of existing urban Aboriginal organizations operating across the country RCAP (1996) points out that there are challenges associated with supporting and enhancing the work of present institutions. Challenges can present themselves where multiple Aboriginal interest groups

of communities' attempt to create competing organizations, which could result in government viewing them as substitutes to other initiatives. This results in a number of organizations offering similar services and competing for the same funding, but not becoming closer to self-government in the end. The model of a city-wide self-governing body with political and administrative functions presents a number of challenges associated with trying to get a diverse group of urban Aboriginal peoples together who have distinct legal and cultural identities as well as various historical relationships with governments to put aside their differences and work towards a form of self-government together (RCAP, 1996).⁷

A large portion of the current literature on urban Aboriginal organizations focuses on how organizations move through stages to various levels of institutional completeness and changes to attempt to better serve their clientele (Price, 1972; Fiske, 1979; Jackson, 2002; Danziger, 1991). None of this literature addresses the situation in Canadian prairie cities where the urban Aboriginal population is comprised of groups with very different legal and cultural statuses. These differing statuses created challenges for First Nations and Métis communities' to work together for legal rights and in return made it difficult to provide status blind services. This research, in this thesis will add to the under researched area of urban Aboriginal organizations in Canada.

Co-production

The literature on co-production provides a useful framework for exploring the

⁷ Both RCAP (1996) and Wherrett and Brown (1995) discuss other forms of urban self-government such as a neighbourhood model which would concentrate Aboriginal people in a certain area; the extraterritorial model which allows for some laws of land based Aboriginal nations to apply to its citizens regardless of their place of residence and the urban Métis Nation governance approach which would be a component of the larger Métis Nation approach where there is a system of decision making bodies at local, regional, provincial and national levels. These approaches, while all valid and important, do not best describe the situation I am exploring in the timeframe (1968-1982).

relationship between government responsibilities and Aboriginal peoples' desire for self-government. At a basic level co-production can be conceptualized as, "service delivery as both an arrangement and a process, wherein citizens and government share 'conjoint responsibility' in producing services" (Marschall, 2004). Beyond service delivery co-production also gives citizens an opportunity to influence public policy formulation and implementation (Cooper & Kathi, 2005). For urban Aboriginal organizations, co-production shows a willingness of government to work with Aboriginal peoples as a group in the city that should be involved in programming as opposed to being assimilated. Co-production was also important for urban Aboriginal organizations in order to become self-governing.

Whitaker (1980) discussed co-production as a way for citizens (or organizations) to exert influences on policy through their participation in the execution of public programs or services. Two of Whitaker's (1980) descriptions of coproduction are relevant for the analysis in this thesis. Whitaker (1980: 242) argued that citizens are able to participate in the implementation of public policies in a number of ways, which include requesting assistance from public agents. This allowed citizens to exert influence over the kinds of activities agencies offer and the ways the activities are distributed to members of the community. For urban Aboriginal organizations, citizens placing pressure on governments for certain services could result in governments working with organizations to ensure that service needs are met. Creating funding for new programs could do this or expanding already existing programs.

The other form of co-production Whitaker (1980: 244) identified is the client-agent mutual adjustment. This is the most useful form in terms of urban Aboriginal

organizations and their quest for self-government. This occurs when public service delivery agents and citizens work together to establish a common understanding of the citizen's needs and what each party can do to help resolve it. This is more reciprocal than other forms of coproduction introduced, and requires mutual adjustment for success. Whitaker argued that mutual adjustment was the most important element in delivery of services. He acknowledged that this level of adjustment is not possible in all situations, but that it is preferable and possible in many situations. Whitaker fully acknowledged that this mutual adjustment does not happen between two equal partners, because the service agent generally has more resources and therefore, he argued the greater skill or special knowledge. The service agent may further have special legal authority to force or impose other sanctions, which gives the service agent a higher power. However, Whitaker stated that in order for this "mutual" adjustment aspect of co-production to be possible, citizens and agents must be willing to recognize the legitimacy of the public policies the agents are charged with implementing.

Co-production can be described as an individual or group initiative. Individual co-production can include where citizens have little choice but to participate in the service or it may include voluntary behaviours that citizens undertake on their own. Citizens do these activities on their own and without organizations, and the benefits to the community are typically minimal (Brudney & England, 1983). Group co-production involves voluntary and active participation by a number of people and often requires formal organizations. An example of this is a neighbourhood association where individuals work together to pool resources among citizens of the neighbourhood (Brudney & England, 1983). In many ways urban Aboriginal organizations engaging in co-production is similar

to neighbourhood coproduction.

Although the extent and different forms of co-production will vary across different areas, Marschall (2004) argues that the fundamental point is that without active citizen participation in service delivery the capacity of the government to provide certain public services would be compromised. The quality of these services is also compromised, because with co-production comes increased service effectiveness, both parties become more aware of the needs and goals of the other party they are working with, and positive outcomes result (Cooper & Kathi, 2005).

Involvement of Aboriginal peoples and organizations in policy and program development and implementation is something that is acknowledged in the literature as integral to strengthening relationships between these communities' and various levels of governments (RCAP, 1996; Maaka & Fleras, 2005; Hunter, 2006; Walker, Moore & Linklater, 2009). RCAP (1996) noted that many mainstream organizations and municipal governments were realizing that they could not adequately provide services to urban Aboriginal peoples and had increasingly turned to urban Aboriginal organizations to provide services for their people. This was a significant development because municipal governments have typically been of the position that they are to produce uniform services to all people and property (Peters, 2005).

Policy and programming relating to Aboriginal peoples need to be co-produced with Aboriginal peoples and organizations because having a voice in policy and programming is in line with Aboriginal communities' goals of self-government (Walker, Moore & Linklater, 2009). However, co-production still remains a joint initiative because the government will not give away its responsibility for making public policy in urban

areas to Aboriginal peoples. As a result, the government will always remain with the higher authority to engage Aboriginal communities in the process (Walker, Moore & Linklater, 2009).

Co-production with urban Aboriginal peoples can be particularly complicated, because of the involvement of all three levels of Canadian governments. It is further complicated by the fact that the courts and Aboriginal communities' point in different directions regarding policy and statutory responsibility for urban Aboriginal peoples (Graham & Peters, 2002). However, where governments have worked with Métis locals and band or tribal council governments which are local to specific areas, this is less problematic because local issues can be worked out without creating lasting implications that are the result of court proceedings (Walker, Moore & Linklater, 2009).

The co-production literature is limited in that it does not take into account the participation of all levels of governments, and it does not acknowledge the creation of relationships that result in co-production. Urban policy in Canada is a shared concern among all levels of government because a large proportion of Canadians live in urban areas (Walker, Moore & Linklater, 2009), but for some reason the co-production literature seems to focus on the municipal government's involvement in these initiatives. Co-production is both important and necessary for the provincial and federal governments in the same ways that it is beneficial for municipal governments. When citizens become involved in the process and implementation the outcomes should be beneficial. This is particularly important for urban First Nations communities' who have a historical relationship with the federal government. I will look at how urban Aboriginal organizations co-produce services with governments and how co-production can be used

to help realize urban Aboriginal organizations goal of being self-governing.

Conclusion

One of the best ways that we can begin to understand Aboriginal peoples and their organizations in urban areas, is to understand how they worked in the early stages. As the urban Aboriginal population continues to grow it is important that we acknowledge the success that many of these organizations have had in the city, and the challenges that they have overcome. The assimilative expectations and motives of various levels of government, and the ways that urban Aboriginal organizations resisted assimilation and managed to create organizations that worked to fit their agendas is important. It is also important to explore challenges to status blind organizations and how urban organizations have dealt with these challenges. Co-production between urban Aboriginal peoples and various levels of governments was emerging during this era, and provided the foundation to self-government for Aboriginal communities' in urban areas in the future.

Chapter 3: Methods and Context

This research used archival data and interviews to explore how the Saskatoon

Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (SIMFC) and the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) worked to meet the needs of the urban Aboriginal population in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. This chapter outlines the research methodology and methods that guided the research. The research was contextualized with the use of available population statistics and the experiences of urban Aboriginal peoples on the Canadian prairies. I then describe the data collection process and the ways that both grounded theory and thematic analysis have been useful in analyzing the collected data. Finally I discuss my position as a researcher. The purpose of this chapter is to frame the methods and methodologies that I have used in this study as a qualitative study in the area of urban Aboriginal organizations.

Research Setting

The research was conducted in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. The location of Saskatoon was chosen because the Aboriginal community in Saskatoon was very involved in the creation of urban Aboriginal organizations in the city. Also, the municipal government became actively involved in working with Aboriginal peoples to create awareness about the issues Aboriginal peoples in Saskatoon, which seemed to be unique during this time period. From 1961 to 1981 the Aboriginal population in Saskatoon grew dramatically from approximately 207 people to 4350 people (Peters, 2005). It is interesting to note that Dosman⁸ (1972: 10) estimated that the Indian and Métis population in Saskatoon in 1969 was over 2000. By 1971, he estimated this number had doubled which suggests that the Aboriginal population may have been significantly higher than the census suggests. At the conference proceedings of the Indian-Eskimo

⁸ Dosman worked with the Aboriginal community and used participant observation in his book on urban Aboriginal peoples in Saskatoon.

Association of Canada, Ed Lavallee of the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre confirmed the census numbers and said that there were about two hundred Indians living in Saskatoon in 1962 (Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada, 1962). However, census counts left out the Métis and non-status population. There are no statistical estimates of how many Métis or non-status peoples were living in Saskatoon, but Dosman's account suggests that the Aboriginal population in Saskatoon was significantly higher than the census counts.

Research Design and Data Collection

The Friendship Centre was incorporated in 1968 in Saskatoon. It was the first non-political urban Aboriginal organization in the city; therefore it is important to explore how the Centre worked to meet the needs of the urban Aboriginal clientele it worked with. The study follows the SIMFC over the subsequent fifteen years. The Community Liaison Committee was established in 1977 in recognition by the municipal government that there was a race relations problem between Native and non-Native people in the City of Saskatoon. This study follows the CLC over the subsequent six years that it existed.

Data about these organizations was collected through archival research and informant interviews. The archival data were collected from a number of sources including: the Saskatchewan Archives Board, the City of Saskatoon Archives, the City of Saskatoon Public Library, the Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre, the University of Saskatchewan Archives, the University of Saskatchewan Libraries, as well as the personal collections of individuals and the archives of the Friendship Centre. At the Saskatchewan Archives Board, a number of different collections were consulted. The most valuable source of information was found in the Indian and Native Affairs

Secretariat Fonds and the Allan Guy Fonds. At City Archives, Council Meeting minutes were an accessible source of information as well specific minutes from the Community Liaison Committee when they were available. These data included newspaper articles, meeting minutes, letters of correspondence, memorandums, proposals, reports, studies, and grants and requests for funding.

In total eighteen informant interviews (twelve for the Friendship Centre and six for the Liaison Committee), and one focus group (for the Friendship Centre with four participants) were conducted with individuals who were identified as important in the documents. In the case of the SIMFC individuals who were identified by the organization as being involved with Friendship Centre during the study period were sought for interviews. Typically, the interview respondents were those who were board members for the SIMFC or were representatives appointed to the CLC by the organizations they were representing. Although these individuals were not the people who were in need of the programs and services that the SIMFC and the CLC offered, they worked with the individuals who were in need and therefore, had a good understanding of the Aboriginal community's needs. I used a snowball effect to gain participants for interviews. I used a questionnaire to guide the questioning for some interviews. For other interviews, I asked respondents to tell me what they knew about a certain topic and asked questions where it was appropriate. I chose to conduct interviews with Elders in this unstructured format because it is more culturally appropriate than structured interviews. Also in keeping with cultural traditions, I presented tobacco and tea to Elders at the beginning of the interview. All participants signed a consent form from the University of Saskatchewan, Ethics Review Board. It is necessary to note that there were difficulties with the data. Almost no

documents were received from the Friendship Centre. There is not a lot of additional detailed information that was possible to obtain for this research. Due to the historical time frame of this research, many participants were not able to pin point dates, however the themes, general dates and the nature of conflict were available.

Data Analysis

Although there is a lot of literature about approaches to qualitative data analysis methods, it remains difficult to explain how data analysis actually takes place.

Schiellerup⁹ (2008:164) describes data analysis as “something that happens, somehow, by mixing analytical approach (e.g. grounded theory) with data (e.g. field notes, transcripts) and technology (e.g. ATLAS/ti).” She goes on to describe data analysis as a process of “constructing and attributing meaning to phenomena” encountered in research. What Schiellerup (2008) describes is an interpretive approach to qualitative data analysis that is informed by an identifiable research method (grounded theory). To analyze my data I used an adapted form of grounded theory and thematic analysis to analyze the interviews and documents. I say an adapted form of grounded theory because as Dey (2004: 80) argues, the split in two forms of grounded theory means that we cannot use grounded theory as a “single, unified methodology, tightly defined and clearly specified.”

Therefore, I used many relevant parts of grounded theory as it worked for my case studies.

Grounded theory was first developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967) since that time the theory has developed in a direction that the authors did not anticipate and that Glaser (1992) rejected (Dey, 2004). Recently grounded theory has been defined as “theory that

⁹ Schiellerup was writing about her experiences as a graduate student trying to understand how the actual data analysis takes shape, she acknowledges that there is an extensive literature on what informs interpretive acts, but that for students starting in data analysis it is sometimes hard to make sense of how the actual data analysis works.

was derived from data, systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process. In this method, data collection, analysis, and eventual theory stand in close relationship to one another” (Strauss and Corbin, 1998:12, as cited in Bryman, 2001). Grounded theory is a way to generate theory through research data as opposed to testing ideas that had been formulated prior to the data collection (Dey, 2004). Grounded theory research begins with the formulation of a general research question. Next relevant sources of data are theoretically sampled¹⁰ and then collected, and then data are coded. During these four steps of grounded theory there is constant movement back and forth to refine the research (Bryman, 2001).

The process of analysis centres on coding the data into categories where comparison is possible, so that the data can be analyzed and key aspects of the data are identified (Dey, 2004). Basically, coding is organizing your data to allow the generation of concepts. Coding allows us to review what the data says, but coding on its own is not analysis (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996). Through constant comparison of the codes the relationships between them, properties can be identified and further developed. This analysis stops “when a core category emerges around which the researcher can integrate the analysis and develop a ‘story’ encapsulating the main themes of the study” (Dey, 2004: 81).

Grounded theory recognizes coding as a process that goes from open to axial to selective¹¹ (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). For this study I did open coding where I broke

¹⁰ Glaser and Struass (1967: 45) define theoretical sampling as “the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyzes his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges.”

¹¹ Open coding allows for concepts that are later grouped into categories. Axial coding is making connections between categories developed through open coding. Selective coding is choosing a central focus and relating it to other categories, which results in the validation of relationships and determining which areas need more development (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

down the data, examined, compared, conceptualized and categorized the data (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Bryman, 2001). From the open coding I chose certain concepts that I felt were most relevant to answering my research questions. I then worked to see which of these concepts could be related to one another and to the research question. This is how I did selective coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Bryman, 2001). While I coded the data, I referred back to the literature to ensure that I maintained a close relationship between my data and the literature. In maintaining this close connection to the literature I was able to start framing my argument.

In addition to grounded theory I also used thematic analysis to explain how I coded the data. Thematic analysis is a process that can be used with other forms of qualitative research (Boyatzis, 1998). Boyatzis (1998) describes three different approaches to using thematic analysis as being theory-driven, prior-research-driven and data-driven. I have adopted the data-driven approach, which has three stages, the first of which is to choose the sampling and design issues and select subsamples. The second stage is to develop themes and codes. During this stage outlines of the data are created and themes within subsamples are identified, relationships between themes are noted and then a code is created (Boyatzis, 1998). This is similar to coding techniques as described by Dey (2004), but it provides a more detailed description of how coding can be undertaken. Finally, once I completed stage two for the subsample and verified it, by comparing the documents and interview responses. Next, I coded the rest of the raw information (Boyatzis, 1998).

I used ATLAS/ti to assist in the coding process. I chose to use a computer program because the large number of documents that I collected would make it difficult

to use manual coding. ATLAS/ti allowed for easy organization and retrieval of data, which allowed for a clearer picture of the structure of the data to emerge for interpretation, and theory building (Schillerup, 2008). Once the coding was completed I interpreted the data and found the themes that emerged out of the codes and paired the emergent themes with literature that could help to explain what the codes were telling me. In the end I chose to explore the struggles of these organizations as they worked towards being self-governing; although there were a number of other themes that emerged from the data. The data showed that organizations worked hard to resist assimilation; they had difficulty negotiating the roles of status blind organizations and that by engaging in co-production with various levels of government these organizations were laying the ground work for self-government.

I say that my research is informed by grounded theory because I have not applied grounded theory to its full extent. I did not ignore all literature until the data was collected; instead as I collected data, I followed up with literature that I felt might be relevant later in my analysis. Much of this literature was thrown out as I chose the themes that I would explore for this thesis. I can only say that this research is informed by grounded theory because I do not intend new theory to emerge from this research. What I have are two case studies from Saskatoon, Saskatchewan that cannot be broadly applied without further research in other cities. However, Coffey and Atkinson, (1996:141) describe theory as “integrating our ideas with our data collection and data analysis, generating new ideas and building on existing ideas. Having ideas and theorizing about our data are central to the research endeavor.” In this sense there is perhaps not the creation of new theory but the expansion of other theory. Regardless of these two

digressions, the research that I have conducted was still analyzed using many principles from grounded theory. The data has guided my research, I am not testing a certain hypothesis and I coded my data to allow the themes to emerge on their own. Charmaz, (2004: 501), argues that grounded theorists “do not force preconceived ideas and theories directly upon their data. Rather, they follow the leads that they define in the data, or design another way of collecting data to try to follow their initial interests.”

Positionality

I am going to begin this section by introducing myself, I will then follow my personal introduction with discussion about the importance of identifying one’s location. Followed by a discussion of insider/outsider research and specifically the discussion of a non-Aboriginal person pursuing research with Aboriginal organizations. I am a Canadian woman, born to parents who are of Ukrainian and German descent, and who have been in North America for at least four generations. I grew up in Yorkton, Saskatchewan, Canada. I am a graduate student and I research urban Aboriginal organizations, and although I am a person who grew up in a small urban setting, I had not had contact with Aboriginal organizations prior to this research; therefore I am coming at this research from an outsider’s perspective. I grew up being conscious of racism in my community, and was unable to understand where it came from until I started university. I entered university intending to leave as an elementary school teacher, and was required to take a Native Studies course as a prerequisite. I chose to make Native Studies my first teaching area, and the more courses I took, the more I found myself challenging what I thought I knew about Canada’s history. I chose to major in Native Studies and pursue an honours degree to continue to learn about Aboriginal peoples in my community. I am continuing

by pursuing a Masters degree in the area. I am aware of my location and I know the privilege that that can hold with it, but I also understand the challenges that I face in trying to conduct research that is valued by both the community and academia. For the community this research has already been used by the Friendship Centre as a part of their fortieth anniversary celebrations; for the CLC I created a history document for them as well to thank the participants for their time and knowledge.

It is now understood that every researcher has a certain degree of bias based on their personal experiences, location or position. Today, many researchers argue that one of the most important principles in conducting research with Aboriginal communities is for the researcher to locate themselves in their research; they argue that this ensures that those who study, write and participate in knowledge creation are accountable for their own position (Gibbs, 2001; Abosolon and Willet, 2005). In doing community based research with Aboriginal peoples, the community should know who is doing the research, and therefore when it comes to Indigenous peoples and their knowledge, researchers today must be prepared to explain who they are and what interest they have in the proposed research before they are allowed to proceed (Absolon and Willet, 2005). As researchers conducting community based research we must recognize that a relationship with the community is necessary to build trust that will lead to meaningful results both for the community and the researcher. However, as researchers we must be prepared to share things about ourselves as we are expecting the community will be open and honest with us.

There is also literature that discusses the benefits and drawbacks of doing research as both an insider and an outsider to a community. Davis (2004) argues that insider and

outsider “ness” is a continuum and it is always changing during a research process, she also points out the complexity of what can make someone an insider/outsider which usually include ancestry or race, but can also include sexuality, gender, age, tribal identity, residence, or other factors. Hammersly and Atkinson (1996) argue that insiders may miss things that they take for granted, because they identify with the group they are studying, and their analysis can be distorted because of their connection to their informants. They call this ‘over rapport’. Brayboy and Deyhle (2000) disagree with this idea saying that this connection enhances research, and argue that outsiders fail to see nuances from the perspectives of their informants.

Swisher (1998) in critiquing non-Native researchers says that they lack the passion from within and they also lack the authority to ask new and different questions based on the experiences of Indigenous peoples. I personally disagree with the idea that because I am not an Indigenous person I have no passion in the research that I do with Indigenous peoples and organizations. I do understand that my experience as a non-Indigenous person cannot be compared to the experiences of an Indigenous person, but I do feel that there is still value in the research that I do. I further acknowledge that my position as an outsider makes it particularly important to conduct research with the community, in order to better understand their situation. I feel that in an area where education of all peoples is emphasized it is contradictory to suggest that a large segment of society be excluded from doing this type of research. I do agree that certain research topics may be reserved for insiders – such as culturally sensitive materials or very personal materials; however this is not the type of research that I seek to do. I think that as an outsider researcher, as long as I go into my research aware that I am an outsider,

willing to work with a community and allow the community to guide me through my research, and as long as I ask questions about what is appropriate at all stages of the research, my research is as valuable as the research of insiders.

Champagne (1998) argues that Native Studies is for everyone, not just Native people; however he states that all people Native or non-Native must respect community rules and their desires to protect certain information from the public's view. He goes on to state that the dissatisfaction on part of Native communities against scholars, and particularly anthropologists is due to the indifferent ways that data was collected and published which resulted in little benefit to the Native communities' they were studying. Further, Marker (2001, p.31, emphasis in original) argues, "the quality of research is not improved *simply* by having Aboriginal people doing the writing. It is improved by a more detailed analysis that includes the perspectives and location of both Natives and non Natives." This statement shows that the quality of research has nothing to do with ethnicity but everything to do with the skills of the researchers.

Conclusion

The setting for which this research was conducted in was Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. I have used archival data and informant interviews to explore how the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (SIMFC) and the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) worked to meet the needs of the urban Aboriginal population during this timeframe. As an outsider researcher, I am aware of certain experiences that I may have (or have not) had which may result in certain challenges both in the field and during analysis. During 1968-1982 the census population statistics show a rapidly growing Indian population, but because of the way census questions were asked it is not clear how

many Métis and Non-Status peoples were living in Saskatoon.

My analysis is informed by grounded theory, which allowed my data to guide my analysis and literature search (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Bryman, 2001; Charmaz, 2004; Dey 2004). I also analyzed my data using the thematic analysis technique, which further allowed for themes to emerge from the data (Boyatzis, 1998). I coded my data using ATLAS/ti. Once the data was coded I returned to the literature to explain the data and the themes that had emerged.

Chapter 4: Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (SIMFC)

The Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre was created due to existing government policy and community members advocating for the creation of a Friendship Centre in Saskatoon. This chapter will explore the Friendship Centre program in general,

and then specifically look at the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre. I will look at the Friendship Centre from its creation in 1968 through to 1982, more specifically I will examine the SIMFC in terms of how the individuals involved resisted assimilation, status blind ideals and worked towards self-government by entering into co-production.

History of the Friendship Centre Program

When Native peoples began migrating to urban areas there were no programs that applied specifically to them. The Citizenship Branch took precedence for policy and program development for Native peoples in urban areas. Like the Department of Indian Affairs, the Citizenship Branch viewed the urbanization of Native peoples in terms of the “threats and assimilationist potentials of culture change” (Peters, 2002: 83). The Citizenship Branch drew on its experience of helping immigrant groups adjust to urban life and created a model of urban ethnicity for Native peoples in urban areas. The Citizenship Branch acknowledged that initially urban Native peoples should be able to retain certain cultural aspects while they adjusted to urban areas and a new culture. Friendship Centres were the main tools that got the Citizenship Branch involved with Native people in cities (Peters, 2002).

In a 1965 address at the Vancouver Friendship Centre, J.R. Nicholson, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated that, “It is up to you, in the Indian Friendship Centre, to provide a place where the harassed city-migrant can find a sheltered haven where he can rest and take stock of himself during the hectic proves of adjustment to city life” (as cited in Peters, 2002: 84). Native peoples however viewed urban Native people differently than governments. The Federation of Saskatchewan Indians (FSI) in their study of urban band members stated that once in the city First Nations people remained

band members who were simply living off reserve. They argued that First Nations people were not rejecting their cultures or traditions in doing so (as cited in Peters, 2002).

Further in a report commissioned by the Citizenship Branch, Bear Robe argued that urbanization did not mean culture shock (as cited in Peters, 2002). The FSI still had concerns and stated that bands felt responsible for their off-reserve band members and as a result they pressured for First Nations' involvement and control of Friendship Centre boards and programs. In addition they noted that,

Mainstream service organizations did not have the skills or knowledge to provide appropriate assistance; that First Nations migrants preferred to receive assistance from aboriginal Friendship Centre personnel; and that because of their lack of knowledge of First Nations cultures and circumstances, social service organizations often referred clients back to Friendship Centres (as cited in Peters, 2002: 86).

This illustrates that mainstream organizations were not well equipped to work with Native peoples in urban areas. As a result many Native people were referred back to Friendship Centres, which in the early days did not have the tools or capacity to help gain access to the help they needed.

The Migrating Native Peoples Program provided core funding to some Friendship Centres across Canada. It was introduced in 1972 by the federal government, through the Department of the Secretary of State (National Association of Friendship Centres, 2008). However, there were a number of Friendship Centres across Canada prior to 1972, including the one in Saskatoon. Prior to the Migrating Native People Program, Friendship Centres were funded on a 50/50 basis by the federal and provincial governments. The federal government reviewed the Friendship Centre program and introduced the Migrating Native Peoples Program to govern the program's development and operation. As a result the federal-provincial cost sharing agreement was terminated, and the federal

government committed itself to spending twenty-six million dollars over a five-year period to cover core funds, capital costs and training needs of staff for Centres across Canada (Bostrom, 1984). David Newhouse (2003: 244) described Friendship Centres in Canada as initially being places to assist Native individuals adjust to urban life. As time moved on they remained important community centres, “fostering the development of an urban Aboriginal community ethos and spirit.” Friendship Centres have continued to play important roles in the development of urban Native communities’.

In discussing the early roles of Friendship Centres the Battleford Indian and Métis Friendship Centre described the roles Friendship Centres played in early urban Aboriginal institutional development (as cited in Newhouse, 2003). The Battleford Indian and Métis Friendship Centre stated that the first Friendship Centres in Vancouver and Winnipeg were created by Native people to assist other Native peoples migrating to the city. The Centres began as drop-in Centres where new migrants to the city could seek advice and assistance from Native people who were already established in the city. In the early days people were referred to other organizations that could assist them in meeting their housing, employment and education needs in the city. The Battleford Friendship Centre stated that:

Migrating Aboriginal peoples became one of the country’s most disadvantaged minority groups, suffering from social isolation, loss of identity, a low level of participation in community life and a lack of understanding of the basic processes and institutions of urban society. As a result, an increasing number of Friendship Centres were established. Friendship Centres gradually evolved into a community-supported response to alcohol abuse and the related social problems faced by Aboriginal peoples in the city. Consequently, Centres began to provide referral services to mainstream social agencies and services, and later counseling related to housing, employment and the justice system. By the late 1960’s, Aboriginal people assumed control of the Friendship Centre Movement (as cited in Newhouse, 2003: 246).

It is also important to understand mainstream populations' perceptions about who urban Native people. G.A. Clark, associate director of the Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada discusses rural to urban transition, in an interview with the *Star Phoenix*. Clark states that there is difficulty "convincing the urban society to face the responsibility of accepting the Indian as co-citizen." Further in the article, Mary Louis Defender, director of the Friendship Centre in Winnipeg said that Indian people were seen first as Indians and not as people. She further stated that problems that individuals faced in mainstream society were attributed to certain conditions but problems faced by Indians were attributed to their race (*Star-Phoenix*, November 14, 1966: 15). Both of these statements show that Native people were viewed as being second-class citizens when compared to mainstream society. It was these kinds of viewpoints by mainstream society that contributed to support for policies of assimilation; mainstream society had attributed Native newcomer's problems to race and not to other issues such as urban transition or orientation difficulties.

The federal government expected Friendship Centres to provide counseling and referral services to urban Natives, and that other services would be offered elsewhere (Bostrom, 1984). Friendship Centres ignored this and over-extended themselves to offer additional services to urban Native peoples. Beyond Friendship Centres other organizations that were designed to assist urban Native peoples were initially to be temporary organizations (Bostrom, 1984). This suggests that governments assumed that once urban Native peoples were referred to mainstream organizations that the Native organizations would no longer be needed because Native peoples would have assimilated into the larger Canadian mosaic.

*The Early/Developmental Years of the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre
(1966-1972)*

Although the federal government had a Friendship Centre program available, it was up to the community to advocate for a Friendship Centre in their city. How the Friendship Centre's creation and their ability to offer services from 1966-1972 remains somewhat unclear. Dosman (1972) and Schilling (1983) both provide information about the Friendship Centre's creation and when both of their stories are put together with the stories of interview respondents and the archival documents collected, it is clear that the Friendship Centres start was complicated and challenging.

It is important to note that during this timeframe there were negotiations between federal and provincial governments regarding fiscal responsibility for Indian people. Prior to 1964 the federal government had not made many efforts to transfer some of its programming and fiscal responsibilities to the provinces (Bostrom, 1984b). From 1964-1968 the provinces negotiated agreements with the federal government that did not lead to any agreements put into practice. In 1969 the White Paper¹² was introduced as an alternative approach to Indian policy. This was rejected by Indian groups across Canada and resulted in organizational disarray and confusion in the Department of Indian Affairs, and strengthened Indian political organizations (Bostrom, 1984b).

According to a *Star-Phoenix* newspaper article (November 14, 1966: 15) and a history of the Friendship Centre Movement (Wilson, 1966) discussions about the creation of a Friendship Centre in Saskatoon started in 1966. Dosman (1972) stated that the Friendship Centre started in 1967 in Saskatoon. He stated that the Centre had a lot of

¹² The White Paper, 1969 proposed a new approach to Indian policy. The Paper would have removed special legal and administrative status from Indian peoples (Bostrom, 1984b).

support when it opened. The Centre had offices and there was a mixed Native-non-Native board. The *Star Phoenix* (May 10, 1967: 3) also reported that a provisional board of five Saskatoon citizens including Gerry Gordon, Mrs. Harry Humphries, David Ahenahaw, Ray Hunter and Alek Greyeyes were involved in formally advocating for a Friendship Centre in Saskatoon, and that “the initiative came from the Native people.”

Dosman (1972) further stated that the Centre did not receive a grant to start but was to receive one once it was established. According to Dosman, the director of the Friendship Centre did not develop programs but rather appealed to churches for funding. When this was unsuccessful the director turned to the white board members to help and lost the confidence of the Native people the centre was to serve. Eventually, the Friendship Centre offices closed. Dosman (1972) argues that this was due to perception that there was too much influence from the non-Native community.

The SIMFC must have re-formed because it was formally incorporated on October 25, 1968 under the *Societies Act*. The initial objectives of the SIMFC were: to provide Indian and Métis peoples with a counseling and referral service; to provide social and recreational facilities and programming; to act as a liaison between Native people and mainstream peoples and organizations; to help in providing social orientation for Native newcomers; and to serve as a resource centre for cross-cultural understanding. The Centre's registered office was on 21st Street East (Certificate of the Societies Act, No. 915, October 25, 1968), however at this point there was no indication that the Friendship Centre was offering any services. It was still in the development stages. Interview respondents suggested that it was possible that this location was never used as a Centre, rather that it was someone's home and they were using the address to get the Centre

started from (Informant Interview, February 10, 2009).

Schilling (1983), in her book about the history of Métis Local 11,¹³ recalled that Clarence Trotchie and a small group of Métis were meeting informally at the Friendship Centre in 1969, to discuss unemployment and alcoholism that many community members were facing. It is further reported by the Social Planning Secretariat of the Province of Saskatchewan in 1969 there was very minimal funding awarded to the Friendship Centre from the province (SAB, Special Cabinet Committee on Social Policy by the Social Planning Secretariat, 1979; SAB, Indian and Métis Department, 1968-1972) although it was unclear what this funding was to be used for. The Centre still did not have an executive director and they still had a provisional board (*Star Phoenix*, February 6, 1969: 7). There was no evidence of any programming, but they had submitted a brief of the programs that they expected to offer and the funding that was required in order to offer programs to Saskatoon City Council (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1969).

Initially the SIMFC relied heavily on volunteers to operate the centre, and the centre was seen as a gathering place for Native people in Saskatoon (*Star Phoenix*, February 6, 1969: 7). At this point the Friendship Centre did not have relationships with various levels of government to rely on them for funding. However, they were starting to go to governments to access some funding to provide programs. However, most of the people involved in the Centre had never been involved with a program like the Centre and were uncertain how to gain access to funding. As a result in these early stages co-production with governments and agencies was limited because of a lack of

¹³ Local 11 was a Métis political group in Saskatoon during this timeframe. They were concerned with Métis rights for the people living in Saskatoon and they wanted to offer social service type services similar to the Friendship Centre, but exclusively for Métis peoples. Members from the Métis Local were also board members at the Friendship Centre for a period of time in the early 1970s, and then left the Friendship Centre in pursuit of programming for the local.

understanding on the part of the Friendship Centre.

In these early stages Indian and Métis people worked together in status blind organizations, such as the Friendship Centre, to offer services that would meet the needs of both Indian and Métis peoples, and to ensure that they were not forced to assimilate. The Friendship Centre in Saskatoon was the first Native organization of its kind in Saskatoon that resulted in a high level of interest from both the Indian and Métis communities'. The challenge was making sure that the Centre could meet the needs of both communities', which meant that the Centre had to offer status blind programs.

A document written by the SIMFC describes the mission of the Centre in the early days as helping with the transition of all Native peoples in Saskatoon. The Centre provided newcomers with assistance in finding living accommodations, finding employment and becoming oriented with the city and its residents. The Friendship Centre played the role of an advocate and a welcoming place that Native people could go to for assistance (Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre, no date). The people involved were most concerned with having a place for all Natives to go, where their issues and concerns were understood. The initial programming was limited because the Centre lacked financial capacity. The goal was to successfully orientate new Natives to the city and to help them adjust to urban life, as well as to provide a place for all Native peoples to gather.

Right from the beginning the Friendship Centre in Saskatoon was seen as being much more than a referral agency by the Native community. The Native community saw the Centre as a place where they could go for recreational opportunities, a place to practice culture, to educate themselves and for assistance in other areas (City of

Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1969). The individuals involved with the setting up of the Centre knew that each Friendship Centre was run independently. There were core programs that many Centres had, such as family and court workers, but community members could advocate for services and the Centre could try to access funding or fundraise if they felt a service would be beneficial (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1969). The community that utilized the Friendship Centre in Saskatoon had a vision of expanding programming that would best help the Native community. In having these goals for the centre the community showed that they did not intend to assimilate into the Canadian community, but alternatively they wanted to expand their Friendship Centre, and work to offer more services in the future. Respondents talked about the cohesive nature of the Friendship Centre in its early days. As one respondent recalled:

The Friendship Centre, I think, is really dear to my heart because I think that's where a lot of people...came together...I'm talking about Aboriginal people coming together, and even non-Aboriginal people coming together. But it was more for Aboriginal people that...unified in our city (Informant Interview, July 23, 2007).

These were the days when the Friendship Centre was the only Native organization in Saskatoon offering the kinds of services that the Friendship Centre did. The respondents talked about people coming together for the good of the Native community. A respondent recalled that the Centre would host dry dances in the early days:

We would have dances, dry dances...when we first started we had no money...so the women would do the cooking and we would bring our own food, and [a community member] played the guitar, and we had a fiddle player...and, it started off small...and eventually it got so big we couldn't accommodate them, that's why we had to move...[Sometimes] we had over three hundred people (Informant Interview, July 23, 2007).

Respondents talked about the Friendship Centre creating networks for Native people in the city because there were not many Native people in the city that were established but

still involved with the Native community; some Native people assimilated into the Canadian mosaic (Dosman, 1972).

By 1970 a formal eight-member board was elected, with seven Treaty Indians and one non-Native person (SAB, 1970; SIMFC, 2005), and the Friendship Centre was operating at its new location at 1008 20th Street West (SAB, 1970). The Centre was receiving limited funding from Saskatoon City Council, the Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Department, the Saskatoon Exhibition Board and donations (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1970; SAB, 1970b; SAB, 1970c; SAB, 1970). However, it is unclear what this funding was used for and there was no evidence of programming being offered. Instead it was open as a meeting place for the community and various other organizations. Interview respondents remember this as being the first location for the Friendship Centre, however they did not remember much in terms of programming at this location (Informant Interview, February 10, 2009).

During 1971, the Friendship Centre received more funding than it had in previous years from both the provincial and municipal governments (City of Saskatoon Clerk's Office, 1971; SAB, 1979; SAB, 1978; SAB, 1979b), and there was a clearer picture of what was happening at the Centre. The Centre was being used by about twenty five women who formed a Chimo Ladies Auxiliary and about one hundred people who were involved with the Saskatoon Urban Indian Association.¹⁴ Meetings for the Native Youth Movement and the Native Sons hockey and baseball clubs were held at the Centre and it hosted Alcoholics Anonymous meetings. In addition, the Centre planned to offer driver training courses, tutoring for students and they hoped to expand to offer services similar

¹⁴ It must be noted that while the Saskatoon Urban Indian Association held its meetings at the Friendship Centre, there were no Métis or non-status peoples on the board of directors. The Saskatoon Urban Indian Association was an organization concerned primarily with Treaty rights in urban areas.

to other Friendship Centres to include family and court workers (SAB, 1970; City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1971). The Friendship Centre worked with the Urban Indian Association and arranged the Indian Village at Saskachimo. It had a joint partnership with the University Extension Division for Cree courses. It also hosted a Native Fastball tournament and a pow-wow (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1971). The variety of organizations specifically for Native peoples that were meeting in the Friendship Centre indicates that Native people involved with the Centre had no intention of using it only for a referral agency to integrate into the mainstream. Early on it is evident that in terms of politics, recreation, education and social services Native peoples wanted to deliver services to other Native peoples.

By the end of 1971, it appeared that the Friendship Centre in Saskatoon was on the road to becoming the organization that many had hoped it would be since the early discussions in 1966. However, from a number of reports it was still difficult to know exactly how programming was created and funded. The Friendship Centre was first discussed in 1966 but by 1970 the Centre did not appear to be further ahead, in terms of programming and funding. This could be why Dosman (1972) assumed that the Friendship Centre had failed, when perhaps it was just taking much longer than anticipated to get the Centre up and running. With regards to Schilling's assessment, it appears that in 1969 the Métis began meeting informally to discuss how they would like to see the Friendship Centre run, and began discussing programming and services that they would like to see take place at the Friendship Centre. In 1972 when some of the Métis community members that Schilling referred to appear on the board of the Friendship Centre, very quickly a number of new programs and services were introduced.

Growing Pains: 1972- 1976

In 1972 the Friendship Centre once again underwent a number of changes with location, board members and approaches to funding. On January 29, 1972, the Friendship Centre relocated to 310-20th Street East (*The Saskatchewan Indian*, February 1972: 3). Because of the election of new Métis people to the board, there were now more Métis people on the board than Treaty people (*SIMFC, 2005*; Newbreed, October 1972: 9). In addition the Friendship Centre now had new organizations using the Friendship Centre as a home base including the Native Alcohol Centre, which was a Métis initiative, and Métis Local 11, which was the political organization of the Métis in Saskatoon (Trotchie, 1972; Newbreed, October 1972: 9).

The approach to funding had also changed somewhat. The Friendship Centre board applied and was granted a license to hold a weekly bingo at the Centre to create revenue (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1972; Trotchie, 1972), and the Centre received more funding from the provincial and municipal governments than they had in 1971 (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1972b; SAB, 1978; SAB, 1979; SAB, 1979b). In addition the Friendship Centre was now receiving core funding from the federal government (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1972b). As a result of the additional funding, the Centre planned to hire more staff to include three court workers, a secretary, a director, an assistant director, four people working the lunch counter and a janitor, and they hosted dry dances every Saturday night and talent shows Sunday afternoons (Newbreed, October 1972: 9; Trotchie, 1972). One participant noted that this was a good sized staff, and that the Friendship Centre received worker initiative funding, so wages were about four hundred dollars a month, “but that was good wages for a lot of our people...[who] were

coming off welfare.” This shows the community oriented nature of the Friendship Centre. They knew that their people needed to be employed and get off welfare so they got funding to have some of these people work in the centre (Informant Interview, July 23, 2007).

Individuals involved with the Friendship Centre worked together to make their Centre a success in the early days. One respondent recalled the community involvement in the Centre in those days, “I find the earlier days, the programs and many of us were more organized and, not only organized, but there was more unity involved. Everybody participated” (Informant Interview, July 23, 2007). They had bingos, dances and raffles to raise money for various programs and events, such as Christmas parties for which they did not receive formal funding (Informant Interview, July 10, 2007). The individuals involved banded together to get things done. One respondent recalled when the Centre was moving buildings everyone helped, “we went in and we cleaned it and everybody chipped in” (Informant Interview, July 23, 2007).

Initially the Friendship Centre had sewing and cooking classes within the Centre. These services were services that the community could offer on their own. The Centre relied heavily on the skills that people within the Centre had; the Centre could seek volunteers to offer classes for skills that they had such as sewing and cooking. This volunteer spirit that took place within the Friendship Centre in Saskatoon showed how much the Native community supported the Friendship Centre. In the early days the Centre was unable to access much programming funding, partially because there was very little to be accessed, and partially because the community did not have the experience applying for funding and did not know how to access it. It was then necessary

for the community to become involved in the Centre to make it a success. There were high levels of volunteerism within the community because the Friendship Centre was the first Native Centre in the city and community members wanted to make it a place that they felt comfortable at, and a place that would benefit other Native peoples in the city or migrating to the city (Trotchie, 1972).

The individuals involved with the SIMFC demonstrated their desire to expand the Friendship Centre from being solely a referral agency to being a Centre that served the communities' needs and interests. Over the years the Friendship Centre developed or was involved in developing of a number of programs including a music and art program for Native youth; a fine option program;¹⁵ a Cree language program; the Native Survival School,¹⁶ and a Native daycare to name a few. Through the development of these program the Friendship Centre showed its strong desire to move away from assimilationist goals of the initial Centres and move towards a centre where Native cultures could be celebrated. Promoting Native cultures in the city was in direct opposition with assimilation practices that believed Native peoples would give up their cultures in favor of mainstream cultural beliefs and practices.

As the Centre gained access to more funding and programming, there were differing views about which programs should be offered, how they should be run, and how the board should be set up. In 1973 there were no Treaty Indians on the board of directors, which resulted in an occupation (by status Indians) of the Friendship Centre (Goertzen, March 13, 1973: 1). This showed that things did not always run according to plan at the Friendship Centre. On March 13, 1973, the Saskatoon *Star Phoenix* reported

¹⁵ A program where people could work off fines, as appointed by the courts.

¹⁶ The Native survival school later called Joe Duquette and currently called Oskayak, was an alternative high school in Saskatoon for Native peoples, many of whom had difficulties in mainstream schools.

that many members at the Friendship Centre were upset with the way that the new board was elected, which they felt resulted in no Treaty Indians being employed at the centre and no Treaty Indians being on the board. According to the *Star Phoenix*, Treaty people felt this was due to the election being held on December 28, 1972 that resulted in non-participation from Treaty Indians. As a result about fifty Indians and Métis occupied the centre demanding a new election. The Métis director of the board, Clarence Trotchie, saw nothing wrong with the board noting that previously the board had only one non-treaty person (Goertzen. March 13, 1973: 1). This uneven representation of Métis and Treaty Indians on the board caused conflict within the Friendship Centre, because Treaty people felt that their needs were not being met.

The friction about board membership and programming at the Friendship Centre eventually led to the creation of new organizations. As a respondent recalled “there was some friction at times too...the ones that started off there, they kind of pulled out for a while, you know, they weren’t happy and whatnot. But they were trying to get their own programs...I wanted everybody to be together cause you’re stronger as a group” (Informant Interview, July 12, 2007). Another respondent recalled that there was friction in the Friendship Centre because everyone wanted control, and even though they seemed to get through those times, groups just spilt away from the Centre to create their own organizations (Informant Interview, July 12, 2007). However, respondents reflect that this was not a negative thing for Native people in Saskatoon in the long run. Discussions got heated because there was so much passion involved from a number of individual, as stated here

Well they had their hearts in it you know? They fought for what they believed in and there was a group of them that believed in the same thing so they just went

after it and that's like housing and how it got started. Those guys moved away from the Friendship Centre but that started and then you guys were able to continue on and build this up and they built the other end and so now in Saskatoon we've got a really nice place for people to come and their kids to do things and you've got housing [Sasknative Housing] on the other side. So and then we had alcohol [the Native Alcohol Treatment Centre], we were starting to look after that to so we sort of really started branching out (Informant Interview, February 10, 2009).

The struggle with having status blind organizations may stem from the fact that Indian and Métis peoples felt that they were politically stronger separately. The struggle was partly because the mainstream population viewed Native people as being one group; they did not understand the differences at this point. However Native people did not see themselves as the same, but rather with distinct cultures and issues before them and in many ways they preferred to be different. This was especially true for Indians pushing for Treaty rights in urban areas and other issues that only Indian people have due to their relationship with the federal government. It is not that Indian and Métis people did not get along, it was that they both had a distinct set of rights that they were both trying to have recognized. However, due to the complex nature of these rights this could not be done from status blind organizations because the issues were status oriented.

As a result a number of the Métis individuals involved in the Friendship Centre started to put their energy into Métis Local 11, Sasknative Housing and Rentals and the Native Alcohol Treatment Centre. Beginning with the election in December of 1972, until December 1973 there was extended conflict within the Centre between the Métis of Local 11 and Treaty Indians. By December of 1973 the Métis of Local 11 had pulled out of the Friendship Centre and began working to create programs within their Local specifically for Métis peoples. In addition, this group of Métis had become more

interested in pursuing housing for Native peoples in Saskatoon, and they left in part to start Sasknative Housing (Interview Respondent, February 10, 2009).

The Friendship Centre at this point was best suited to act as a gathering place and programming that kept politics out (because it was mandated to be non-political). It began to become political because Native people in the city had no other organizations to exercise their political rights from.¹⁷ Once the different groups realized that the Friendship Centre could not act as a place where status specific political rights could move forward from they began putting more energy into their political organizations such as Métis Local 11 and the Saskatoon Urban Indian Society, from which their political rights could be practiced and advocated.

The legal and cultural differences between Métis and Indian peoples caused rifts in the Friendship Centre. The focus on separate political organizations resulted in competition for funding between them and the Friendship Centre. Respondents recalled that the Métis were always struggling for recognition from various levels of government, and that Treaty people always had recognition and numbers. The Métis respondents argued that there was no way to count Métis peoples, like there was for Treaty people and so they had a difficult time accessing funding and programming (Interview Informant, February 10, 2009).

When individuals got more comfortable with working with governments in trying to access funding, they felt confident in spending more time with their status specific organizations including Métis Local 11, in particular, as well as the Saskatoon Urban Indian Association. An interview respondent noted that in the early days of the

¹⁷ I recognize that there was the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians but this organization dealt with a number of concerns that were broader than the Indian community in Saskatoon.

Friendship Centre, no one really knew what they were doing because everyone was inexperienced. But when they broke away from the Friendship Centre they were much more experienced in how to access program funding (Informant Interview, July 10, 2007). Local 11 spent time focusing on a number of services and other organizations including the Native Alcohol Treatment Centre, and Sasknative Housing and Rentals. The local itself had a family workers program and had a number of cultural events for its members.

Respondents discussed the competition for funding that occurred after the creation of more organizations. Initially it was only the Friendship Centre and so the Centre was able to access more funding but with the creation of other Native organizations there was now competition for funding for programs. As one respondent recalled there was “competition for funding...from those levels of government, federal and provincial... created a dog-eat-dog world” (Informant Interview, July 10, 2007). As a result of this the Friendship Centre was no longer the only place for Native people to go to have their needs addressed by Native people. People still supported the Friendship Centre in principle and what the Centre stood for, however many people moved on and put their resources into other organizations. There was a level of expertise that had developed at the Friendship Centre because the people that were involved from the early days had learned how to apply and successful receive funding, they knew how to fundraise and they knew which programs were successful and which ones were not. In addition, they had formulated new ideas about future programs that would be beneficial to the community.

In 1974 the Centre began holding bingos twice a week (City of Saskatoon Clerks

Office, 1974). The Friendship Centre was reliant on funding from various governments and departments, and often times had to structure programs around what funding was available to them. The Friendship Centre also had a variety of fundraisers over the years. Bingos were the Centre's fundraiser of choice. The Centre was able to use funds from bingos to top up government funding in their programs, have parties for children and elders to celebrate various holidays, and help people in the community on a case by case basis. By 1974 the board was more even in terms of status and the centre began holding bingos twice a week (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1974; SIMFC, 2005). In 1975 SIMFC also started offering a housing service where they were able to provide referrals to twenty four low income rental units through the Department of Municipal Affairs (province). In addition to the services mentioned they also provided transportation, hospital visits, meals and clothing, domestic science, sports and recreation, entertainment, crafts and culture, court workers program (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1975).

In 1976 the bylaw regarding board members was officially changed so that equal representation could be ensured to five Métis individuals, five Treaty individuals, and one for representation which could include, Métis, Treaty or non-Native on the board of directors (*The Saskatchewan Indian*, July 1976: 7). Also, in 1976 they added a youth group, guitar lessons, all Indian drama, summer camp for children and youth, and cribbage night for elders (*The Saskatchewan Indian*, July 1976: 7). In 1976 and 1977 the Friendship Centre began seeking support to relocate to a larger building. In 1978 they started a home school liaison program and a streetworkers program (Thomas, January 1978: 43-45).

Once the election bylaw changed, the Centre was more effectively able to focus

on their programs to suit all Native people in Saskatoon, as opposed to attempting to use the Friendship Centre for political gain. It had been no secret that the Government of Canada had goals of assimilation in mind when it came to Canada's Native peoples. This was no different in the early days of the Friendship Centres. Even into the late 1970s as the Friendship Centre in Saskatoon was offering much more than the basic programming that the government had intended for centres to use, the government's goals of assimilation were still evident within its own correspondence. In 1977 after a meeting with the Secretary of State regarding the Task Force on Migrating Native people, which included the Friendship Centres program, the Government of Saskatchewan sent out a memo. The memo stated that the task force defined Native people that the task force was concerned with as being those Native people that were "bumping against mainstream society" (SAB, 1977). It was intended that the Friendship Centre would be the initial place of contact for Native peoples, but that they would be referred to mainstream organizations and services to address their needs. This was intended to be a temporary service because Native newcomers would go to the Centres to be referred to mainstream organizations that they would not have otherwise been familiar with because they were new to the city. In the case of status Indians from reserves they were not familiar with the services of provincial and municipal governments that are offered in cities. This statement by the federal government illustrated the goals of the Friendship Centres, "To assist in the identification of the basic survival needs, including emergency needs of native people migrating into communities and to refer those in need to the appropriate social service delivery agencies in those communities" (SAB, 1977b).

At this time of assimilationist policies and ideologies it was difficult (but not

impossible) for the Friendship Centres at local levels to engage in co-production with governments and other agencies. Co-production was happening at a limited level at the national level because the Centres were offering services for referrals to various programs. However, the Friendship Centre did negotiate program funding at the local level. The Friendship Centre was limited to applying for grants that were available and working to convince the funding agency that it would be beneficial to have the Friendship Centre offer certain services to Native peoples.

After 1970 the federal government was still trying to create acceptable policy and funding agreements with the provincial governments. They were negotiating cost sharing agreements for Friendship Centres. The provincial governments were hesitant of the federal governments' motives regarding the Friendship Centres. R.H. Neumann, Secretary, Planning Secretariat of the Province of Manitoba in a letter to Mr. K. Svenson notes that he was concerned that the federal government would use the Friendship Centre program as a way to "avoid their greater responsibilities to migrating natives in the areas of housing and employment particularly"(SAB, 1977b). The Province of Saskatchewan also noted some concerns that the Friendship Centres would not be implemented to their greatest potential leaving the province to have to fill in the pieces in terms of services and programs for urban Native peoples (SAB, 1977c). Once these agreements between the federal and provincial governments were sorted out, Friendship Centres were seen as being more permanent fixtures in communities across Canada. Although Friendship Centres were still designed to assist in the transition to urban areas and serve as referral agencies, the Friendship Centres were now offering a much wider variety of services.

The Canadian Government eventually moved away from its assimilation policies,

probably in part because they had not been successful. The government began consulting with the National Association of Friendship Centres to strategize how to make the transition to urban areas. After one of these consultations with the National Association of Friendship Centres the government suggested that Native people should be encouraged to contribute their cultural and social values to the “larger Canadian mosaic” (SAB, 1977b). This statement was moving the government away from its assimilation policies of the past, but it still does not recognize Native people as being a number of distinct cultures.

Just the Friendship Centre, 1976-1982

Although most people who were previously involved with the Friendship Centre still supported the Centre, there was now competition for programming funding from other organizations that had similar goals as the Friendship Centre. In many cases people branched off to go to status specific organizations (such as Local 11 and the Urban Indian Association) where the agendas of either Indian peoples or Métis peoples could be acted upon. This happened at a time when both Indian and Métis peoples were trying to gain control over their own affairs and become more self-sufficient and push for self-government. The Friendship Centre still remained important to Saskatoon, because it was a status blind organization that filled in the gaps of many other organizations, and it provided a place to gather in an informal way and gain access to resources of the larger community. However, the Friendship Centre also had goals of becoming self-governing so they could make more decision about how which programs would be offered, and control over their budget.

In 1979 the Centre was finally able to move to its 168 Wall Street location, where

it is currently located today. From 1979 to 1982 co-production at the Friendship Centre was happening between the Friendship Centre and all levels of government. The Centre was able to secure significant funding from municipal, provincial and federal governments for the purchase of their Wall Street building (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1980c; *Star Phoenix*, September 28, 1979: D1). This shows that these governments agreed that the Friendship Centre was an important asset to the Native community in Saskatoon. The Friendship Centre was continually attempting to fill programming voids that urban Native peoples faced. The Centre wanted to help fill the childcare void that their clientele faced.

The SIMFC worked with both the provincial and municipal governments to get their daycare centre up and running. In a letter to the Mayor of Saskatoon Cliff Wright, from Solinus Jolliffe, Assistant Director/Program Director at SIMFC on August 13, 1979, Mr. Jolliffe was requesting the rezoning of the Friendship Centres location to enable a daycare centre. The Friendship Centre had received clearance from Social Services to have a daycare for thirty-four children, noting that Social Services recognized the need for a good Native Daycare in the city. This letter shows co-production with the provincial government Department of Social Services. The Friendship Centre had been discussing the importance of holding a daycare centre within the Friendship Centre because Social Services saw a substantial need for a Native daycare in Saskatoon. Social Services recognized that the Friendship Centre would be a good choice to offer such a service so that they could refer children to the Friendship Centre. This was an example of co-production. This was particularly important because the Department of Social Services approached the Friendship Centre, which showed that the Friendship Centre was

valued and seen as an important tool to offering services to urban Native peoples (City of Saskatoon Clerk's Office, 1979). The Native daycare at the Friendship Centre was seen by the Secretary of State as beneficial because it would "strengthen and maintain family and cultural ties" which was important especially for the Native people who felt "rather alienated in an urban society" (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1980). In 1979 the Friendship Centre operated a daycare centre at their new location (City of Saskatoon Clerk's Office, 1979). However, the Friendship Centre received opposition from the non-Native businesses in their attempt to make the daycare permanent, so the daycare was short lived.

In 1980-81 the Friendship Centre was negotiating to gain management control of thirty-three houses that the Saskatoon Housing Authority had been responsible for (SAB, 1980). It was unclear why but the Friendship Centre did not gain control over these houses and at some point they lost control over the twenty-four houses that they previously could refer people to. Interview respondents recalled the Friendship Centre being able to refer people to these houses, but they did not recall the Friendship Centre actually controlling them (Interview Informant, February 10, 2009). The SIMFC offered a wide range of programs and activities for the members of the Centre; during these early years there was a lot of change in the programs as the Centre was working to figure out which programs were most important for the community.

Once Friendship Centres had been operating for a certain length of time they began offering other services such as: social, cultural, educational and recreational (SAB, 1979). This pointed to a shift in the governments' policies towards Friendship Centres, as the Centres themselves start offering more services rather than only referring people to

mainstream organizations, and as various levels of governments supported this (with funding particularly) Friendship Centres transformed from being organizations that would aide assimilation to organizations that embraced and celebrated Native cultures in the city.

Conclusion

Being the first Native organization in Saskatoon, which offered the types of services they did, the Friendship Centre has a colourful history. It began as a result of the community advocating for a Centre, which was an example of the communities' and governments' willingness to coproduce services. However, this relationship was not always an easy one because of the fact that this was uncharted territory and there was emerging competition.

The goals of assimilation were apparent in the early days of the Friendship Centre, however as the community worked together they were able to overcome those assimilationist obstacles. The Friendship Centre by its very definition was a status blind organization. The Friendship Centre's goal was to provide services to all Native people and therefore it will always remain status blind in that sense. However the Friendship Centre from its early days expressed a goal of being self-sufficient. They began to exercise these goals by offering services with their self-generated funds.

The Friendship Centre initially worked well because Treaty Indians and Métis worked together at a common goal, to help newcomers and create a status blind community in Saskatoon. It also gained support (or at least recognition) from the mainstream population about Native people but once this achieved there was a progression away from status blind initiatives to fight for status specific rights. Also

being status blind worked to win the fight against assimilation. There was a common goal at that point between Treaty Indians and Métis, once they achieve that goal the next goal was to fight for specific rights, which they could not effectively do together.

During this timeframe (until 1982) the Friendship Centre provided a place for other organizations to form, and these organizations began the fight for having self-governing organizations. However, the Friendship Centre took steps toward being self-determining prior to people breaking away from the Centre. Fundraising allowed the Centre to control their own funds, which is very important to have control over what programs, and services were offered with the fundraising money. Involvement of volunteers was also important. The Friendship Centre was able to offer services that they wanted because they did not need funding but rather community expertise (which in many cases was volunteered) to run programs and finally negotiating programs with various levels of government was an early step towards having control over the Friendship Centre. This early co-production laid the groundwork for many years of co-production within the Friendship Centre. The Friendship Centre acted as a learning experience for many people who went on to start new organizations that would push for more self-governing ways.

It is important to recognize that the Friendship Centre saw the importance of being self-sufficient and self-governing from the early days. Unfortunately the quest to be self-governing organizations took a lot of time, patience and negotiation. Typically organizations cannot become completely self-governing because they will rely on governments for funding their programs. However the actions that many organizations take push them in the direction of becoming self-governing and being able to negotiate

long term funding deals, have effective fundraising campaigns and organizations that work to determine the best programming for their clientele.

Chapter 5: Community Liaison Committee (CLC)

In this chapter I explore the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and how both the individuals involved and the organizations worked to resist assimilation, resist being status blind and promote self-governance through coproduction. I will also discuss how the CLC's need to be status blind often undermined self-government within the Native organizations. I will divide this section into three sections based on the activities of the CLC chronologically and explore assimilation, operating as status blind and coproduction in each of these sections and how the CLC was affected by these factors.

The Early Years 1976 to Intercultural Dialogue Conference (April 1978)

Alderman Helen Hughes was the driving force behind the creation of the Community Liaison Committee (CLC). Hughes was concerned about the “difficult situation” that many Native people found themselves in as well as challenges in Native and non-Native relations. Hughes approached a number of organizations involved in providing services to the urban Native population including: local Native organizations and administrators; programmers in social services, education, recreation, law enforcement; Indian affairs; business; labour; and religious organizations to assess the situation of Native people and race relations in Saskatoon in 1976. Hughes found that there was little communication between the Native and non-Native communities’ as well as with agencies and individuals concerned with the situations many Native peoples faced (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). A number of Native leaders expressed willingness to work together with the city even though there were “clear indications of conflict among the Native organizations” (Fisher and McNabb, 1979:22).

On January 4, 1977, as a newly elected Alderman, Helen Hughes proposed that a committee be established in Saskatoon to “foster... harmony, co-operation and interaction between citizens of native ancestry residing in our city and all others in our midst who call Saskatoon home” (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1977). Hughes believed that working at the municipal level would allow for the inclusion of a number of organizations, agencies and departments and that having a committee appointed by the city council would give the committee “legitimacy and credibility” with a number of organizations and citizens, as well as the provincial and federal governments (Fisher and McNabb, 1979: 22-23).

Some Council members were initially reluctant to support the committee because they did not think it was the municipality's role to step in. The matter was referred to the Legislation and Finance committee for discussion and they recommended that representatives of all Native groups participate actively in the creation of the committee and that Council would not establish the committee until that was demonstrated (Fisher and McNabb, 1979).

Hughes held consultations with the Saskatoon Native Women's Movement¹⁸ the Métis Society Local 11, the Saskatoon Urban Indian Association, the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre, the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and the Provincial Department of Social Services. All organizations consulted had a strong concern for the difficulties facing Native people in Saskatoon and supported the creation of the committee (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). Hughes was unable to receive support from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians (FSI) who were concerned that the committee's actions would overshadow the report they were preparing on urban Indians. There was also concern by the FSI, that Treaty Indians' relationship with the federal government would be confused with the relationship that Non-Status and Métis peoples had with the province as a result of the status blind committee (*The Saskatchewan Indian*, February 1977: 17).

From the beginning the CLC had a lot of support from a number of organizations including concerned citizens (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1977c), churches (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1977d; City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1977e), cultural centres (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1977f) and Native organizations (City of

¹⁸ This organization was made up primarily, if not completely, of Métis women, and they had overlap in membership with Métis Local 11. It is also listed in some documents as the Saskatoon Native Women's Chapter.

Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1977g). As a result of this support, City Council approved the Community Liaison Committee. Initially the CLC worked to alleviate tensions between Natives and non-Natives in Saskatoon including tensions between business owners in Riversdale and community members in the area (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978). Meetings with governments and mainstream organizations built the capacity of both the CLC and individual organizations because they aided in both Native and non-Native peoples, organizations and businesses getting to understand where the others stood on certain issues. This was necessary to gain access to funding and programming.

From the beginning the CLC was seen by those involved as a:

catalyst to increase awareness and facilitate action through collaboration of different groups, but not as a programming body, which would actually put solutions into action. The objective was to bring together a core group of highly committed citizen volunteers who would provide leadership to the committee in addressing perceived problems (Fisher and McNabb, 1979: 25).

The initial meetings focused on establishing terms of reference and objectives of the committee. The terms of reference of the CLC state that the committee will:

provide combined leadership, help and guidance [to assist in the] orientation of Indian and Métis people into urban life [and] to foster progress [in the areas of] economic development... housing, education, employment, law and its enforcement, recreation, health and human relationships...by involv[ing] such resource and support services as may be available in the community involving governmental departments and agencies, civic departments and Boards including Parks and Recreation, Police Commission and Board of Health; educational institutions in the City of Saskatoon; Housing Authorities; voluntary agencies; religious groups, etc. (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1977b).

This tells us that the Community Liaison Committee, both Native and non-Native members, saw Native people in Saskatoon as people who needed help becoming orientated to city life. Native people were assumed to have challenges in a number of social service type areas, and the CLC worked to involve various levels of governments

and agencies involved to work to improve the lives of Native peoples in Saskatoon.

Next a number of areas of concern including housing, recreation, employment and human relations were addressed. Representatives of different agencies and departments were invited to meets to discuss existing programs and their perceptions of issues urban Native people face. During these meetings, it was stated that “in every case, it was clear that there was a large gap between the level of service that should be offered and the existing limited utilization and availability of such services for native people” (Fisher and McNabb, 1979: 25). Prior to the CLC and other similar initiatives (including Native organizations requesting services) there was little consultation between Native organizations and initiatives to benefit Native people and mainstream organizations and governments. Vicki Wilson, co-ordinator of the street workers program stated that,

A deep sense of alienation and isolation, coupled with ignorance of their rights and sources of help available, prevent them from reaching out for assistance. Others do not seek help because they are unskilled at articulating their problems or because they feel they no longer matter as persons (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978c).

This statement shows the lack of cooperation and consultation that took place to actively engage Native people who were in need of assistance. Although programming was likely available in mainstream organizations because of the alienation felt by many Native people in the city, individuals were not aware of programs that were designed to help them. In many cases this was a result of mainstream and Native organizations and governments not working together.

Prior to the CLC and in its early stages there was tension between the Native and non-Native communities'. There was particular tension in the Saskatoon neighbourhood of Riversdale, between the Native peoples and area business men who felt the Native

peoples' presence was jeopardizing their business. The CLC facilitated a series of problem identification meetings between the committee members, concerned citizens and groups in the Riversdale area. It became clear that many people were willing to have discussions focused on the resolution of problems. This was an example of coproduction in its infancy. For the first time the community came together to look for solutions to the problems in Riversdale. This was innovative because the community was becoming involved in problem solving and decision-making. As a result of the outcomes of these meetings, the committee decided to hold a workshop about Native people on the streets and the difficulties that they faced.

The CLC Native People on the Streets workshop was the first workshop in Saskatoon that brought together Native and non-Native organizations and citizens to focus on specific problems that Native people might be facing (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978e). The CLC was able to bring together a diversified group because they were associated with the city council and were recognized by the non-Native community. On the other hand, if Native organizations attempted to do these types of things they may not have been supported or attended by as many non-Native/mainstream organizations.

As a result of the good attendance and positive feedback on the Native People on the Streets Workshop, an Intercultural Dialogue Conference followed the workshop in April 1978 (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). At the Intercultural Dialogue Conference seventeen Treaty, non-status Indians and Métis people addressed issues that Native people in Saskatoon faced to an audience of about two hundred. This conference included discussions on which task forces would be formed and how to include grassroots input. The conference was intended to initiate communication between Native and non-Native

peoples. The Native speakers stated “many of the problems encountered by native people in Saskatoon are due to the inability of non-native people to try to understand the Indian culture” (SAB, 1978b). This statement shows that Native people in Saskatoon were not willing to assimilate, but rather they felt that non-Native citizens in Saskatoon should at least attempt to understand them.

The CLC was composed of volunteers. This was important in order for the Committee to remain a “public agency” that had the support of city council, which lent to the credibility and visibility of the Committees actions. However, the volunteer aspect made it difficult to get people to contribute a large amount of time and energy that was necessary in a committee such as the CLC (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). Ideally the CLC would have had more Native members. However, it was not always possible to have consistent and desired voluntary membership of Native people because of their already large time commitments to Native organizations, travel with their jobs, or family or personal commitments (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). In addition, the CLC was time consuming as one respondent recalled “looking back...it felt like every night I was at City Hall for some meeting” (Informant Interview, November 9, 2007). Also during this time period, Aboriginal organizations were expanding and being created so Native members were very busy (Informant Interview, November 9, 2007).

The relationships that were formed among members of the CLC showed that assimilation was resisted. Prior to the CLC many people did not have the opportunity to engage with each other as they did on the CLC and this helped the capacity of the CLC as well as other future initiatives these people were involved in. An Aboriginal respondent talks about how she felt she and other Aboriginal members of the CLC were treated on

the CLC:

Well the people that were coming forward were very vocal which is something that I don't think had ever really happened before, we would sit around and share ideas and we were intelligent people, we came up with good things, I mean the committee wouldn't have been there and stayed there for as long as it did if it hadn't. I think I want to use the word honour, I think they honoured what we had to say, because they had never really heard a lot of Aboriginal voices before, you had your stereotypes and they still exist today, on welfare, not working, drinking, fighting, whatever, I mean that still takes place today, but the thing is they also know that there is another segment of that population and I don't think that they had really been exposed an awful lot to that and so we had people that were working, we had people that were going to school. It was something that I think people might have thought about but they didn't know and then when they meet you and they talk to you and find out that you can carry out a conversation and that you have smart things to say that that you've got input you know I think there was a lot of honour that came out of that for Aboriginal people, a lot (Informant Interview, November 9, 2007).

Another respondent spoke of the importance of Native people on the CLC stating that non-Native members may have had different connections than Native people and they could provide support to native organizations and people. Many of the non-Native people involved in the CLC had experience in working with various levels of governments' and other organizations. As a result, they could help Native peoples and their organizations to gain access. The respondent recalled, "Helen tended to carry more influence because she had so many connections, with potential funding sources, decision makers and the whole bit, so she could kind of be more of a coordinator of efforts, to develop proposals and get things in from there" (Informant Interview, July 5, 2007). Hughes had a number of contacts at various levels of government and with a number of businesses in Saskatoon, which was beneficial in getting attention for the CLC.

During these early years, it was clear that the Community Liaison Committee was working with Native peoples in Saskatoon to resist assimilation. The committee did this by making Native issues more visible in Saskatoon and working with Native people to

provide a platform to have their issues heard and began to work towards solutions. This atmosphere also showed the coproductive atmosphere that was developing in Saskatoon, where Native and non-Native people dedicated themselves by volunteering to find solutions in Saskatoon.

*The Middle Years: Post Intercultural Dialogue Conference to Helen's Departure
(September 1980)*

After the Intercultural Dialogue Conference the CLC submitted a research grant proposal to the Municipal Research Support Program of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. The CLC needed some research to support their vision and they felt it was important to document the committee in its early days and the relationships between Native and non-Native peoples. This grant was approved and the CLC was able to hire a research assistant (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). Hiring the research assistant increased the capacity of the CLC because this person was full time, was able to attend meetings and workshops, and gather and analyze information and write reports for the CLC. Before the research assistant was hired most of the work of the CLC was done by volunteers, most of whom were either fulltime students or worked fulltime. The research assistant also provided capacity in developing program proposals (Fisher and McNabb, 1979).

During this time the CLC was experiencing some internal conflict. There was a history of conflict between Métis Local 11 and the Friendship Centre where the Saskatoon Native Women's Movement aligned with Métis Local 11 and the Urban Indian Association aligned with the Friendship Centre. This resulted in Métis Local 11 and the Native Women's Association leaving the CLC for a period of time (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). Métis Local 11 and the Friendship Centre often found themselves competing for

the same funding which caused friction between the two organizations even prior to the CLC. The CLC was a status blind focused organization, where improving the lives of all Native peoples was the goal, similar to the Friendship Centre. Métis Local 11 on the other hand was focused specifically on Métis rights and there was not a platform to do that within the CLC, which resulted in frustration. Following the Intercultural Dialogue Conference the CLC decided to have four new members from the Native community at large to replace the representatives that left (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). The individuals who joined the CLC were not from any particular organizations, but were interested in the work of the committee.

The CLC did frustrate many Native people in the city. They wondered when all of the talk of the liaison committee would result in action. One conference attendee said "he hoped that people would do more than just talk about all the problems of our modern world" (Rita Schilling, *NewBreed*, 1978). This was partially a capacity issue, because the CLC did not have the capacity or the mandate to actually act on the change. The CLC would discuss issues and then make recommendations to organizations and governments who could actually make the change. In many ways the CLC was successful, but after three years of discussions, the hope was that more could have been done, and that more would be done in the future.

The CLC was instrumental in getting governments to look at a wide variety of issues that urban Native people face. Although the CLC may not have gotten a lot of programming created they laid the ground work for getting meetings with various levels of government. The CLC may have been able to get meetings with various levels of government because they did not represent a particular organization but the relationships

between Native and non-Native people (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978). The CLC was only advocating for services for Native people, which may have made them more approachable in the eyes of government.

The CLC decided to form task forces after the Dialogue Conference to work on specific problem areas including: education, employment, housing and recreation. The employment task force was concerned with the lack of employment opportunities for Native people and the lack of services aimed at increasing the number of Native people in the labour market. The task force investigated alternative programming approaches by meeting with a number of Native people.

During June and July 1978 the task force drafted a proposal for a Native Outreach program through the Canadian Employment Centre. The vision was to work with the Centre's Native Employment Councilor, where part time services would also be offered in other locations more frequented by Native peoples such as the Friendship Centre, Local 11's office and the Friendship Inn.¹⁹ Here the task force engaged in coproduction to ensure that an employment service that was needed for Native peoples in the community was not only offered, but offered in a way that was beneficial to the Native community. The task force also wanted the program to be accountable to a board with a number of Native members on it. The program was approved in February 1979 and implemented in May 1979 (Fisher and McNabb, 1979).

There is an important distinction that needs to be made regarding co-production on the Community Liaison Committee. There is the basic co-production that is taking place within the Committee with volunteers working together to improve the quality of

¹⁹ Many Native peoples in Saskatoon accessed the Friendship Inn, a mainstream organization, which was known as a soup kitchen.

life of Native citizens in Saskatoon. There is another kind of co-production that was important to the Native organizations, and that is co-production that results in self-government. Native organizations wanted to use the CLC as a platform to have Native issues dealt with but when programming was proposed the organizations had a difficult time supporting the CLC. This was because supporting the programs the CLC was developing, worked in direct competition with the Native organizations on the Committee. The Native organizations wanted the programs and funding for themselves because additional funds and programs would help them realize their goals of self-government. The discussions that took place regarding program initiatives within the committee became frustrating for Native organizations because they wanted to offer the services on their own. There was difficulty agreeing to which organization should offer which services which resulted in the municipal government stepping in to attempt to fill program gaps. However, the municipality did not often want to offer programs exclusively for Native peoples, as the Native organizations would have preferred.

The Recreation Task Force was concerned with the lack of utilization of recreation programs by Native people so they held meetings with the Parks and Recreation Department of the City of Saskatoon to develop initiatives in the area of recreation. In July and August of 1978 the Task Force worked with the research assistant to survey the recreation needs of Native families. The survey showed that Native families were interested in recreation programming that promoted cultural activities and offered sporting opportunities primarily for children. The survey found that Native people were not aware of recreation programs, they could not afford involvement and that they faced discrimination. As a result a Native Recreation Association was created to encourage

participation and the development of programs aimed primarily but not exclusively for native people. Approval for the creation of the Board was required from the Friendship Centre and Métis Local 11; and Métis Local 11 refused to provide support (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). It is likely that Local 11 would not provide support for this initiative because they wanted to offer the services through their own organization. This was a challenge that the CLC faced in enhancing the services of civic departments, because the Native organizations involved did not want any further competition for funding. It was also difficult to make the argument to funding agencies that their organization should be granted funding to offer a program that the municipality was already offering, even though not exclusively for Native peoples.

The CLC also worked with the Parks and Recreation Board to survey urban Aboriginal peoples to determine why they do not use civic service for recreation. As a result the Native Recreation Association (NRA) was formed (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978e). The NRA offered Indian drumming and dancing, Indian crafts as well as sports around the city to encourage the participation of Native people in recreation programs run by the city. The NRA was also involved with the YMCA and Colgate-Palmolive to sponsor and carry out a ten-week learn to swim class with over ninety children attending (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978e). This initiative once again showed a number of organizations becoming involved to reach a certain goal. The CLC identified a need, and upon sharing their concern with a number of other organizations were able to see some programming as a result, this is how successful co-production works according to the municipality. However Native organizations, would have preferred to offer these programs through their organizations rather than through the city.

The Education Task Force formed in November 1978 discussed the difficulties that Native children had in the existing educational system. Members of the Task Force were involved in a special meeting regarding the education of Native children held by the Citizen's Advisory Council to the Public Board of Education. The Task Force decided it would focus on the educational system's priorities and programs and consulted with other school jurisdictions on initiatives that other schools had implemented. This shows a level of co-production at work where the Task Force is able to work with the Public Board of Education to address the needs of Native children in the education system. The Task Force was also involved in forming the Native Parents Association. In February/March 1979 the Task Force prepared a submission regarding the education of Native children to the Public Board of Education and the Catholic Board of Education as a result of the Task Force's consultations with schools. The report was received positively and resulted in further investigation by the school boards. In turn Cree kindergarten classes and a school/community worker were implemented where a high number of Native children attend schools (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). Once again although this was beneficial to the Native community in Saskatoon this initiative did not help to further the Native organizations' agenda for self-government.

The Housing Task Force had received funding from the Provincial Social Planning Secretariat to hire an external consultant to assist the committee in developing a housing and complimentary social programming plan and recommendations for implementation. In January 1979, Thomas Owen and Associates of Ontario, a consulting firm, began their investigation of housing in Saskatoon. The results of the consultant report in October 1979 were poorly received by the Native community (Fisher and

McNabb, 1979). In particular by Métis Local 11 and Sasknative Housing because the report suggested the separation of housing and social services, and that the City of Saskatoon should act as a facilitator and catalyst (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1979b). Sasknative Housing was a Métis organization that offered subsidized rental housing to Native people in Saskatoon. The individuals involved with Sasknative Housing were the same group of people involved with Métis Local 11. The Housing Task Force knew that housing was a key element in successful urban transition that needed to be accompanied with adequate social services, and that the existing programs were too limited. The Task Force wanted to see non-profit corporations offering housing on a geared-to-income basis with a rent-to-purchase option. They also felt it was important to improve neighbourhood relations, but it would be up to various organizations to make that happen (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). These recommendations directly undermined Sasknative Housing's authority in the housing area. As Sasknative Housing was trying to grow their organization to be able to assist the Native population with their housing needs, this report suggests that the City of Saskatoon should have more power over the housing. If this happened it would have been a digression from the level of self-government that Sasknative Housing had already achieved, which was why the report was not supported.

The beginning of co-production was also at work in the Housing Task Force. The CLC sent a document about housing in Saskatoon to the Saskatoon Housing Authority. The CLC was then able to meet with the Authority to clarify their policies, management and the availability of public housing that is administered through the Authority. The CLC was acting as an organizational body to get a number of parties to sit together to

discuss the issues. Seemingly simple tasks like this had not happened at the group level. Instead, there would have been meetings with one organization and the housing authority at a time (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978e).

In addition to meeting with the municipal housing authority, the Housing Task Force invited different government departments and agencies to their meetings to gain clarification of the governments policies and programs. Specifically the Housing Task Force met with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) to discuss their policies on housing studies. During this meeting CMHC said that they were willing to work with the municipal government to establish projects (SAB, 1978c). This was an agreement to engage in co-production in the area of housing for families and seniors in Saskatoon. This is positive in terms of gaining attention for Native issues in Saskatoon. However, CMHC wanting to work with the municipal government as opposed to Native organizations created challenges for Native organizations in Saskatoon who were trying to gain self-government powers.

The CLC also had concerns with a number of other issues; formalized task forces addressed some of these, while others were dealt with in a number of other task forces. The CLC was concerned with the issue of law and its enforcement but had been unable to engage enough willing Native citizens to become involved in a Task Force (Fisher and McNabb, 1979). The CLC was also concerned with alcohol abuse issues so the committee referred its concern to the Alcoholism Society of Saskatoon requesting Native people be involved. The Housing Task Force was working through the CLC's concerns with health to a certain degree and the CLC's concern with human relations has been integrated into a number of other committee initiatives (Fisher and McNabb, 1979).

These initial meetings with governments and agencies were important to create a working relationship with the CLC and its task forces. In many ways the CLC acting as a cohesive group was able to gain the attention of departments and agencies that one Native organization by itself may have not been able to do. These initial meetings were able to create an environment where co-production could take place, however, there were still a number of obstacles that the CLC and its members needed to overcome in order to engage in meaningful co-production.

The overall ability of the CLC to engage in meaningful co-production with external organizations and governments was hindered by the competition between Native organizations on the CLC. When two organizations from the CLC were both trying to offer the same program it inhibited the effectiveness of the CLC to coproduce. This is not to say that the same program (like the family workers program) could not be offered at a number of organizations but when the CLC did not provide a united front to other organizations and government that could be viewed as problematic (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1978c; Fisher and McNabb, 1979). Prior to going into discussion with governments and agencies the CLC needed to make sure that all members of the task force had the same goals.

Native organizations often felt that some new programs would be competing with already existing programs and there was fear that the already existing programs could lose their funding. This was a problem for coproduction. For example when the CLC submitted a proposal to the provincial government to offer services, the provincial government requested all Native organizations in Saskatoon endorse the program. Due to competition Local 11 would not endorse the program, which resulted in the proposal

being rejected. This reveals two issues: first, the inability of Native organizations to support initiatives that their programs or organization would not directly benefit from and secondly, the inability of governments to understand the complexities of different Native identities to Native people which led them to oppose status blind programs. Both of these issues inhibited co-production because for meaningful co-production all parties needed to understand the goals and concerns of the other parties (Fisher and McNabb, 1979).

During this time period in the CLC, assimilation was resisted as Native peoples had shown other members of the CLC the importance of culturally appropriate programs. If there were still goals of assimilation evident it would not be possible to be engaging in coproduction at the level that they were and with the success. There was still resistance to being status blind on the committee, because Métis Local 11 was unable to use the CLC as a platform to further Métis rights. However, Métis Local 11 must have seen the CLC as valuable because members of the local returned to the meetings less than a year after they left. The return was an acknowledgment of the important work that the CLC was able to get done. Working with various agencies and government departments to coproduce services that were beneficial to Native people in Saskatoon provided the organizations involved with the experience needed to co-produce services within their own organizations, and aided them in working towards their goals of self-government.

The Late Years: The Exit of Helen Hughes (October 1980) to the dissolution of the CLC after 1982

It remained important to the CLC during its final years to stress “the Community Liaison Committee does not and doesn’t intend to enter into program delivery but acts as an initiator, catalyst and advocate” (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1980b). The CLC

underwent a number of changes in 1980 through to 1982. In October of 1980 Alderman Helen Hughes resigned from City Council, and Alderman Kate Waygood was appointed and worked with Shirley Vols, co chair of the CLC. In the spring of 1980 the CLC got funding to hire a community development officer, who was hired in May 1981 to help do some of the legwork for the CLC. In the fall of 1981 the CLC office expanded to include secretarial support. The CLC was also reorganized in September 1981 to include a four-member executive (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1982).

During 1981 and early 1982 during the restructuring period the CLC established two new task forces including the Community Relations Task Force which had a mandate of creating awareness for Native issues and cultures, and the Employment and Training Task Force which was in its early days of development (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1982). The CLC had been working with the Indian Cultural College in October 1980 to create a slide-tape presentation to promote cross-cultural awareness. The committee was still working on this project in 1982 but there is no evidence that this project was ever completed (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1982). The CLC had also initiated a pilot project for a Native Day Camp for children five to twelve years to participate in recreational and educational activities. The camp was a success and the CLC recommended that the City's Recreation and Parks Department continued with the camps. It is not known if the City continued with the camp.

In September 1981 the municipal and federal governments approached the committee to apply for funding through the Canada Community Development Project. The CLC submitted a funding application for the Projected Native Employment Data and Evaluation Project. Funding was received and the one-year project was projected to start

on February 15, 1982, employing four people of Native ancestry (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1982). There was an economic and development task force working during this time whose main objective was to “identify union barriers to Native employment” but little progress had been made in the area by the time the CLC ended (City of Saskatoon Clerks Office, 1982).

The CLC ended in early 1982. It is not clear exactly when the committee ended or what the cause of the committee ending was, as I have not seen correspondence regarding the committee past July, 1982. Many of the interview respondents reflected on the ending of the CLC as being due to the loss and leadership of Alderman Helen Hughes (Informant Interview, January 4, 2008), and due to conflict among the Native organizations on the CLC as had been an issue in the past (Informant Interview, July 5, 2007). People had put a lot of effort into the CLC and were getting tired. Other things began taking priority for individuals and as a result attendance at meetings dropped and energy for projects was not what it had been previously (Informant Interview, January 4, 2008). The respondents acknowledged that the CLC had served its purpose of creating some awareness and trying to get programs started in the City of Saskatoon, but that the CLC was not moving forward any longer and so it was ended. It became apparent to Native organizations that the CLC could be used as a platform for awareness. However, the CLC was not able to help individual organizations to further their own agendas. Due to the awareness the CLC brought to the public and governments Native organizations were able to move away from the CLC to advocate on their own for funding and programs. The CLC provided these organizations with introductions, through task force meetings, to government officials who were aware of the issues and willing to work with Native organizations to

address those issues (Informant Interview, January 4, 2008).

Although the CLC disbanded in 1982, the CLC's members and initiatives provided a certain level of capacity in the area of Native and non-Native relations. An interview respondent noted that the impact of the CLC after the CLC was gone was huge, "the origins of the social interactions and people knowing each other had a huge impact for later initiatives that got going. It may have taken half a decade, or a few decades to get going but it was huge." The respondent went on to say that, "the Community Liaison Committee was a spark, the flames never died. They were fanned by different people at different times and evolved. Housing was one and the race relations is another" (Informant Interview, January 4, 2008). So although the CLC was not successful in remaining a city council committee in the long term, its members provided a certain level of capacity to other committee's and organizations because they had formed relationships on the committee.

The CLC disbanded in part because of a decreasing capacity. A respondent recalled that people were tired and becoming more involved in other things and did not see the committee as a priority anymore (Informant Interview, January 4, 2008). Another respondent felt that people just did not feel that the CLC was moving forward any longer and so it was dissolved (Informant Interview, December 11, 2007). Respondents were uncertain if the expectations of the CLC were met. One respondent said that they were unsure if the expectations were met but that the CLC had lots of meetings and there was a lot of talking, but they got some programs and most importantly non-Native people on the committee became aware of Native people in the city (Informant Interview, November 9, 2007). Another responded recalled, "I think there were high expectations,

and I think she [Helen] made a significant contribution by putting issues to the force and creating a space for us to talk about those issues” (Informant Interview, February 7, 2008). Perhaps other people felt that they could better push other concerns forward in other ways, away from the CLC. One respondent admitted, “I think that there was some frustration because I don’t think that we realized all of our goals, but I also think that was not probably realistic” (Informant Interview, February 7, 2008).

Conclusion

The very idea of the CLC, Native and non-Native people working together to improve the situation of urban Native people in Saskatoon was, for the most part a step beyond previous policies and ideals of assimilation. There may have been some people involved in the CLC, sitting in on task forces periodically, who believed in the ideals of assimilation but these people did not hold influence over the committee’s outcomes. The municipal government was looking to employ an inclusive approach because they did not have any legal responsibility for urban Native peoples and therefore they did not want to officially offer programs exclusively for one particular group. However, the municipal government created programs that would be geared towards involving Native community members (i.e. Native drumming, dancing and crafts), but could be accessed by anyone. The fact that the municipal government would work to address the needs of the urban Native population specifically were innovative because it had not been done before.

Being status blind was often resisted at the CLC by the status specific organizations and embraced by the other organizations and other members. For a committee at this stage, they for the most part wanted to stay away from focusing their energy on only status Indians, Métis or non-status, rather they wanted to see services for

all Native people being developed. This status blind approach caused some conflict within the liaison committee because the status-oriented organizations were most interested in programming that would be offered within their own organization. When things got heated at the CLC some of the organizations would remove themselves from the CLC for a period of time, and reevaluate if the CLC was still beneficial for their people. Other organizations stayed away altogether. The Federation of Saskatchewan Indians was not involved with the CLC. It seemed as though they wanted to work through the issues of urban Indian peoples on their own. For the most part, the CLC was quite successful in taking this status blind approach, as it was able to attract a wide variety membership to be included. The committee was not large enough to work through the issues of the Métis, status Indians and non-status Indians all at the same time.

The CLC had very limited self-governing opportunities, because the committee was not set up in a way that they were able to offer services and programs. Rather the CLC advocated for the creation of services and programs to external agencies and governments. The CLC did gain the opportunity to be responsible for some programming at different points in time, mostly having to do with research projects. However, the Native organizations sitting on the CLC had goals of working in self-governing Native organizations. Many of these organizations were already self-governing in a number of different capacities. However, it was difficult to use the CLC as a way to gain more power because there were a number of Native organizations' competing for the same funding and programs. These organizations influence at the CLC resulted in the CLC making recommendations to have more organizations run by and for Native people, but they did not support specific organizations.

Co-production within the CLC paved the way for a number of joint efforts in the future. By starting small the CLC was able to build strong relationships that would carry into other organizations and committees in the future. The CLC and its task forces provided a meeting ground for Native organizations and government departments to discuss concerns of the Native population, and because the municipal government backed this committee it helped in initiating these discussions.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This thesis has explored how the Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre and the Community Liaison Committee were created and developed in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan from 1968-1982. Through documents collected about these two organizations and informant interviews I explored how these organizations resisted assimilation, resisted status blind ideals and how they engaged in co-production to further their goals of self-government. Prior to 1968 there were no urban Native service providers in Saskatoon. Native peoples were expected to use the mainstream organizations that were unfamiliar with the challenges facing urban Native peoples and that lacked an understanding of the diversity of Native cultures. The Friendship Centre was the first organization in the city that was able to address these issues. From the beginning the federal government's objectives for the Friendship Centre had some

fundamental flaws, particularly that it was an instrument to assist assimilation policies. However, the Native community in Saskatoon rallied around the Friendship Centre, and created programs that required little support from governments and were able to offer a number of “city” skills and cultural type programs. In doing this the Friendship Centre created a uniquely Native place in Saskatoon.

Once the Friendship Centre became established in the city, individuals involved wanted to use the Centre as a place from which to advocate for political rights. This resulted in a number of conflicts between First Nations and Métis peoples at the Centre because it was difficult to use the Centre as a place to fight for rights for both groups simultaneously. As a result, new Native organizations were created to fill this void of political rights.

In 1977 the Community Liaison Committee was created in Saskatoon. This Committee was to explore and bring awareness to Native and non-Native relations in the city. In some ways the CLC was able to bring back some of the cohesion that once existed between Native peoples at the Friendship Centre. However, there were still splits in the ideologies of the Native community, which caused conflict on the Committee. There was often consensus on what initiatives needed to be focused on but there was difficulty in determining which of the Native organizations would offer such programs. As a result the municipal government would often offer programs and services geared towards Native people although not exclusively for them. This undermined the Native organizations’ goals of self-government.

This research makes contributions to what we know about Aboriginal peoples and how they organize themselves in cities. This study shows Aboriginal peoples as a strong

group of people determined to help their own community. The Aboriginal community had a strong vision for self-government from the early beginnings of their organizations. They were both creative and competitive in attempting to serve the needs of their community. It shows the Aboriginal individuals who worked very hard to ensure people in their community would have access to the programs and services that they needed for a successful future.

This work shows the municipal government in Saskatoon becoming involved in Aboriginal issues, which was uncommon during this time frame. The active role that the city took in programming and services for Aboriginal peoples is important. However, it also must be noted that it was difficult to negotiate who would offer the programs and services, and how that in turn could negatively effect Aboriginal organizations quests for self-government.

This research contributes to the literature on co-production between governments and Aboriginal organizations in the early stages of development. It explored how these relationships were built often with small amounts of funding initially and grew too much larger initiatives. This research adds to the limited information available on urban Aboriginal organizations in Canada. It shows the challenges associated with offering status blind services to peoples with distinct cultures and legal rights. Research in other Canadian cities is needed to determine if this was a common trend in Canada. It seems as though the struggles surrounding status may not be the case in other areas. There has been very little work that explores the relationships between different cultural and status groups in urban Aboriginal organizations. It is possible that this trend is unique to Saskatoon in particular or perhaps to most prairie cities. There is more research needed in

this area to determine this.

In contemporary times, many of the issues discussed in this thesis are still evident. Statistics Canada (2008) states that over half of the urban Aboriginal population now lives in urban areas. Because Aboriginal people still face many of the same challenges they did in the late 1960s to early 1980s it is important for municipalities to work and understand Aboriginal aspirations in urban areas (Walker, 2008). Walker, 2008 points out that there seems to remain a desire by both municipal governments and urban Aboriginal organizations to work together. However, because of a lack of jurisdictional clarity municipalities have often waited for other governments to act rather than working with Aboriginal communities. Walker, 2008 argues that municipalities have the power to work with Aboriginal communities and should therefore do so. He further argues that there must be recognition of Aboriginal rights and goals of self-government by the municipality for success. It seems that not much has been gained in terms of municipal relationships with urban Aboriginal organizations since the 1970s, there is still a lot of discussion about how Aboriginal organizations and municipalities can work together. Urban Aboriginal organizations and municipalities must move forward and begin to implement strategies that work for all parties concerned in order to move towards more mutually beneficial relationships in the future.

The challenges that were seen with status blind organizations still exist with status blind service delivery today, particularly in prairie cities. Many individuals still believe that goals of self-government can be best met through status specific organizations. While these status specific organizations are able to advocate for specific rights for First Nations and Métis communities, they leave a number of people behind. For those

individuals without status or connections to specific Aboriginal communities status specific organizations are not an option. It is with this population that status blind organizations remain important. Status blind organizations such as Friendship Centres still provide a place for Aboriginal peoples to go to receive services from other Aboriginal peoples and provide a connection to an Aboriginal community. Similarly to the time period of this thesis, self-government still remains something that the Friendship Centre is actively working towards for the future.

This research was not without its challenges. The Friendship Centre itself, had very little written documentation of its history. The Community Liaison Committee on the other hand had a lot of written history in the form of meeting minutes. However, because of the formality of meeting minutes it can be difficult to determine what kinds of discussions may have taken place in order to accept or reject a motion. It was a challenge initially to engage research participants. A number of individuals that I contacted did not see the value of this research because they had been involved in research in the past and had not seen any positive outcomes for themselves or their community. Luckily with the support of the Friendship Centre I was able to gain the confidence of research participants and was able to show them the value of this work. The value can be demonstrated in that for the Friendship Centres fortieth anniversary, a summary of the history of the Friendship Centre, which was possible through this research, was presented back to the community. This history is seen as being valuable to the community, because there is no other comprehensive written documentation. In addition a number of the individuals who were involved in these organizations during this timeframe have passed on, many of those who are still around today have limited memory, especially for details. However,

there were still a number of respondents who were willing to share their stories to the best of their abilities, and for that I am extremely grateful.

Finally, upon reflection on this project I cannot say that I would do things differently. I would change my expectations going into the research. Before I engaged in research I did not understand that challenges that come with working with organizations and individuals because research projects are not often at the top of their priority lists. This type of research requires patience to wait for the right time to approach community members and to work around their schedules and needs, rather than the schedule and needs of the University. I also understand now the importance of maintaining relationships with participants over the course of the research, and to a certain degree developing a relationship with participants that shows your interest in things beyond the set list of interview questions. This may not be necessary for the actual research, but it is necessary to make the research a positive experience for both the participant and the researcher.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- City of Saskatoon Clerks Office. 1969. Letter from Mrs. E. Brass, Chairman, the Provisional Board of the Indian and Métis Friendship Centre, to His Worship Major S.J. Buckwold and Members of City Council, November 28, 1969, RE: the establishment of a Friendship Centre in Saskatoon.
- — —. 1970. “Bylaw No.4995.” City Council Meeting Minutes. April 13, 1970.
- — —. 1971. “Submission of Support of Request.” Submitted to City Council by the Indian and Métis Friendship Centre.
- — —. 1971b. “Grants-in-Aid.” City Council Meeting Minutes. March 22, 1971.
- — —. 1972. “Application for a license to hold a bingo: Saskatoon Indian Métis Friendship Centre (File No. C. 12-8-2)” City Council Meeting Minutes. January 17, 1972.
- — —. 1972b. “Grants-in-Aid.” City Council Meeting Minutes. March 27, 1972.
- — —. 1974. “Application for a license to hold a bingo Indian and Métis Friendship Centre (File No. C.12-8-2).” City Council Meeting Minutes. January 28, 1974.
- — —. 1975. “Letter of Correspondence to Mr. J. Kolynchuk, Secretary, Legislation and Finance Committee, from D.V. Vandale, Program Director, Indian and Métis Friendship Centre.” January 27, 1975.
- — —. 1977. “Motions.” City Council Meeting Minutes. January 24, 1977.
- — —. 1977b. “Report No.3- 1977 of the Community Liaison Committee.” City Council Meeting Minutes. August 8, 1977.
- — —. 1977c. “Letter of Correspondence from Don Sugden, citizen, to George Taylor, Alderman, RE: the study of native – white problems in Saskatoon February 10, 1977.

- — —. 1977d. “Letter of Correspondence from Rev. Eleanor Geib, Secretary, Saskatoon Ministerial Association, to Members of City Council, RE: support for Alderman Helen Hughes motion of January 24, 1977” February 10, 1977.
 - — —. 1977e. “Letter of Correspondence from Dennis Johnson and Keith Davidson, the Board of McClure United Church, to George Taylor, Alderman, RE support for the proposed native community liaison committee” February 21, 1977.
 - — —. 1977f. “Letter of Correspondence from Ann Coxworth, Co-chairman, board of directors, One Sky Saskatchewan Cross Cultural Centre, to Mayor and Council of the City of Saskatoon RE: support for the proposed native community liaison committee February 12, 1977.
 - — —. 1977g. “Letter of Correspondence from Brian Tootoosis, Saskatoon Urban Indian Association, to Members of City Council, RE: support for the proposed native community liaison committee February 22, 1977.
 - — —. 1978. “Community Liaison Committee, Interim Report to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, a Social Services Planning Approach to Native/Non-Native Relations in Saskatoon.” September, 1978.
 - — —. 1978b. “Community Liaison Committee. “Interim Report to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities A Social Services Planning Approach to Native/Non-Native Relations in Saskatoon” June 1978.
 - — —. 1978c. “Resume of the Intercultural Dialogue and Action Planning Workshop” April 28, 1978.
 - — —. 1978d. “Report No. 6-1978 of the Committee on Committees.” City Council Meeting Minutes, November 6, 1978.
 - — —. 1978e. “Report No. 1-1978 of the Community Liaison Committee.” City Council Meeting Minutes, February 27, 1978.
 - — —. 1978f. “Community Liaison Committee. Interim Report to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities: A Social Services Planning Approach to Native/Non-Native Relations in Saskatoon” December, 1978.
 - — —. 1979. “From Solinus Jolliffe, Assistant Director/ Program Director...” City Council Meeting Minutes. August 13, 1979.
 - — —. 1979b. “ Final report on housing and social services by Thomas Owen and Associates Ltd.” Community Liaison Committee. July 30, 1979.
 - — —. 1980. Letter from George Stushnoff, Social Development Officer, Secretary of State, to His Worship, Mayor Cliff Wright and City Council, January 31, 1980, RE: Daycare Centre at the Friendship Centre.
 - — —. 1980b. “A Submission by the Saskatoon Community Liaison Committee and its Training and Employment Task Force to the Adult Basic Education Review Committee August, 1980.
 - — —. 1980c. “The Saskatoon Indian & Métis Friendship Centre – Program Fund Revenue and Expenditure.” Attachment to letter from Solinus Jolliffe, Assistant Director/ Program Director, SIMFC to Miss Susan Coley, Secretary, Legislation & Finance Committee, February 12, 1980.
 - — —. 1982. “Report No. 1-1982 of the Community Liaison Committee.” City Council Meeting Minutes. February 8, 1982.
- Fisher, Ronald and McNabb, Harold. 1979. “A Social Services Planning Approach to Native/Non Native Relations in Saskatoon.” In collaboration with the

- Community Liaison Committee, October 1979. Unpublished report.
- Goertzen, Hank. 1973. "Indians continue to occupy centre." *Star Phoenix*, March 13, 1973, 1.
- Indian-Eskimo Association of Canada. "The Challenge of Assisting the Canadian Aboriginal People to adjust to Urban Environments." Report of the First Western Canada Indian – Metis Seminar. University of Alberta, September 11-13, 1962. Edited by G.K Hirbayashi and A.J. Gormier.
- National Association of Friendship Centres. "National Association of Friendship Centres." <http://www.nafc-aboriginal.com>
- Newbreed. "Saskatoon Friendship Centre." *Newbreed*. October, 1972, 9.
- Saskatchewan Archives Board. 1969. "Minutes." Saskatchewan Task Force on Indian Opportunity. Allan Guy Records (Coll # 47, File #18) December 11, 1969.
- — —. 1968-1972. "Orders in Council 1968-1972." *Indian and Métis Department Collection R-354*, File 3.8
- — —. 1970. "Saskatchewan Friendship Centres Meeting Held May, 26, 1970 in Saskatoon." Meeting Minutes. Allan Guy Records (Coll # 47, File #11a) May 26, 1970.
- — —. 1970b. "Letter of Correspondence from C.L.B. Estey, Minister, Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Department, to His Honour, The Lieutenant Governor in Council." Allan Guy Records (Coll # 47, File #21) May 11, 1970.
- — —. 1970c. "Department Memo from J.S. Sinclair to Hon. C.L.B. Estey." Allan Guy Records (Coll # 47, File #21) May 12, 1970.
- — —. 1977. Department memo, from Planning and Research Executive Council to Memo to File, RE: Meeting with the Secretary of State Task Force on Migrating Native People, March 10, 1977.
- — —. 1977b. Letter of Correspondence from R.H. Neumann, Secretary. Province of Manitoba, Planning Secretariat Cabinet to Mr. K. Svenson, Director, Policy Analyst and Program Development, Executive Council, Government of Saskatchewan, "Re: Migrating Native People's Task Force" April 20, 1977.
- — —. 1977c. "Memo from Rob Milen, Co-ordinator, Treaty Indian Land Claims Department of Northern Saskatchewan, Regina, to Ken Svenson, Director, Socio-Economic Policy, Planning and Research, Executive Council, April 21, 1977, Re: Secretary of State: Task Force on Migrating Native People.
- — —. 1978. Collection R-1453, Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, File 1.54, A Policy Paper Prepared for the Special Cabinet Committee on Social Policy by the Social Planning Secretariat; 1978, document, "Saskatchewan Government Relations with Native Groups. A Policy Paper Prepared for the Special Cabinet Committee on Social Policy by the Social Planning Secretariat. December 28, 1978, Appendix A "Native and Indian Organizations in Saskatchewan""
- — —. 1978b. Collection R-1453, Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, File 1.407 document "Liaison Committee-Housing Sub-group Meeting Minutes, November 15, 1978."
- — —. 1978c. Collection R-1453, Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, File 1.407, document "Minutes of Community Liaison Committee – Housing Task Force." November 22, 1978.
- — —. 1979. collection R-1453, Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, File 1.47,

- Attacking Urban Native and Indian Poverty; Support Services Supplement II; 1979; document "Attacking Urban Native and Indian Poverty. Support Services Supplement II Prepared for the Special Cabinet Committee on Social Policy by the Social Planning Secretariat November 8, 1979 "Friendship Centre – Saskatoon Indian and Métis.""
- — —. 1979b. Collection R-1453, Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, File 3.10, Appendix – Funding History and Background; 1979, document "Appendix Funding History and Background; 1979, Funding of Provincial Programs." 1979.
- — —. 1980. Collection R-1453, Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, File 1.339; (1.339.1), General (Sask. Housing Corp.); 1976-1983; (1976 to 1983; 1976, 1978-1983), document "Letter of Correspondence from Fred Hodgkinson, Chairman, Saskatoon Housing Authority, to Fred Starr, Chairperson, SIMFC Housing Committee, RE: 33 Low Income Housing Units, January 31, 1980."
- — —. 1982. Collection R-1453, Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat, File 1.394, document "Letter of Correspondence from, Carole Camponi, Acting Chairperson, Community Liaison Committee to, Minister of Urban Affairs, RE: Native Employment, April 27, 1982."
- The Saskatchewan Indian. 1972. "Mayor Sears Opens New Friendship Centre," *The Saskatchewan Indian*. February 1972, 3.
- — —. 1976. Saskatoon Centre Board is Dominated by Métis Members." *The Saskatchewan Indian*. July 1976, 7.
- — —. 1977. "Saskatoon Aldermen Asked to 'Cool It.'" *The Saskatchewan Indian* 7, no.2 (February 1977), 17.
- Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre. 2005. *SIMFC PAST AND PRESENT: Board of Directors*. 2005, received from SIMFC, July 2006.
- — —. N.d. "Saskatoon Indian and Métis Friendship Centre." RE: Mission Statement and Program Services.
- Star-Phoenix. 1966. "Friendship Centre offers Indians chance in Society." *Star-Phoenix*. Page 15, November 14, 1966.
- — —. 1967. "Indian and Metis Centre Proposed." *Star Phoenix*. May 10, 1967, 3.
- — —. 1969. "Govt. provision likely for Friendship Centre, grant." *Saskatoon Star Phoenix*. February 6, 1969, 7.
- — —. 1979. "Friendship Centre Opens." *Star Phoenix*. September 28, 1979, D1.
- Svenson, Ken. 1978. "The Explosive Years: Indian and Métis Issues in Saskatchewan to 2001." Canada: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.
- Thomas, Violet. 1978. "Saskatoon Friendship Centre Commences New Program." *The Saskatchewan Indian*, 8, no. 1 (January 1978), pages 43-45.
- Trotchie, C.J. President, Local #11. 1972. "Letter to the Editor." *New Breed*. February 1972, Page 2.
- Wilson, Rusty-Jack ed. 1988. *The Friendship Centre Movement: 30th Anniversary*. 1988. Received from SIMFC.

Secondary Sources

- Absolon, Kathy and Cam Willett. 2005. "Putting Ourselves Forward: Location in Aboriginal Research." In *Research as Resistance: critical, indigenous, & anti-oppressive approaches*, edited by Leslie Brown and Susan Strega. Toronto:

- Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Alfred, Taiaiake. 1999. *Peace, Power and Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, David L. 1984. "Government Policies and Programs Relating to People of Indian Ancestry in Saskatchewan." In *The Dynamics of Government Programs for Urban Indians in the Prairie Provinces*, edited by Raymond Breton and Gail Grant. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Barron, F. L. 1988. "The Indian pass system in the Canadian West, 1882-1935." *Prairie Forum* 21: 25-42.
- Bostrom, Harvey. 1984. "Government Policies and Program Relating to People of Indian Ancestry in Saskatchewan." In *The Dynamics of Government Programs for Urban Indians in the Prairie Provinces*, edited by Raymond Breton and Gail Grant. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- — —. 1984. "Recent Evolution of Canada's Indian Policy." In *The Dynamics of Government Programs for Urban Indians in the Prairie Provinces*, edited by Raymond Breton and Gail Grant. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Boyatzis, Richard E. 1998. *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*. Sage Publishers.
- Brayboy, Bryan McKinley and Donna Deyhle. 2000. "Insider-Outsider: Researchers in American Indian Communities." *Theory into Practice* 39 (3): 163-169.
- Brealey, Ken. 1995. "Mapping Them 'Out': Euro-Canadian Cartography and the Appropriation of the Nuxalk and Ts'ihlqot' in First Nations' Territories, 1793-1916." *Canadian Geographer* 39 (2): 140-156.
- Brudney, Jefferey and Robert England. 1983. "Toward a Definition of the Coproduction Concept." *Public Administration Review* 43 (1): 59-65.
- Bryman, Alan. 2001. *Social Research Methods*. 2nd edition. Oxford University Press.
- Cairns, Alan. 2000. "Citizens Plus: Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian State." Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Cassidy, Frank. 1991. "Aboriginal self-determination: Proceedings of a conference held September 30- October 3, 1990." Lantzville, B.C.: Oolichan Books.
- Champagne, Duane. 1998. "American Indian Studies is for Everyone." In *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing about American Indians*, edited by Devon A. Mihesuah, 181-189. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2004. "Grounded Theory." In *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice*, edited by Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Leavy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clatworthy, Stewart, Jeremy Hull and Neil Loughren. 1994. "Urban Aboriginal Organizations in Winnipeg, Toronto and Edmonton." In *Aboriginal Self-Government in Urban Areas: Proceedings of a Workshop May 25 and 26, 1994*, edited by Evelyn J. Peters. Kingston, Ontario: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queens University.
- Coffey Amanda and Paul Atkinson. 1996. *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*. Sage Publications.

- Cooper, Terry and Pradeep Kathi. 2005. "Neighborhood Councils and City Agencies: A Model of Collaborative Coproduction." *National Civic Review* 94 (1): 43-53.
- Cresswell, T. 1996. *In Place/ Out of Place: Geography, Ideology and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Daziger, Edmund J. 1991. *Survival and Regeneration: Detroit's American Indian Community*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Davis, Lynne. 2004. "Risky Stories: Speaking and Writing in Colonial Spaces." *Native Studies Review* 15 (1): 1-20.
- Dey, Ian. 2004. "Grounded Theory." In *Qualitative Research Practice*, edited by Clive Seale, Giampietro Gobo, Jaber F. Gubrium and David Silverman, 80-93. London: Sage Publications.
- Dosman, Edgar J. 1972. *Indians: The Urban Dilemma*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Falconer, P. 1985. "Urban Indians Needs: Federal Policy Responsibility and Options in the Context of the Talks of Aboriginal Self-Government." Unpublished discussion paper, Winnipeg.
- Fiske, Shirley J. 1979. "Urban Indian Institutions: A Reappraisal from Los Angeles." In *Urban Anthropology* 8 (2): 149-171.
- Frideres, James S. and Rene R. Gadacz. 2001. *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: Contemporary Conflicts*. 6th Ed. Toronto: Prentice Hall.
- Gibbs, Meredith. 2001. "Towards a Strategy for Undertaking Cross-Cultural Collaborative Research." *Society and Natural Resources* 14:673-687.
- Glaser, B and Stauss A. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glaser, B. 1992. *Emergence v. Forcing: Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Graham, K.A.H. and E.J. Peters. 2002. "Aboriginal Communities and Urban Sustainability." In *The Federal Role in Canada's Cities: Four Policy Perspectives* edited by F. L. Seidle, 1-34. Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc.
- Hammersley, M., and P. Atkinson. 1996. *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. New York: Tavistock.
- Hanselmann, Calvin. 2001. "Urban Aboriginal People in Western Canada: Realities and Policies." Calgary: Canada West Foundation.
- Harris, C. 2002. *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Hunter, Anna. 2006. "The Politics of Aboriginal Self-Government." In *Canadian Politics: Democracy and Dissent*, edited by J. Grace and B. Sheldrick. Toronto: Prentice Hall.
- Jackson, Deborah Davis. 2001. "A Place Where I Can Let My Hair Down: from social club to cultural center in an urban Indian community." In *City and Society* XIII (1): 31-55.
- . 2002. *Our Elders Lived It: American Indian Identity in the City*. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Kalbach, W.E. 1987. "Growth and distribution of Canada's ethnic populations, 1871-1981." In *Ethnic Canada: Identities and Inequalities*, edited by L. Dreidger, 82-

102. Toronto: Cop Clark Pitman.
- Krotz, Larry. 1980. *Urban Indians: The Strangers in Canada's Cities*. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, Inc.
- LaGrand, James B. 2002. *Indian Metropolis: Native Americans in Chicago 1945-75*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Liebow, Edward D. 1991. "Urban Indian Institutions in Phoenix: Transformation for Headquarters City to Community." In *Journal of Ethnic Studies* 18 (4): 1-27.
- Maaka, Roger and Augie Fleras. 2005. *The Politics of Indigeneity: Challenging the State in Canada and Aoteroa New Zealand*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Marker, Michael. 2000. "Economics and local self-determination: Describing the clash zone in First Nations Education." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 24 (1): 30-44.
- Marschall, Melissa. 2004. "Citizen Participation and the Neighborhood Context: A New Look at the Coproduction of Local Public Goods." *Political Research Quarterly* 57 (2): 231-244.
- Mucha, Janusz. 1983. "From Prairie to the City: Transformation of Chicago's American Indian Community." In *Urban Anthropology* 12 (3-4): 337-371.
- Newhouse, David and Evelyn Peters, eds. 2003. *Not Strangers in These Parts: Aboriginal People in Urban Areas*. Ottawa: Privy Council Office.
- Newhouse, David. 2003. "The Invisible Infrastructure: Urban Aboriginal Institutions and Organizations." In *Not Strangers in These Parts: Aboriginal People in Urban Areas*, edited by David Newhouse and Evelyn Peters. Ottawa: Privy Council Office.
- Norris, Mary Jane, and Stewart Clatworthy. 2003. "Aboriginal Mobility and Migration Within Urban Canada: Outcomes, Factors and Implications." In *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*, edited by David Newhouse and Evelyn Peters. 51-78. Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.
- Peters, Evelyn. 1995. "Preface." In *Aboriginal Self-Government in Urban Areas. Proceedings of a Workshop, May 25-26, 1994*, edited by Evelyn Peters, vii-viii. Kingston, Ontario: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's.
- — —. 1996. "'Urban' and 'Aboriginal': an impossible contradiction?" in *City Lives & City Forms: Critical Research & Canadian Urbanism*, edited by J. Caulfield and L. Peake, 47-62. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- — —. 2000. "Aboriginal People and Canadian geography: a review of the recent literature." *The Canadian Geographer* 44 (2): 44-55.
- — —. 2002. "'Our City Indians': Negotiating the Meaning of First Nations Urbanization in Canada, 1945-1975." *Historical Geography* 30: 75-92.
- — —. 2005. Atlas of Urban Aboriginal Peoples. (web atlas)
http://gismap.usask.ca/website/web_atlas/AOUAP/ Accessed June 15, 2008.; original sources: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) *Customized Data, 1981 Census* (Ottawa: Indian Affairs Branch 1985). Statistics Canada, *Perspective Canada* (Ottawa: Information Canada 1974) 244.
<http://www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo43b.htm> Accessed January 2003.
- Price, John A. 1975. "U.S. and Canadian Indian Urban Ethnic Institutions." In *Urban Anthropology* 4 (1): 35-52.

- Reeves, W. and J. Frideres. 1981. "Government Policy and Indian Urbanization: The Alberta Case." *Canadian Public Policy* 7 (4): 584-595.
- Rosenberg, M. Michael and Jack Jedwab. 1992. "Institutional completeness, ethnic organizational type and the role of the state: the Jewish, Italian and Greek communities of Montreal." In *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 29 (3): 266-287.
- Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Canada. 1996. *Perspectives and Realities*, vol. 4. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- — —. 1996. *Restructuring the Relationship*, vol. 2. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Schiellerup, Pernille. 2008. "Stop making sense: the trails and tribulations of qualitative data analysis." *Area* 40 (2): 163-171.
- Schilling, Rita. 1983. "Gabriel's Children." Saskatoon: Saskatoon Métis Society, Local 11.
- Sibley, D. 1988. "Survey 13: purification of space." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 6: 409-421.
- Silver, Jim. 2006. "In Their Own Voices: Building Urban Aboriginal Communities." Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Statistics Canada. 2006. "Aboriginal People in Canada in 2006: Inuit, Métis and First Nations, 2006 Census." Catalogue No. 97-558-XIE. Ottawa: Minister of Industry, 2008. Accessed on January 22, 2009 from <http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/analysis/aboriginal/index.cfm>.
- Statistics Canada. 2008. *Aboriginal peoples in Canada in 2006: Inuit, Métis and First Nations, 2006 Census*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Swisher, K. 1998. "Why Indian people should be the ones to write about Indian education." In *Natives and Academics: Researching and Writing About American Indians*, edited by D.A. Mihesuah, 90-99. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Tobais, J. L. "Canada's subjugation of the Plains Cree, 1879-1885." *Canadian Historical Review* 64: 519-549.
- Trush, Coll-Peter. 2002. "The Crossing-Over Place: Urban and Indian Histories in Seattle." Ph.D. Diss., University of Washington.
- Walker, Ryan. 2008. "Improving the Interface between Urban Municipalities and Aboriginal Communities." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 17 (1): 20-36.
- Walker, Ryan, James Moore and Maeengan Linklater. 2009. "More than Stakeholders, Voices & Tables: Creating Good Urban Aboriginal Affairs Policy in Manitoba." Presented at Aboriginal Policy Research Conference, Ottawa, ON. March 9-12.
- Weibel-Orlando, Joan. 1999. *Indian Country, L.A.: Maintaining Ethnic Community in Complex Society*. Revised Edition. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Wherrett, Jim and Douglas Brown. 1995. "Models for Aboriginal Government in Urban Areas." In *Aboriginal Self-Government in Urban Areas. Proceedings of a Workshop, May 25-26, 1994*, edited by Evelyn Peters, 83-110. Kingston, Ontario: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's.
- Whitaker, Gordon. 1980. "Coproduction: Citizen Participation in Service Delivery." *Public Administration Review* 40 (3): 240-246.
- Wilson, K. and Evelyn J. Peters. "“You can make a place for it”: remapping urban First Nations spaces of identity." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23:

395-413.