HIST 3580
Course Director:

Second Term Assignment: Research Paper (20%)
Due Date: March 23, 2021
Length: 12-15 pages

Outline: Pass/fail
The essay will not be graded unless an outline is submitted for approval. Outlines may be submitted at any time before the final paper is due.

Drawing on Doug Owram's *Born at the Right Time*, you should discuss some aspect of life in Post-War Canada.

You may draw on any of the key themes discussed in lectures.

The following are provided as suggested topics:

- the changing nature of childhood and the emergence of 'adolescence'
- postwar affluence and the rise of the nuclear family
- influence of Cold War on home, family and security
- Cold War politics and the policing of 'normal' citizens
- Domesticity and gender relations
- 'Displaced Persons' and post-war citizenship
- Canadian culture and identity vis-à-vis US model of consumerism

You may select a primary source (government reports, newspapers, magazines, club records) as the major focus of your research essay. Select an appropriate group of secondary sources (minimum of 5 books in addition to Owram's book) that deal directly with your theme. Note that 3 journal articles equal 1 book. Use the secondary sources to set the interpretive context for your discussion.

Be sure to summarize the period, based on your reading of the course materials. The essay may be a careful analysis of your primary document, drawing on the relevant scholarship (secondary sources) as an interpretive guide. In the alternative, you may produce a research paper that summarizes the central arguments and thesis discussed in each of your secondary sources. Set out the central research questions addressed in the secondary sources.

The essay should be 12-15 pages, double-spaced, 12-point font. Please follow the Chicago Manual of Style.

As with the first-term assignment, once you have begun to understand the scholarly arguments developed in your secondary sources, you will have to begin to develop your own. Try not to slip

into the present. We are interested in historical evidence from the past. You will use your primary source to provide such concrete evidence, based on how you interpret the source.

Your paper will be marked for grammar, style and the persuasiveness of your argument. Your essay should be divided into proper paragraphs which follow a logical sequence. Sentences should be complete and in logical order. There should be no spelling or grammatical errors. Quotations should be transcribed exactly. Use of other's ideas and work must be properly referenced with either a footnote or endnote, following the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

Your essay should have a title page (unnumbered). All pages should be numbered. Include a complete bibliography. Encyclopaedia and Internet-based general reference material does not count as a legitimate secondary source. Proofread and revise your work carefully. Use proper methods of citation.

A Guide for Writing Papers

Please adopt the following rules in writing your essays.

1) Your essays should be typed. All essays should be double-spaced. Please use 12 point font. Times Roman is preferred though not mandatory.

2) Your essay should have a title page. On the title, the following information should appear:

Your name
Your student number
Name of course and course number
Tutorial instructor
Title of Essay
Date of Submission

3) Number your pages.

4) Please attach your pages together with a staple. Do not use a paper clip. **Do not use a binder or cover.**

5) Your essay should have an introduction and conclusion. Your thesis statement should be in the introduction.

6) Use footnotes, not endnotes. Both MS Word and Word Perfect contain internal programmes that allow you to use footnotes. Use them.

7) Please footnote all information or ideas that are not your own. General information need not be footnoted. For instance, you need not footnote the dates of the Nuremberg War Trials or

the dates for the Second World War. Nor would it be necessary to footnote the fact that between 10 and 13 million Africans were forcibly brought to the Americas before 1808. However, if you were to discuss various historians' interpretation of that data, then you would need to cite their articles or books. **Do not cite lectures as a source of information!!!**

8) **You are not allowed to e-mail your paper**. You must hand in a hard copy of your essay on the due date.

9) Plagiarism is taking the ideas or words of another person and making them seem to be your own. All ideas or phrases taken from a book or article must be properly footnoted. When you use the words of a published author verbatim, you must put their words in quotation marks.

10) Do not take material from the Internet and integrate it into your essay. Use your own words and your own ideas. Those who violate these instructions will be rewarded with a zero on their assignment. It is very easy to check whether or not you have used the internet to write your essay.

11) Use the following formats in your footnotes. You will be penalized for not using the citation style used below.

a) Books:

Desmond Morton, *Fight or Pay: Soldiers' Families in the Great War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004), 51.

In this case, 51 refers to the page number where you got the information for your essay.

b) Articles in Scholarly Journals:

Mary Louise Roberts, `Samson and Delilah Revisited: The Politics of Women's Fashion in 1920s France,' *American Historical Review* 98 (1993), 657.

In this case, 98 refers to the volume number of the journal (American Historical Review) and 657 refers to the page number where you got the information for your essay.

c) Articles in Books:

Lieutenant Calley: His Own Story,' in Jay W. Baird, ed. *From Nuremberg to My Lai* (Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath Company 1972), 213.

In this case, *From Nuremberg to My Lai* refers to the book and 213 refers to the page number.

d) After you have cited a book the first time, you may abbreviate the citation the second time. For instance, the first citation for the book would look like this:

Desmond Morton, *Fight or Pay: Soldiers' Families in the Great War* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004), 51.

The second time you cite a book, in this example Morton's, you may use the following abbreviated form:

Morton, *Fight or Pay*, 51.

In this case, I have shortened the title and not included any publication information. In shortening a book's title, use your own judgment.

The Sixties Scoop Era:
Apprehension, Adoption and Assimilation

Sarah Zimbalatti

HIST 3580

Professor

April 11, 2021

According to Indigenous cultures, children are regarded with high-esteem as they are understood to be special "gifts from the spirit world."[1] Indigenous children play a significant role within their families and communities and therefore, they must be treated well and safeguarded.[2] In fact, the responsibilities of caring for and protecting Indigenous children are so significant to Indigenous cultures that the failure to do so is considered "perhaps the greatest shame" that could occur.[3] Unfortunately, this is a shame that Indigenous families have encountered over many generations and continue to do so as a result of settler colonialism and its legacies.[4] Certainly, the root of this shame can be traced back to several policies and practices implemented by the governments of Canada, such as the *Indian Act* (1876), the residential school system (1876-1996) and the apprehension of Indigenous children during the Sixties Scoop era (c.1950s-1980s).

In defending what was later termed the "Sixties Scoop," former director of social services, D.J. Cameron, stated that in his opinion "...it makes little difference to a child what culture he is brought up in."[5] Cameron's opinion was upheld by many others including Herman Rolfes, Saskatchewan's former Minister of Social Services from 1975 to 1979.[6] Therefore, when the department encountered opposition and was accused of implementing racial and cultural genocide, as Indigenous children were removed from their homes and communities and placed for adoption in white homes, this accusation was rebuffed as the department did "...not believe that a child who is placed in a home which is racially different cannot grow up with a healthy and positive identification with his racial and cultural beginnings." [7] However, these accusations

---

[1] Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples: Volume 3 - Gathering Strength. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, (1996), 29.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., 30.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Jennifer Fowler, "Creator of Indigenous Adoption Program Says It Wasn't Meant to Place Kids with White Families | CBC News," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada, October 21, 2018).
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.

are quite accurate, especially with hindsight and taking into consideration the insight of Richard Wagamese who acknowledges that during that time in history, the adoption of Indigenous children was synonymous with the severance of their Indigenous identity.[8] As it had historically, assimilation, systemic discrimination and cultural genocide shaped Canada's relations with its Indigenous Peoples during the Sixties Scoop era.[9] This paper will analyze the Sixties Scoop and how it was successive to the residential school system. The paper will then narrow its focus on the Adopt Indian-Métis Program (A.I.M.), a transracial adoption program in Saskatchewan which developed an advertisement campaign to foster the adoption of Indigenous children into the homes of "normal" Canadian citizens. In doing so, this paper will analyze the post-World War II period and its relation to the integration of Indigenous Peoples, as well as the intentions behind the apprehension and adoption of Indigenous Peoples through the perspectives of former government officials, social workers and members of the Indigenous community. This paper will intermittently step away from historical perspective to argue that while there may have been *good* intentions, the realities of these adoptions were harmful and damaging to Indigenous identities and communities. To garner the ideologies of the past, this paper will refer to news reports, newspaper advertisements, television broadcasts and written reports from the Sixties Scoop era.

Prior to delving into the focus of this paper, it is essential to emphasize the responsibility and more importantly the *actions* that Canada's governments and citizens must take in the move towards reconciliation. In regards to child welfare, as observed in *Canada's Residential Schools: The Legacy: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, "reform

[8] Petra Fachinger, "Colonial Violence in Sixties Scoop Narratives: From in Search of April Raintree to a Matter of Conscience," *Studies in American Indian Literatures,* 31, no. 1-2, (2019), 115.
[9] Jacqueline Marie Maurice, "De-Spiriting Aboriginal Children: Aboriginal Children during the 1960s and 1970s Child Welfare Era," (Thesis, National Library of Canada, 2003), 138.

is essential, and the crisis of Aboriginal overrepresentation in child welfare cannot be addressed without interventions that also target its contributing causes" which have been ingrained from colonial history.[10] For more than half a century, Indigenous children in Canada have been disproportionately represented within the child welfare system.[11] Therefore, the nation can no longer stand by and plead ignorance. Action needs to be taken in order to reconcile relations and the living conditions of First Nations, Inuit and Métis. Just recently, in 2015, the *TRC* released its final report which focused on the Canadian residential school system. Included within the report were 94 Calls to Action which work to "redress the legacy of residential schools and advance the process of Canadian reconciliation."[12] The *first* five calls to action listed in the report are devoted to child welfare, highlighting the significant toll that the residential school system and its legacies continue to have on Indigenous families.[13] Essentially, these five petitions call upon Canada's three branches of government to: (1) take on various strategies and methods to decrease the amount of Indigenous children who are wards of the state.[14] (2) Gather data, and publish yearly reports that examine; the quantity of Indigenous children in care and how that measure differs from non-Indigenous children in care, reasons why Indigenous children have been apprehended, expenditures used towards preventative and care services, and evaluations on the success of government involvement.[15] (3) Enforce Jordan's Principle.[16] (4) Sanction

[10] "Child Welfare: A System in Crisis," in *Canada's Residential Schools: The Legacy: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, vol. 5 (Montreal: Published for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada by McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015), 54.
[11] Trisha Fox, "An Exploration of the Lived Experiences of Non-Aboriginal Foster Parents in Providing Care for Children from Remote First Nations Communities," (Thesis, 2014), 1.
[12] "Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015), 1 & Allyson Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada." *Revista Direito e Práxis* 10, no. 2 (2019), 1,244.
[13] "Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action," (2015), 1.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.

Indigenous child-welfare legislation which constructs "national standards of Aboriginal child apprehension and custody cases" while following culturally significant principles.[17] (5) To establish parenting programs that are culturally relevant and suitable for Indigenous families.[18] Reports such as the TRC as well as Blackstock's "Reconciliation in Child Welfare: Touches of Hope for Indigenous Children, Youth, and Families," are vital towards gaining insight and the required strategies needed to strive towards reconciliation and the reformation of child welfare.

As the Canadian government diminished the role and prevalence of residential schools during the 1950s, the child welfare system emerged as the successive approach towards the assimilation and colonization of Indigenous Peoples.[19] Simply put, "residential schools were an early manifestation of a child welfare policy of child removal...[and] child welfare services carried on where the residential schools left off."[20] The residential school system essentially paved the way for the over-representation of Indigenous children within Canada's child welfare system.[21] Similar to the how colonization and assimilation were rationalized through the discourse of racial and religious superiority, European child-rearing practices were deemed superior to Indigenous parenting.[22] This is evident during the formation of the residential school system as Indigenous parents were declared "unfit."[23] While this assumption is undoubtedly prejudiced and not an accurate reflection of Indigenous parenting prior to the residential school system, it eventually became a reality as the system led to a detrimental breakdown in the

---

[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Sarah Wright Cardinal, "Beyond the Sixties Scoop: Reclaiming Indigenous Identity, Reconnection to Place, and Reframing Understandings of Being Indigenous" (Dissertation, 2017), 19.
[20] "Child Welfare: A System in Crisis," in *Canada's Residential Schools. The Legacy: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*, 11.
[21] Ibid., 31.
[22] Ibid., 12.
[23] Phil Fontaine and Aimée Craft, *A Knock on the Door: The Essential History of Residential Schools From the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, Edited and Abridged* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2015), 6.

structure of the Indigenous family.[24] Once residential school survivors grew up and became parents, they themselves became unfit parents as a result of the trauma and abuse they suffered from the schools.[25] Thus, these schools marked the "beginning of an intergenerational cycle of neglect and abuse," which is regarded as "one very important contributor" to the disproportionate rates of Indigenous children in the welfare system.[26] Consequently, as articulated in *A Knock on the Door: The Essential History of Residential Schools from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada,* by Phil Fontaine and Aimee Craft:

> what has come to be referred to as the "Sixties Scoop" – the dramatic increase in the apprehension of Aboriginal children from the 1960s onwards – was in some measure simply a transferring of children from one form of institution, the residential school, to another, the child-welfare agency.[27]

Overall, the study of the Sixties Scoop cannot be conducted without analyzing the role and legacies of the residential school system as they are not only successive to each other, but because the outcomes from both institutions are equivalent factors contributing to and perpetuating intergenerational trauma.

The association between the residential school system and the Sixties Scoop, through the work of the child-welfare agency, is quite striking. This is apparent from factors such as their ramifications. *Both* institutions disrupted Indigenous identity through the loss of culture and language, separated children from their family and communities, and caused self-esteem to dwindle as racism and stereotypes became internalized by vulnerable members of the community.[28] Effects of both these institutions moreover included unemployment, addiction,

---

[24] Mona Gleason, "Psychology and the Construction of the 'Normal' Family in Postwar Canada, 1945–60." *The Canadian Historical Review* 78, no. 3 (1997), 14-15.
[25] Ibid.
[26] "Child Welfare: A System in Crisis," 31.
[27] Fontaine and Craft, *A Knock on the Door,* 43.
[28] Cardinal, "Beyond the Sixties Scoop: Reclaiming Indigenous Identity, Reconnection to Place, and Reframing Understandings of Being Indigenous," 14.

poor academic success, poverty and sexual and domestic violence.[29] The list of ramifications did not end there however, as the Indigenous community also became susceptible to mental illnesses and high rates of suicide.[30] Although the similarities between these two institutions are quite prominent, there is a notable difference. Even though the residential school system tried to assimilate Indigenous identity, the children *knew* of their Indigenous identity and *eventually* returned to their families and communities.[31] This could not be said of those apprehended and put into the care of foster or adoption homes, where their Indigenous identities, often including their status and birth names "were erased, often forever."[32]

The term "Sixties Scoop" was not coined until decades later, in 1983, by Patrick Johnson.[33] The term was derived from the comments of a "longtime employee of the Minister of Human Resources in B.C. [who] referred to this process as the "Sixties Scoop." She admitted that provincial social workers would, quite literally, *scoop* children from reserves on the slightest pretext" [emphasis added].[34] While the name may be misleading, the Sixties Scoop was commenced *prior* to the 1960s and continued *beyond* the decade.[35] This practice of apprehending Indigenous children and placing them in the homes of non-Indigenous families actually started towards the end of the 1950s, flourished during the mid-1960s, and persisted into the 1980s.[36] In the post-World War II era, successive governments at all levels became engaged in various

[29] "Child Welfare: A System in Crisis," 11 & 15.
[30] Rachel Shabalin, "The 'Sixties Scoop': A Dark Chapter in Canadian History." *Law now* 41.4 (2017), 18.
[31] Suzanne Fournier and Ernie Crey, *Stolen from Our Embrace: The Abduction of First Nations Children and the Restoration of Aboriginal Communities* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1997), 81.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Christopher Dart, "The Sixties Scoop Explained," (CBC News (CBC/Radio Canada), accessed March 15, 2021.
[34] Patrick Johnston, *Native Children and the Child Welfare System* (Toronto: Canadian Council on Social Development in association with James Lorimer * Co., 1983), 23.
[35] Mira Lewis, "Struggle Persistence Survival: Sixties Scoop Survivors Share Their Stories," *Our Times* (2018), 30.
[36] Ibid & Dart, "The Sixties Scoop Explained," (CBC News (CBC/Radio Canada).

social service endeavors.[37] Consequently, in 1951, "the federal government amended s.88 of the *Indian Act* to allow "all laws of general application... [such as child welfare services] in force in any province,"" thereby extending the scope of such laws to Indigenous Peoples everywhere, whether or not they lived on-reserve .[38] In doing so, however, the federal government did not provide any supplementary financial assistance to support the provinces in these newly established obligations.[39] Furthermore, both the federal and provincial governments were reluctant to finance services, such as therapy and preventative services, which would have helped ameliorate Indigenous families and communities that were suffering from ongoing injustices.[40] The solution then, was to continue the nations' legacy of removing Indigenous children from their families and communities rather than using the affluence that the nation gained from the war to provide necessities and social programs that "were urgently required."[41] As a result, Indigenous children were adopted and placed in homes scattered throughout the country, in America and even outside the continent.[42] In doing so, as Raven Sinclair emphasizes, permission from parents and bands was *not* needed and so they were often deprived of the knowledge about the apprehensions.[43]

Before the federal governments' intentions behind the Sixties Scoop can be thoroughly analyzed, the perceptions formulated during this time period must be explored first. For starters, as acknowledged by Brian Wharf in his work, *Rethinking Child Welfare in Canada*, the theories

[37] "Child Welfare," The Justice System and Aboriginal People: The Aboriginal Justice Implementation Commission, accessed March 1, 2021.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples: Volume 3 - Gathering Strength, 24.
[41] Fournier & Crey, *Stolen from Our Embrace*, 84.
[42] "Child Welfare: A System in Crisis,"15.
[43] Raven Sinclair. "Identity Lost and Found: Lessons from the Sixties Scoop." *First Peoples Child & Family Review 3*, no. 1 (2007), 66

behind childhood *drastically* changed at the end of the nineteenth century.[44] Prior to this transformation, industrialization sent children to work in factories.[45] Seven year-old children were regarded as responsible adults, raised with physical discipline and without emotional and physical connection to their parents.[46] To say the least, childhood was not recognized as a stage separate from adulthood.[47] Through the transformation, however, childhood became acknowledged as a distinct "stage of life in which greater protection, sheltering, training, and education were necessary."[48] This eventually led to the prominence of psychologists, the emergence of psychological discourse which established the distinctions between "normal" and "deviant" relationships, and the significance of mental health.[49] In his book, *Born At The Right Time: A History of the Baby Boom Generation,* Doug Owram recognizes that as early as the 1920s, Canada "had already seen the intrusion of 'experts' on child care, telling prospective parents how to raise their children."[50]

Initially, psychologists worked with soldiers, however their popularity grew as their knowledge became integrated into the everyday lives of Canadian citizens.[51] As psychological discourses and principles gained greater prominence, families would be judged for their ability or failure to reach these standards, leading the way for experts, such as social workers, to involve themselves within the lives of families.[52] Those who did not meet the standards of the "idealized" family, such as non-nuclear, immigrant, racialized, working-class and women-led

[44] Brian Wharf, Rethinking Child Welfare in Canada, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1993), 15.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid., 16.
[49] Gleason, "Psychology and the Construction of the 'Normal' Family in Postwar Canada, 1945–60." 3 & 5.
[50] Doug Owram, *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 20
[51] Gleason, 3.
[52] Ibid., 9.

families, were criticized.[53] Overall, this was a period in history "when psychologists increasingly recognized the emotional vulnerability of children. The crux of the matter was clear and was passed on to parents: children needed stable, affectionate homes in order to develop normally."[54] While these principles of childhood were known and understood, as well as the consequences of separating children from their biological families, Canadian governments *still* decided that it was best to remove Indigenous children from their family and try to integrate them into the dominant society.[55]

In Allyson Stevenson's dissertation "Intimate Integration: A Study of Aboriginal Transracial Adoption in Saskatchewan, 1944-1984," she refers to various scholars to assemble an accurate representation of the time period. The integration and citizenship of Indigenous Peoples into Canadian society, as discussed by Hugh Shewell, was a major focus in the period following World War II.[56] "The discursive term *integration"* then, as Stevenson describes, was deliberately implemented by the Indian Affairs Branch to indicate a change from preceding approaches to assimilation.[57] Shewell and Bryon Plant have both acknowledged that integration, especially into provincial institutions, became the new method of assimilation.[58] "New" should not be taken too literally however, as this notion of integration was reflected in the 1920 goals and policies as described by the Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs Duncan Campbell Scott who stated that "our object is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic."[59] Fast-forward a few decades and federal and provincial

[53] Ibid., 2.
[54] Ibid., 9.
[55] Ibid & Jessa Chupik-Hall, "'Good Families Do Not Just Happen:" Indigenous People and Child Welfare Services in Canada, 1950 - 1965." (Thesis, National Library of Canada, 2001), 101.
[56] Allyson Stevenson, "Intimate Integration: A Study of Aboriginal Transracial Adoption in Saskatchewan, 1944-1984," (Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 2015), 29
[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid., 29 & 30
[59] Fontaine & Craft, 5.

governments approached the "Indian problem" through this solution of integration, which was significantly centered around the integration of Indigenous children, as evident from the transracial adoptions.[60] During this time, integration was also apparent from the 1969 White Paper which attempted to terminate "Indian" status as well as the Treaties which had been negotiated between the federal government and First Nations, Inuit and Métis.[61] Accompanying the policy of integration was the language of equality, which had been virtuously expressed through the discourse of child welfare services.[62] In reality however, as Stevenson argues, "the application of equality rhetoric, embodied in "They are not Indians, they are just people," served to justify the extension of provincial services, while further accomplishing the goal of integration."[63] Despite this rhetoric of *equality*, Indigenous families were not given *equal* amenities that were customary to other families in Canadian society.[64] These perceptions and discourses from the post-World War II are therefore reflected in the governmental intentions behind what became known as the "Sixties Scoop."

As already mentioned, the intentions of the Canadian government, through the apprehension and transracial adoption of Indigenous children, was the citizenship and integration of Indigenous Peoples. According to Stevenson, social workers shared these intentions, as they worked alongside Indian Affairs and supported the objective of assimilating the Indigenous community into the dominant society.[65] It should be noted that during the Sixties Scoop era, *none* of the social workers were Indigenous, which certainly played a role in the formation of their objectives and perspectives.[66] Speaking impartially and through historical perspectives of

---

[60] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 31.
[61] Fontaine & Craft, 5.
[62] Chupik-Hall, "'Good Families Do Not Just Happen," 1.
[63] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 29.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid., 295.
[66] Fournier & Crey, 85.

the social workers at the time, they believed that the removal of Indigenous children from their families and their adoption into the homes of non-Indigenous families were for the child's *benefit*.[67] A former B.C. social worker testified the intentions of her and

> her colleagues [who] sincerely believed that what they were doing was in the best interests of the child. They felt that the apprehension of Indian children from reserves would save them from the effects of crushing poverty, unsanitary health conditions, poor housing and malnutrition, which were facts of life on many reserves.[68]

Stevenson analyzed this quote, acknowledging that the social workers really *did* have good intentions as they wanted to protect and save the children from the "material conditions" they lived in.[69] Yet, Stevenson offers an important critique, noting that through this rationale, the causes of these conditions were entirely overlooked, appointing no liability on the Canadian government and the effects of colonization.[70] In the mission to rescue and protect Indigenous children, social services agencies did not spend a suitable amount of time screening homes in order to gain an appropriate understanding of potential foster or adoptive homes, as they could not do so because of the countless of cases they handled.[71] Regardless, they were confident that the children would not end up in a bad environment, as they were being placed for adoption in the homes of the 'ideal' family, middle-class and white, and so no harm was intended or anticipated.[72] In regards to the intentions of the Canadian citizens who received the children, Betty Ann, a Sixties Scoop survivor, shared her thoughts on what she believed to be their intentions during an interview:

> Foster parents in those days, I really don't think people, as a general rule, had bad intentions. I think people *thought* they were helping children by helping them to fit into the white world and maybe be able to have success in life that way, because people knew

[67] Fox, "An Exploration of the Lived Experiences of Non-Aboriginal Foster Parents in Providing Care for Children from Remote First Nations Communities," 9.
[68] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 46.
[69] Ibid., 47.
[70] Ibid., 47.
[71] Fournier & Crey, 84.
[72] Ibid.

> very well that Canadian society was not kind to Indigenous People...And in those days, people *thought* they were doing good things for children by helping them to get along in the white world, not understanding that they were robbing them of their identity and leaving them to feel alone in the world, disconnected from their people.[73]

Collectively, these intentions speak to the help and well-intentioned services that everyone involved *tried* to accomplish through the apprehension and adoption of Indigenous children. These intentions are reflected in a project during the Sixties Scoop era, the Adopt Indian- Métis (A.I.M.) program, as Canadian citizens were assigned with the responsibility of *saving* the "Indian" child.

In 1967, Cyril Macdonald, the Provincial Minister of Welfare, sought to expand the adoption of Indigenous Peoples in Saskatchewan through the promotion of the Adopt Indian-Métis Program (A.I.M.), a pilot project at the time.[74] In addition to Macdonald, several other players were involved in the production of this program, including Otto Driedger, who established the program and later became Saskatchewan's Director of Child Welfare, and Frank Dornstauder, the program's director.[75] While it was a provincial initiative, it is important to note that the federal government provided the program with financial support.[76] The A.I.M. program, which was an adoption agency specifically for the provinces' "Indian" and Métis children, "organized a saturation publicity campaign with radio and T.V. advertising and most effective of all, large photographs in provincial newspapers."[77] Dr. Jacqueline Maurice, a Sixties Scoop survivor, has concluded that approximately 1,700 to 1,900 children were transferred through the

---

[73] "Birth of A Family: The Story of Betty Ann Adam," Internet Archive (Redeye Collective, January 11, 2018), https://archive.org/details/BirthOfAFamilyTheStoryOfBettyAnnAdam.
[74] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,252.
[75] "Saskatchewan's Adopt Indian Métis Program | CBC Radio," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada, March 21, 2018) & "CBC News Report by Craig Oliver about the Adopt Indian and Métis Program in 1968.," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada), accessed March 15, 2021
[76] Lewis, "Struggle Persistence Survival: Sixties Scoop Survivors Share Their Stories," 35
[77] "CBC News Report by Craig Oliver about the Adopt Indian and Métis Program in 1968.," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada), accessed March 15, 2021

program.[78] The adoption of these children was directed towards the "normal" families living in Saskatchewan who were accepted and encouraged to provide a permanent home for the Indigenous and Métis, thereby saving them from the reserves while also alleviating the strains on the foster homes.[79] The new outlook on children, as future citizens and the responsibility bestowed upon the nation to rescue them, is certainly reflected in the practices of the A.I.M. program. As Stevenson has explored:

> The Adopt Indian and Métis program brought the needs of Aboriginal children to the attention of the viewing public in Saskatchewan, erasing their ties to their Aboriginal heritage and offering the public the opportunity to imagine themselves as parents forging a new colorblind society...The Adopt Indian and Métis program shared a common language and goal with the nineteenth century child rescue movement [in Britain] ...The "child as future citizen" was the core tenet of child rescue discourse...children were transformed from private parental property to future citizens, and hence the responsibility of the nation.[80]

Overall, while complex and contradictory to the outcomes of the program, the intentions behind the A.I.M. program will now be analyzed.

In the 1967 television announcement in which Macdonald introduced the A.I.M. program, he declared it "essential."[81] According to Driedger, the sole purpose of the program was to locate permanent homes for the children.[82] The initiative of the program was therefore regarded as a significant resolution towards the over-representation of Indigenous children in government care.[83] During the broadcast, Macdonald himself asserted the importance of finding permanent homes for the Indigenous children: "while the officials of our department are most grateful for the many foster homes... it is a well-known fact that this can never take the place of

[78] Mark Melnychuk, "'They Were Treated like Animals': How a Regina Family Was Torn Apart by the Sixties Scoop," (Regina Leader Post, October 15, 2017).
[79] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 215-216.
[80] Ibid., 216-217
[81] "Cyril Macdonald Announces AIM Program," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada), accessed March 15, 2021.
[82] Fowler.
[83] Ibid.

an adoption home where the child takes the name of the parents and becomes a full member of the family."[84] In an interview, Driedger clarified that this relocation of children, specifically into the homes of *white* families, was *not* the programs' objectives nor "the basis of the child welfare programs."[85] Contrary to his statements, however, it is crucial to acknowledge that more than 90 percent of the children relocated through the program, solely during its first four years, were placed into the homes of white families.[86] In addition to this main objective, the A.I.M. program also served other purposes. While it was not a central component, according to a 1971 CBC news report by John Warren, it was hoped that as "a side effect of the program," race relations would improve.[87] Moreover, the A.I.M. program worked to reduce government finances that would have been directed towards the child, had they remained in government care.[88] With that being said, through the historical perspective of the statements made by these officials, it is certainly evident that they believed the program was well-intentioned, as it was principally used to find a suitable home and a permanent family for the children to join. Even Maurice has acknowledged that good intentions existed within the implementation of this program.[89] These sincere objects are particularly evident from Macdonald's broadcast, as he specified that the priority of the program was "looking for...the love parents have for their children, the warmth of a family, and the ability for them to give the [Indigenous] child a good home, not only as an infant, but as he [or she] grows into adulthood."[90] However, as Maurice contends, the program was ultimately a "race-based policy" which had detrimental ramifications similar to those created by the

[84] "Cyril Macdonald Announces AIM Program," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada).
[85] Fowler.
[86] Ibid.
[87] "CBC News Report from 1971 by John Warren about the Adopt Indian and Métis Program," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada), accessed March 15, 2021.
[88] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,253.
[89] Melnychuk.
[90] "Cyril Macdonald Announces AIM Program," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada).

residential school system, which this essay has already addressed.[91] Nonetheless, the program and its ads convinced the public of the positive impact they could have in the lives of the Indigenous children that they adopted.

Various forms of media were used in the advertisement campaign of the A.I.M. program, including newspaper and radio advertisements, slide shows and television commercials.[92] As Owram indicates, the television set, which was the most popular "instrument of leisure" during the 1950, maximized family time.[93] Interestingly then, while the TV increased the amount of time families spent together, the A.I.M. television commercials acted as a means in which families could be created, enlarged and broken apart. The company Struthers and Associates, was hired by the Saskatchewan provincial government to design an effective advertising campaign to spark the public's interest in the adoption of Indigenous children through the A.I.M. program.[94] The Saskatchewan Department of Welfare was content with "the ad campaign [which] was 'dignified and in good taste,'" as stated in its 1969 report.[95] Within the ads, children were portrayed as "normal" and cheerful children in good health.[96] The advertisements then, were meant to arouse public sympathy for the children.[97] This is evident from a 1972 advertisement which appeared in the *Regina Leader-Post* newspaper.[98] The ad, about a 2½ year old boy named Arthur, includes both a happy picture and an upbeat narrative of the child which describes his appearance, characteristics and interests.[99] According to this narrative, Arthur "likes being told stories, being cuddled and sung to...[and] is used to a big family and lots of

---

[91] Melnychuk.
[92] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,254.
[93] Owram, *Born at the Right Time*, 87.
[94] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,254.
[95] Fowler.
[96] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,254.
[97] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 179.
[98] Fowler.
[99] Ibid.

activities."[100] These ads, therefore, enticed public approval and appeal towards apprehending and adopting Indigenous children:

> social workers sought the support of the public through the use of both the images [as displayed in the ads] and the accompanying testimonials by imaginary adoptive parents...inviting the audience to imagine themselves as benevolently responding to a government generated need.[101]

Overall, the A.I.M. program and its campaign were regarded as a success.[102] On the contrary, the narratives about these children were selective, their families and distinct experiences were expunged.[103] Consequently, these advertisements which had been consumed by the public, diminished Indigenous parenting, enforcing the idea that Indigenous children needed to be saved from the unfortunate and dangerous conditions they faced through the solution of adoption.[104] Therefore, one must question the authenticity of these ads, especially considering that the names of the children were often different than the ones given to them in the ads, the effects the ads had on the Indigenous community, and how much information was intentionally formulated to gain the approval of the public.

As historians have studied the 1960s, consumerism has been recognized as a central aspect during this time period. This is evident in how the A.I.M. advertisements were presented in newspapers, often placed beside *product* advertisements.[105] In retrospect, these advertisements are degrading as Indigenous children were dehumanized, marketed as a commodity as if they were for sale like the other products advertised in the paper. The ads have recently received opposition from the Indigenous community as Nora Cummings, former president of the

---

[100] Ibid.
[101] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,255.
[102] Fowler.
[103] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,254 & 1255.
[104] Cardinal, 23.
[105] Melnychuk.

Saskatchewan Native Women's Association, has commented that the children were advertised as if they were a pet.[106] This notion that the children were advertised as animals is not only reflected in the dehumanizing effects of the ads as a whole, but also from a specific advertisement published by the *Regina Leader-Post* newspaper, which compared a little girl's features to that of an animal. In this ad, Lorna was described to have a "tiny pug nose."[107] Therefore, it appears that these portrayals did not present these children as *children*, which seems to have influenced the way in which those who adopted them viewed them. For example, Maurice spoke of how she thinks that "some children were farmed out so to speak," which is evident in the fact that in addition to experiencing multiple forms of abuse from their new families, many were also put to work.[108] With this being said, while the non-Indigenous community saw no harm in these advertisement campaigns nor in the A.I.M. program itself, it is evident that it impacted and troubled the Indigenous community in profound ways.

The A.I.M. program has certainly received an abundance of criticism today, as it has been called out as "racist" and as a form of "cultural genocide," however the program also received opposition while it was actually implemented, removing thousands of Indigenous children from their homes, communities and cultural identities.[109] As reported in 1971, the program encountered backlash from the leaders of the Indigenous community in Saskatchewan who were in the process of "drafting complaints about the system to present to both the federal and provincial governments."[110] Warren, the reporter, then discussed that the opposition was rooted in the suspicion that that the program was "an attempt at integration or worse."[111] Nonetheless,

---

[106] Fowler.
[107] "Saskatchewan's Adopt Indian Métis Program | CBC Radio," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada, March 21, 2018).
[108] Melnychuk.
[109] Fowler.
[110] "CBC News Report from 1971 by John Warren about the Adopt Indian and Métis Program," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada).
[111] Ibid.

despite the opposition that the Indigenous community expressed, the program continued, contributing to the severance of "another generation of Indigenous children from their families," the central consequence of the Sixties Scoop era.[112]

Utilizing hindsight to examine the practices of the Sixties Scoop and the A.I.M. program as a project *within* this era, it is blatantly obvious that while officials and social services workers expressed sincerity and had good intentions, the reality was the opposite. The Indigenous community was degraded, labelled as unfit parents and were ultimately forced into another system that tried to assimilate them. As Fontaine and Craft have discussed,

> for over a century, the central goals of Canada's Aboriginal Policy were to eliminate Aboriginal governments; ignore Aboriginal rights; terminate the Treaties; and, through a process of assimilation, cause Aboriginal peoples to cease to exist as distinct legal, social, cultural, religious and racial entities in Canada.[113]

Therefore, it is not a revelation that the federal and provincial governments decided to continue in this persistent endeavour through the apprehension and adoption of Indigenous children.

Recent works of scholarship have deconstructed the practices of the welfare system, prompting a critical examination that must be acknowledged during the Sixties Scoop. While adoption had been declared the solution to bad parenting, such as neglect, scholars have provided insight on the role that race, class, gender and the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples has had on the apprehension of Indigenous children.[114] Many publications have referred to Karen Swift, the author of *Manufacturing 'Bad Mothers': A Critical Perspective on Child Neglect,* as she offers insight into the operations of the welfare system. In her book, Swift has explored how "bad mothers" have often been fabricated through the practices of the child welfare system, as they are judged based upon factors such as poverty and race rather than on their child-rearing

[112] Melnychuk.
[113] Fontaine & Craft, 3.
[114] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 43.

practices.[115] Indigenous mothers were held to the same expectations of their white counterparts, an absurdly unreasonable standard to say the least considering that the Indigenous community was and continues to be impacted by various legacies of colonization, such as alcoholism and violence, which impede their parenting.[116] Swift has therefore acknowledged "how the legal and social category of neglect works to mask divisions of class, gender, and race," and how neglect is asserted as a parental issue "rather than as the visible appearance of underlying social relations."[117] Overall, then, while the factors which impacted Indigenous parenting were a result of the policies and practices implemented by the Canadian government, such as the residential school system, these factors were disregarded, Indigenous parents were deemed inferior, and rather than help heal the trauma, the apprehension of Indigenous children was justified.

Justice Edwin Kimelman's 1985 report "No Safe Place: Review Committee on Indian and Métis Adoptions and Placements," is an important read concerning the study of child apprehension during the Sixties Scoop. In his report, Kimelman stated that "cultural genocide" occurred "in a systemic routine manner,"[118] an allegation that is accurate according to Article II (e) of the 1948 United Nations Convention on Genocide which defines genocide as "forcibly transferring children of the group to another group," the reality of the Sixties Scoop.[119] Kimelman also expresses the complexities involved because everyone involved thought that their actions were in the best interest of the child, which makes it difficult to pinpoint where the blame should fall.[120] Nonetheless, in a noteworthy statement, Kimelman assigns blame to *everyone* involved, explaining their wrongdoings:

---

[115] Chupik-Hall, "'Good Families Do Not Just Happen," 11.
[116] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 45.
[117] Stevenson, "Intimate Integration," 45.
[118] Maurice, "De-Spiriting Aboriginal Children: Aboriginal Children during the 1960s and 1970s Child Welfare Era," 13.
[119] Sinclair. "Identity Lost and Found: Lessons from the Sixties Scoop," 67.
[120] "Child Welfare," The Justice System and Aboriginal People: The Aboriginal Justice Implementation Commission

> all parties have been at fault—federal and provincial governments who failed to resolve their jurisdictional dispute for the care of Treaty Indian children; former Directors of Child Welfare who neglected to build accountability into the system; the child care agencies, both public and private, who failed to examine the results of their policies and practices and who failed to keep accurate statistical data; the native organizations who remained too silent, too long before demanding control of their children.[121]

Thus, the significance of this report cannot be understated, not only because of its findings but also because it "would mark the end of the Sixties Scoop era."[122]

Through the experiences of the Sixties Scoop, the lives of Indigenous youth *drastically* differed from those of dominant Canadian society during this era. While Owram's book does not focus on Indigenous Peoples or any minorities for that matter, a methodology which he outlined in his preface, there is still a major takeaway that can be garnered from this book. Canada has and continues to uphold a narrative which asserts the nations multiculturalism, sweeping the presence of the country's systemic racism under the rug. Significantly, Owram deconstructs this narrative, as he acknowledges that while Canada is known for and "proud of its international reputation as a land of equality," this narrative does not coincide with the "people who live on the other side of the "colour line" in Canada."[123] Through this outlook then, one must be cautious in generalizing the 1960s, as the lived experiences between Canada's white youth versus Indigenous youth were *completely* different. Ultimately, systemic racism, specifically against the First Nations, Inuit and Métis has and continues to be a part of the "social, political and legal DNA of Canada,"[124] an issue that is indicative from the events of the Sixties Scoop and the continued overrepresentation of Indigenous children in government care *today*.

This paper has analyzed the Sixties Scoop and how it was successive to the residential

---

[121] Ibid.
[122] Dart, "The Sixties Scoop Explained," (CBC News (CBC/Radio Canada).
[123] Owram, 72.
[124] Stevenson, "Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children's Rights in Canada," 1,257.

school system. In narrowing its focus, this paper has also discussed the Adopt Indian- Métis Program (A.I.M.), a project within this overall era. As recognized within this paper, the ideologies of integration during the post-World War II period directly applied to the intentions behind the apprehension and adoption of Indigenous Peoples. While this paper has analyzed the objectives and perhaps even positive intentions of those involved in implementing the practices and policies during the Sixties Scoop era, as evident from the historical perspectives of government officials and social services workers, this paper has examined that the outcomes were rather the opposite, as Indigenous identities and communities were harmed and damaged in the process. The study of this era is quite complex to say the least, considering that there were some positive outcomes and relationships developed between the Indigenous children and their adoptive parents.[125] However, these positive results cannot outweigh the overall fact that through the consequences of their work, the white social workers continued the works of their predecessors; the missionaries, the priests and the Indian agents.[126] Therefore, the key point to take away about the child welfare system during the Sixties Scoop era, is that Indigenous children were " placed...in "triple jeopardy," removed from parents, extended family, and culture."[127]

[125] Fachinger, "Colonial Violence in Sixties Scoop Narratives: From in Search of April Raintree to a Matter of Conscience," 117.
[126] Sinclair, 67
[127] "Child Welfare: A System in Crisis," 16

Bibliography

"Birth of A Family: The Story of Betty Ann Adam." Internet Archive. Redeye Collective, January 11, 2018. https://archive.org/details/BirthOfAFamilyTheStoryOfBettyAnnAdam.

Cardinal, Sarah Wright. "Beyond the Sixties Scoop: Reclaiming Indigenous Identity, Reconnection to Place, and Reframing Understandings of Being Indigenous," Dissertation, 2017.

"CBC News Report by Craig Oliver about the Adopt Indian and Métis Program in 1968." CBCnews. CBC/Radio Canada. Accessed March 15, 2021. https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/1177224259554.

"CBC News Report from 1971 by John Warren about the Adopt Indian and Métis Program." CBCnews. CBC/Radio Canada. Accessed March 15, 2021. https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/1189618243746.

"Child Welfare: A System in Crisis," in *Canada's Residential Schools. The Legacy: The Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* 5, Vol. 5. Montreal: Published for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada by McGill-Queen's University Press, 2015: 11-60.

"Child Welfare." The Justice System and Aboriginal People: The Aboriginal Justice Implementation Commission. Accessed March 1, 2021. http://www.ajic.mb.ca/volumel/chapter14.html#6.

Chupik-Hall, Jessa. "'Good Families Do Not Just Happen:" Indigenous People and Child Welfare Services in Canada, 1950 - 1965." Thesis, National Library of Canada, 2001.

Dart, Christopher. "The Sixties Scoop Explained." CBCnews. CBC/Radio Canada. Accessed March 15, 2021. https://www.cbc.ca/cbcdocspov/features/the-sixties-scoop-explained#:~:text=The%20practice%20continued%20throughout%20the%201970s%20and%20well%20into%20the%20'80s.&text=In%201983%2C%20researcher%20Patrick%20Johnson,Canadian%20Council%20on%20Social%20Development

Fachinger, Petra. "Colonial Violence in Sixties Scoop Narratives: From in Search of April Raintree to A Matter of Conscience." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 31, no. 1-2, (2019): 115-135.

Fontaine, Phil, and Aimée Craft. *A Knock on the Door: The Essential History of Residential Schools from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, Edited and Abridged*. Winnipeg, CA: University of Manitoba Press, 2015.

Fournier, Suzanne, and Ernie Crey. *Stolen from Our Embrace: The Abduction of First Nations Children and the Restoration of Aboriginal Communities.* Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1997

Fowler, Jennifer. "Creator of Indigenous Adoption Program Says It Wasn't Meant to Place Kids with White Families | CBC News." CBCnews. CBC/Radio Canada, October 21, 2018. https://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/creator-of-sixties-scoop-adoption-program-says-it-wasn-t-meant-to-place-kids-with-white-families-1.4584342.

Fox, Trisha. "An Exploration of the Lived Experiences of Non-Aboriginal Foster Parents in Providing Care for Children from Remote First Nations Communities." Thesis, 2014.

Gleason, Mona. "Psychology and the Construction of the 'Normal' Family in Postwar Canada, 1945–60." The Canadian historical review 78, no. 3 (1997): 442–477.

Johnston, Patrick. Native Children and the Child Welfare System Toronto: Canadian Council on Social Development in association with James Lorimer & Co., 1983.

Lewis, Mira. "Struggle Persistence Survival: Sixties Scoop Survivors Share Their Stories." *Our Times* (2018): 29–39.

Maurice, Jacqueline Marie. "De-Spiriting Aboriginal Children: Aboriginal Children during the 1960s and 1970s Child Welfare Era." Thesis, National Library of Canada, 2003.

Melnychuk, Mark. "'They Were Treated like Animals': How a Regina Family Was Torn Apart by the Sixties Scoop." Regina Leader Post, October 15, 2017. https://leaderpost.com/news/local-news/they-were-treated-like-animals-how-a-regina-family-was-torn-apart-by-the-sixties-scoop.

Owram, Doug. *Born at the Right Time: A History of the Baby-Boom Generation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

Rachel Shabalin, "The 'Sixties Scoop': A Dark Chapter in Canadian History." *Law Now* 41.4 (2017), 18.

Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples: Volume 3 - Gathering Strength. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1996. https://ocul-yor.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/01OCUL_YOR/sqt9v/cdi_cel_documents_216500

"Saskatchewan's Adopt Indian Métis Program | CBC Radio," CBCnews (CBC/Radio Canada, March 21, 2018), https://www.cbc.ca/radio/findingcleo/saskatchewan-s-adopt-indian-m%C3%A9tis-program-1.4555441.

Shabalin, Rachel. "The 'Sixties Scoop': A Dark Chapter in Canadian History." *Law now* 41.4 (2017): 18–. Print.

Sinclair, Raven. “Identity Lost and Found: Lessons from the Sixties Scoop.” *First Peoples Child & Family Review 3*, no. 1 (2007): 65–82.

Stevenson, Allyson. “Child Welfare, Indigenous Children and Children’s Rights in Canada.” *Revista Direito e Práxis* 10, no. 2 (2019): 1239–1260.

Stevenson, Allyson. “Intimate Integration: A Study of Aboriginal Transracial Adoption in Saskatchewan, 1944-1984.” Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 2015.

“Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action.” Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015. http://trc.ca/assets/pdf/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Wharf, Brian. Rethinking Child Welfare in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1993.