Lost Kids

Edited by Mona Gleason, Tamara Myers, Leslie Paris, and Veronica Strong-Boag

Lost Kids

Vulnerable Children and Youth in Twentieth-Century Canada and the United States

UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Lost kids : vulnerable children and youth in twentieth-century Canada and the United States / edited by Mona Gleason ... [et al.].

Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-7748-1686-1

1. Children with social disabilities – Canada – History – 20th century. 2. Children with social disabilities – United States – History – 20th century. 3. Youth with social disabilities – Canada – History – 20th century. 4. Youth with social disabilities – United States – History – 20th century. I. Gleason, Mona, 1964-

HQ792.C3L67 2010 362.70971'0904 C2010-903400-X

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press
The University of British Columbia
2029 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083
www.ubcpress.ca

For my parents, Margaret and William Gleason (1923-99) – MG

For my grandmother, Mable Nelson (1911-2009) – TM

For my parents, Roz and Joel Paris – LP

For my heroes, Stephen Lewis and Mary-Ellen Turpel-Lafond – VSB

Contents

Illustrations

Figures

Tables

Lost Kids

Introduction

Mona Gleason, Tamara Myers, Leslie Paris, and Veronica Strong-Boag

Children and youth occupy important social and political roles, even as they sleep in their cribs or hang out on street corners. Conceptualized alternatively as harbingers or saboteurs of a bright, secure tomorrow, young people in various historical contexts have been central to adult-driven schemes to effect a positive future for children, families, communities, and nations.[1] In Western societies, children are believed to have become, as sociologist Viviana Zelizer argues, emotionally "priceless," gaining in social importance as their economic value waned in the industrial age.[2] Since the late nineteenth century, longer mandated periods of schooling and new age restrictions on workplace employment have shielded greater numbers of children from participation in wage labour; twentieth-century health advances such as the pasteurization of milk and the development of new vaccines have helped to protect them against potentially fatal illnesses; and protective legislation has formally recognized sexual relations between adults and minors as criminal.[3] In these ways and more, the past century was marked by a particular emphasis on improving children's lives and opportunities. Spurred on by the growing sentimentalization of childhood, twentieth-century children were to benefit from adult reform efforts intended to better protect them from risk and exploitation. But as we ask in this volume, which children benefited and which were left behind?

While those lucky youngsters raised to achieve their full potential provide a benchmark for societal evolution, their story has unfolded against a cast of girls and boys with more curtailed options who have experienced the sometimes contradictory outcomes of policies designed with "good intentions." Children today termed "at risk" – those who are considered to be more physically, economically, or socially vulnerable to becoming victims (or even perpetrators) of abuse – have long been the subjects of particular scrutiny among adults. These boys and girls turn up both in the popular Western imagination and in the real-life headlines that trumpet sad histories: the sexual and physical abuse of Aboriginal and Native American students

at twentieth-century residential schools, the perils of long-term foster care, and the apparent ubiquity of drug use and violent acts within many adolescent cohorts. These stories remind us that childhood and adolescence constitute ambiguous social, cultural, and political territory in the world of adults: these young people appear at once to have been lost and found, understood and misinterpreted, valued and distrusted.

This volume concerns those vulnerable youngsters who have, for a variety of reasons, experienced fewer of the benefits the modern sentimentalization of childhood has had to offer, and the aspirations and judgments of the adults who have raised and supervised them. Boys and girls understood to be inadequate or at risk, whether disadvantaged by parental or community failings or by their own perceived characteristics, have been central to modern Western reform efforts – including philanthropy, policy making, therapeutic and educational support, and punitive options designed to contain the peril of disaffected or culturally distinct youth. Yet, as these essays suggest, although intermittent panics about the death of children in foster care or the discovery of high suicide rates among certain youthful populations have frequently elicited promises of reform, all too often these crises have faded away, leaving vulnerable children "forgotten" until the next crisis. For all the attention and outrage youth at risk in Canada and the United States have generated on rough streets, in overwhelmed institutions, and in troubled homes from the nineteenth century to the present, the most vulnerable youngsters continue to face higher risks and fewer opportunities than their better-off counterparts. Those children who deviate from the mainstream by reason of mental or physical disability, class, race, or simply age, or because their families cannot adequately care for them, have more often been "lost"; in this volume, we seek to "find" them and to showcase the importance of how the various debates about young people judged disadvantaged, vulnerable, or otherwise problematically "in need" have been framed. The chapters in this book remind scholars and practitioners working in various areas in childhood and youth studies that the varying experiences of disadvantaged youth are centrally implicated in state formation, class conflict, citizenship debates, and the cultural politics of identity. More broadly, we see how social inequalities are historically produced; young people, disadvantaged and otherwise, are central figures in the manufacture and maintenance of these hierarchies at the hands of parents, professionals, state representatives, and, sometimes, other children.

Lost Kids represents a collective effort by historians and social scientists to explore key difficulties faced by vulnerable children and their caretakers over the last hundred and more years in Canada and the United States. It marks an attempt to recast vulnerable children, their representation, their treatment, and their responses as social actors often *made additionally vulnerable* through the action and inaction of adults. Although children and youth

experience a wide diversity of social locations based on their race, class, sex, and ability, they share a relationship to the power of adults that often places them at a distinct disadvantage. Yet, these children have often been resilient; many have carved out satisfying lives in spite of their difficult childhoods, enabled by or despite the efforts of adults.

As scholars, we endeavour to be attentive to how the conditions of children and youth deemed vulnerable have been alternately underrepresented and overdramatized in historical narratives of social, political, and cultural change in their contemporary iterations.[4] Marginalized children and youth around the world have appeared in adult narratives as waifs, as strays, and sometimes, as monsters. Some are construed as having lost their bearings, moral and otherwise, and being in need of correction or salvation. Some are deemed physically or intellectually deficient. Others, those who appear to represent less of a threat, are simply ignored. As Canadian editors, of one of the twenty-first-century nation-states whose history and current policies we probe in this book, we are motivated by efforts to connect past and present in ways that may illuminate the lives of such youngsters and the adults who plan for them.

Childhood in Canada and the United States

In the era considered in this book – the nineteenth century to the present – Canada and the United States share histories of investigating and attempting to improve and control children and youth. This has been an era of reform and child-saving, as well as of growing acknowledgment of children's rights. At the state level, early initiatives included Canada's Royal Commission on the Relations of Labor and Capital (1889), which devoted much attention to child labour, and the first American White House Conference on Dependent Children (1909), which supplied the momentum for the creation of the US Children's Bureau (1912). In both countries, the settlement house movement of the late nineteenth century onward had a significant focus on (mostly urban) youth; reformers also focused on institutional "care," including orphanages and industrial schools, the kindergarten movement, and new hygienic measures to preserve children's health. Overall, concern for children, especially those deemed at risk, was a central tenet of the developing social welfare apparatus in the two nations. Canadians and Americans were variously motivated by adult sentimentality, benevolence, and humanitarian concern. Reformers strove to integrate recent immigrants and racial minorities into the cultural mainstream, to prevent the economic drain of pauperism, and to produce industrious and self-reliant citizens. From juvenile courts that dealt both with dependent and delinquent children and kept minors out of the reach of criminal law, to international covenants recognizing the rights of children, the category of the child emerged as a fundamental political and social concern. In sum, social reform in the decades before World War One produced the institutions of modern child welfare.

These bold efforts had important results. Yet, a century later, many children in wealthy nations remain at risk or are understood as "trouble." Studies from provincial, state, and federal authorities, together with those from non-profit groups, have provided abundant empirical data on the difficulties facing vulnerable youngsters in both countries. For instance, the uncertain pace of improvement for indigenous girls and boys was recently signalled by Canada's 1996 *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. In 2000, one in six of the "rich world's children" (residents of the thirty members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) was estimated to live in poverty, placing them, as one UNICEF-commissioned study concluded, "at a marked and measurable disadvantage" in matters of physical and mental development, health, education, job prospects, income, and life expectancy.[5] UNICEF ranked Canada fourth (below South Korea, Japan, and Finland) in the percentage of children scoring below international benchmarks of reading, math, and science literacy, while the United States stood eighteenth.[6] The national pattern of births to teenage mothers, an especially vulnerable group, is similarly revealing: the United States had the highest rate in the developed world at 52.1 births per 1,000 fifteen to nineteen-year-olds; Canada came in twenty-first at 20.2.[7] Meanwhile, although evidence suggests that fewer children are victims of abuse than in the past, perhaps 3,500 youngsters under age fifteen in the industrialized world die from physical abuse and neglect every year.[8] Intra-country variations among classes and communities of residents are sometimes greater than international disparities, reflecting deep chasms of domestic inequality in the world's richest nations. Aboriginal youngsters and those from other minority racial groups, disabled boys and girls, and many from single-parent households have often faced particular difficulties.[9]

The rights of children to stable, safe, and rewarding lives have been widely acknowledged, most notably in the United Nations' 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CROC) that, as of January 2009, had been signified and ratified by all members of the UN, except Somalia and the United States. Such recognition of the human rights of children is reassuring, inasmuch as it places their rights on many national agendas. Legal scholars, among others critically attuned to the need for vigilance in enacting such endorsements, have nevertheless pointed out that CROC's "implementation is left to the good will of nation states."[10] Thus, although the Canadian government ratified the CROC in 1991, it has yet to be fully implemented in the country's domestic laws.[11] The recently concluded administration of President George W. Bush rejected ratification, arguing that "the text goes too far when it asserts entitlements based on economic, social and cultural rights ... The human rights-based approach ... poses significant problems as used in this text."[12] Although governments would like to be seen to be promoting and protecting the national well-being of children, rights and emancipation

remain contested, and the shifts in power relations that would be required for children's greater protection are clearly difficult to enact.

Scholarly Attention to Vulnerable Youngsters

The contributors to *Lost Kids* draw upon a number of theoretical perspectives, including feminism, critical race studies, and postcolonial studies, as they are employed in history, criminology, critical legal studies, and sociology. Foremost among these approaches is feminist scholarship, which has been influential in sensitizing us to the symbolic and material significance of children and youth, to questions of privilege and resistance, and to the value of recovering voices whose perspective has been so frequently ignored. Our work as historians and as scholars of contemporary child and youth studies is also marked by interdisciplinary and sometimes international linkages. These approaches make clear that particular ideas about, and treatment of, young people are historically constituted and indicative of unequal relations and often oppressive understandings of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability.

Although the scholarly literature we draw on is vast, we direct readers' attention to three interrelated issues of particular concern to child and youth studies in Canada and the United States. First is the central place of the state – its evolving politics, procedures, and prejudices – in both the construction of and responses to vulnerable children. Second is the shifting context of families and households whose fundamental dynamics, occasionally quite in opposition to the priorities of the state, shape young lives. Finally, we consider the evolution of child welfare and criminal justice, two systems that are closely interconnected and have been likely to impinge on or even determine the future of disadvantaged girls and boys.

Early challenges to traditional interpretations of state intervention in vulnerable families, including, for example, Linda Gordon on American single women and welfare, Anthony Platt on juvenile justice in the United States, and Patricia Rooke, R.L. Schnell, and Neil Sutherland on the deinstitutionalization movement and child welfare in Canada, have provided astute critiques of social welfare politics.[13] Scholars in multiple national settings have described how ideologies became "modern" or "child-centred" as well as frequently "mother-centred" or mother-blaming in the last century and half, and how professionals became more and more powerful in setting the contours of public thinking about childhood. Increasingly, historians are highlighting a diversity of opinion about youngsters and their families. There is, for example, much evidence that Aboriginal communities have evolved different views of children than have settler societies and that the views of immigrant groups often differ from those of the mainstream. Thinking about young people in the two nations has ranged from the reactionary to the progressive, the punitive to the therapeutic, the clinical to

the commercial, the idealistic to the pragmatic. Yet, it is difficult, as scholars have shown, for these groups to escape the disciplinary ideologies of childhood and youth propagated by schools, social welfare systems, and the popular media in both lands.[14]

Families and households, fundamental sites for the unfolding of lives, permit a close consideration of children's socialization as well as counter-discourses and resistance to mainstream norms. Early-twentieth-century reformers once largely idealized the domestic arrangements of middle-class white settlers, describing others as more likely to produce problem youngsters. That tradition has not entirely disappeared, but today's scholars are more likely to portray and appreciate the diversity of kin and residential arrangements and the ways that these work variously to support girls and boys, including non-standard arrangements where same-sex couples, grandparents, aunts, siblings, and other interested adults meaningfully care for girls and boys. There is also considerable recognition that particular families and households face tremendous threats, originating not only with poverty, addiction, and violence but also with the shortcomings of state regimes. In other words, critical studies of childhood and youth in Canada and the United States are increasingly aware of the ways in which class, race, gender, and ability matter a good deal when it comes to family opportunity.[15]

In both national contexts, scholarly examination of ideas about families and households has also regularly blended into discussions of the development of child welfare policy. This evolution has revealed long-standing assumptions that kin should properly care for their own (though the meaning of proper care has been contested), and that public aid should be directed, through both punishment and reward, to achieve this end. Canadian and American private and public assistance, ranging from the relatively generous to the deeply punitive, was never intended to undermine the pre-eminent obligation of family. Thus, relief, whether in the form of pensions, allowances, or workfare, has never provided financial options better than those available to families of the lowest paid wage earners. Linked to such assumptions and policies is a prevailing preference for men's commitment to breadwinning and women's to unwaged work for home and kin. Children everywhere have had the greatest claim on the hearts and the purses of the powerful and on tax dollars if their families were believed to match this portrait of responsible gendered parenting. That result has been especially clear in contemporary scholars' examination of the experience of those marginalized by class, gender, race, and disability in both nations.[16]

In the course of appraising ideas about children and youth, the role of families and households, and the emergence of child welfare, scholars have begun to recognize that vulnerable girls and boys have not necessarily been silent or powerless. Many seek to realize their own ambitions, to slip away

from any too-ready supervision, and to resist the will of others. This has not always been to positive effect; but truancy, shoplifting, and joyriding, although different from the more socially approved options of academic or athletic prowess, also reflect young people's efforts to negotiate alternative realities for themselves. Such efforts at agency have had many outcomes, some more favourable to young people than others.[17]

Thinking about *Lost Kids*

In December 2006, funding from Canada's Killam Program enabled the editors to host an international workshop at the University of British Columbia. As members of the newly founded History of Children and Youth Group, now affiliated with the Canadian Historical Association, we wanted to engage with scholars who were doing stimulating new work in the North American context. Because we were further committed to fostering connections between historians and other social scientists addressing contemporary issues, we invited scholars in law, political science, and human kinetics. The ways in which our historically oriented workshop on vulnerable youngsters made connections to the present stand out as unusual. This volume affirms the significance of the connection between past and present for children as for adults.

Among the goals of *Lost Kids* is to highlight various ways in which scholars might approach vulnerable girls and boys. The keynote speaker at the workshop, historian Neil Sutherland, who contributes our postscript, pointed in particular to the possibilities of deriving children's stories from adult memories, while acknowledging the methodological concerns of doing so. And although young people's voices have been too often silent in the historical record, they surface here in numerous places. Mona Gleason uses interviews with adults as a way into a history of childhood illnesses. Tamara Myers, engages media interviews with youngsters targeted as potential trouble. Leslie Paris employs children's voices as they were recorded in contemporary newspaper and scholarly accounts. Wendy Frisby examines recent interviews with Aboriginal youth. In these sources, young voices are often mediated by adults but are revealing nonetheless.

Many contributors to this volume have mined institutional records. Veronica Strong-Boag uses ministerial and other public accounts to illuminate how disability has been understood and experienced. Hospital records provide Denyse Baillargeon with a perspective on patients at Montreal's Sainte-Justine Hospital. Juvenile justice records are central to William Bush's analysis of race and delinquency in Texas. An examination of expert thought on children and youth is central to Cynthia Comacchio's study of adolescence. The adoption files of child welfare agencies in Winnipeg and Montreal supply insights into cross-racial adoption for Karen Dubinsky.

Numerous contributors examine public policy more broadly. Molly Ladd-Taylor examines variations in the status of disadvantaged American children over the twentieth century. Law scholars Cindy Baldassi, Susan Boyd, and Fiona Kelly explore legal sources to suggest how adoption and the principle "in the best interest of the child" can be variously interpreted to raise questions about "normality." Stephen McBride and John Irwin employ contemporary Canadian public policy records. The array of sources used in *Lost Kids* illuminates the diversity of childhood and discourages the essentialism casually evoked in notions of the priceless child or the hopeless youth.

Several themes link the chapters in the book. One central concern is prejudice, and patterns of recurring discrimination that raise questions about whose interests were ultimately being served. Whether the spotlight is on white American elites' refusal to grant childhood to African American boys, as in Bush's study; Ladd Taylor and Strong-Boag's revelation of how ableism fuelled North American public policy in schools and child welfare; or Baldassi, Boyd, and Kelly's identification of the heterosexism of Canadian case law, the authors demonstrate the vexed nature of secular experts' claims to impartiality, and the ways in which child-management projects often served professionals' own claims to expertise.

The power of the child as a trope alternatively of innocence, vulnerability, and danger provides another recurring interest of contributors. Very often, youngsters emerge in public discourse as important indicators of the condition and future of the community or the nation more broadly. Dubinsky makes this connection in her comparison of the adoption of black and Aboriginal youngsters in Canada. Paris illuminates adult fears that rising American divorce rates signalled social disarray. Myers links debates about curfew laws to more general worries about nighttime social disorder and unease about youth's claim to public space. Comacchio emphasizes how adolescence invoked North America's anxieties about an immoral modernism freed of the constraints of propriety and custom. Gleason demonstrates how the small bodies were employed as symbols of both a strong citizenry and one in need of treatment and repair. Often, as these examples testify, cultural symbols of youngsters stand in the way of appreciating individual girls and boys.

The history of legal remedies for children in trouble or in need encompasses another shared theme for many of our contributors. How such children were to be assisted and straightened out has presented a recurring problem for the legal system, as Baldassi, Boyd, and Kelly demonstrate. Legislation to protect children from workplace exploitation, McBride and Irwin argue, continues to be compromised by the seemingly unassailable logic of consumer capitalism. Numerous authors remind us that public policy makers built edifices that allocated special and always inferior places and programs

to those assumed to be hopeless or disabled. Ironically, such youngsters' lack of access to their fair share of funding often subsidized mainstream families' achievement of "normality."

The importance of what has been termed "the politics of identity" also regularly emerges in the following chapters.[18] Race looms particularly large in the discussions of Bush and Dubinsky, but it never stands alone. Black girls suffer different disabilities from their brothers. Class, race, and gender are invoked in the fears of adolescence uncovered by Comacchio and Myers. Frisby's teens would be hard put to know whether their recreational needs are ignored because of their age, their class origins, or, in some instances, their Aboriginality. The ideal and miscreant families described by Paris rise and fall in the public imagination and in state policy by virtue of their particular embodiment of racial and class ideals. Ultimately, these multifaceted identities shape children's experiences. Some attributes, for good or ill, may be singled out for special attention.

To further complicate these stories, a number of the contributors point to global and transborder connections. Canadians and Americans have always been variously linked to near and far-flung communities and empires. Long after first contact, Aboriginal North Americans frequently ignored settler-imposed borders to travel for work and community. As Dubinsky points out, the adoption trade in indigenous youngsters was often equally transgressive. Few of the girls and boys recovered in these pages were unaffected by the global market in ideas about youngsters; some literally crossed frontiers in response to adult agendas. These themes of prejudice, cultural imagery, public policy, intersectionality, and border crossing invoke complicated histories that stand close to the heart of modern life. Youngsters do not constitute an isolated cohort. As members of intergenerational communities, they embody the preconceptions and the priorities of their larger societies.

In the mould of pioneering feminist historians such as Mary Quayle Innis in Canada and Mary Ritter Beard in the United States, we believe that past and present operate in tandem, and that illuminating the connections between them helps us understand both better.[19] To take only one example, Aboriginal residential schools (and, as the Law Commission of Canada has argued, children's institutions in general) have scarred far more than the generations they actually abused.[20] Survivors have sometimes passed on their trauma in the course of their own parenting, schooling, and employment. Equally dangerous have been some of the conclusions drawn by political elites who see such children's subsequent difficulties as proof of their inferiority and not as most properly an indictment of mainstream indifference, neglect, and abuse. The pattern of vulnerable children and youth we see around us in the world today is ultimately the legacy of past choices. The Child Welfare League of Canada has recently produced resource papers that

review key contemporary child protection issues. Many echo the issues treated in this collection: children in institutional care, Aboriginal youth, youth homelessness, children and juvenile delinquency, and working conditions for youngsters.[21] We hope that readers of *Lost Kids* will not only better understand the past but also be able to make the critical linkages that will help us to understand the conditions of childhood in the present.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank the Killam Program of the Canada Council for funding the workshop for which most of these chapters were produced and for its contribution to the publication of this volume. We are also grateful for the support of SSHRC and our university departments at the University of British Columbia: Women's and Gender Studies, Educational Studies, and History. We also thank the graduate students who have assisted this project at various stages, notably Laurie Parsons, Beth Stewart, and Dilek Kayaalp. Finally, the enthusiasm and patience of our UBC Press editors, first Jean Wilson and now Darcy Cullen, transformed this hard work into a pleasurable experience.

Notes

1 Canadian scholarship includes Patricia Rooke and R.L. Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum: From Child Rescue to the Welfare State in English-Canada, 1800-1950* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983); Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth Century Consensus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976); Cynthia Comacchio, *Nations Are Built of Babies: Saving Ontario Mothers and Children, 1900-1940* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990). In the American literature see, for example, Kriste Lindemeyer, *A Right to Childhood: The U.S. Children's Bureau and Child Welfare, 1912-46* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997); and Judith Sealander, *The Failed Century of the Child: Governing America's Young in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

2 Viviana Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children* (New York: Basic Books, 1985).

3 See Matthew Waites, *The Age of Consent: Young People, Sexuality and Citizenship* (Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

4 There is a significant historical and contemporary literature on "children at risk." In particular, juvenile delinquency, children and drug use, sexuality, and children at the centre of moral panic have received extensive exploration in numerous national contexts. Less scholarly attention has been paid to children labelled "disabled," particularly in historical and non-therapeutic literature, though that is slowly changing. See, for example, Richard J. Altenbaugh, "Where Are the Disabled in the History of Education? The Impact of Polio on Sites of Learning," *History of Education* 35, 6 (2006): 705-30.

5 UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, "A League Table of Child Poverty in Rich Nations," *Innocenti Report Card* 1 (June 2000): 3. See also UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, "Child Poverty in Rich Countries, 2005," *Innocenti Report Card,* 6 (2006); and John Micklewright, "Child Poverty in English-Speaking Countries," Innocenti Working Paper No. 94 (UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence, 2003).

6 UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, "A League Table of Educational Disadvantage in Rich Nations," *Innocenti Report Card* 4 (November 2002): 4.

7 UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, "A League Table of Teenage Births in Rich Nations," *Innocenti Report Card* 3 (July 2001): 4; see "Juvenile Justice," *Innocenti Digest* 3 (1998).

8 UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, "A League Table of Child Maltreatment Deaths in Rich Nations," *Innocenti Report Card* 5 (September 2003): 2. The figures are averaged over five years.

9 See Maggie Black, "Children and Families of Ethnic Minorities, Immigrants and Indigenous Peoples: Global Seminar Report," Innocenti Global Seminar, 1995 ser., 7 (UNICEF ICDC,

Florence, 1997). See also the National Clearinghouse on Family Violence, *The Abuse of Children with Disabilities* (Ottawa: Family Violence Prevention Unit, Health Canada, August 2000).

10 Melinda Jones, "Changing Families, Challenging Futures" (paper presented at the 6th Australian Institute of Family Studies Conference, Melbourne, 15-27 November 1998), http://www.aifs.gov.au/institute/afrc6papers/jones.html.

11 See Canadian Children's Rights Council, "About the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC)," http://www.canadiancrc.com/UN_CRC_webpage/UN_CRC.htm; Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, "Children's Rights," http://www.humanrights.gov.au/human_rights/children/index.html.

12 World Net Daily, "Bush Team Signals New U.N. Direction," http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=21590.

13 See, for example, Linda Gordon, *Pitied but Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare, 1890 to 1935* (New York: Free Press, 1994); Anthony Platt, *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977); Patricia Rooke and R.L. Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum: From Child Rescue to the Welfare State in English-Canada, 1800-1950* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983); and Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society.*

14 For an introduction to these concerns see Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000) and *Growing Up: Childhood in English Canada from the Great War to the Age of Television* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997) and Kriste Lindenmeyer, *A Right to Childhood: The U.S. Children's Bureau and Child Welfare, 1912-1946* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997).

15 See Margrit Eichler, *Families in Canada Today: Recent Changes and Their Policy Consequences* (Toronto: Gage, 1988); and Sherri Broder, *Tramps, Unfit Mothers, and Neglected Children: Negotiating the Family in Nineteenth Century Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2002).

16 Christopher Walmsley and Diane Purvey, eds., *Child and Family Welfare in British Columbia: A History* (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, 2005); Patricia T. Rooke and R.L. Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum;* Patricia Monture, "A Vicious Circle: Child Welfare and the First Nations," *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 3, 1 (1989): 1-17; Janet Golden, Richard A. Meckel, and Heather M. Prescott, *Children and Youth in Sickness and in Health: A Historical Handbook;* Lori Askeland, ed., *Children and Youth in Adoption, Orphanages, and Foster Care: A Historical Handbook and Guide* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2006); LeRoy Asby, *Endangered Children: Dependency, Neglect and Abuse in American History* (New York: Twayne, 1997); Marilyn I. Holt, *Indian Orphanages* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2001); and Linda Gordon, *Pitied but Not Entitled*.

17 Tamara Myers, *Caught: Montreal's Modern Girls and the Law, 1869-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006); for first-person accounts see Evelyn Lau, *Runaway: Diary of a Street Kid* (Toronto: HarperPerennial, 1996). More representative of the vulnerable were the lives of the murdered young prostitute and addict recalled in Maggie de Vries, *Missing Sarah: A Vancouver Woman Remembers Her Vanished Sister* (Toronto: Penguin, 2004) or the sad-eyed foster child whose suicide was immortalized in *Richard Cardinal: Cry from the Diary of a Métis Child* by Aboriginal filmmaker Alanis Obomsawin (Montreal: National Film Board of Canada, 1986).

18 See Leslie McCall, "The Complexity of Intersectionality," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30, 3 (2005): 1771-1800; and Patricia Hill Collins, "It's All in the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Nation," in Uma Narayan and Sandra Harding, eds., *Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a Multicultural, Post-Colonial, and Feminist World* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000), 156-76.

19 See Mary Ritter Beard, *A Woman Making History: Mary Ritter Beard through Her Letters,* edited with an introduction by Nancy F. Cott (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991); Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice, eds., *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Woman and the Work of History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997); and Anne Innis Dagg, "Mary Quayle Innis," in Mary Ann Dimand, Robert W. Dimand, and Evelyn L. Forget, eds., *Women of Value: Feminist Essays on the History of Women in Economics* (Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar, 1995).

20 See Law Commission of Canada, *Restoring Dignity: Responding to Child Abuse in Canadian Institutions* (Ottawa: Law Commission of Canada, 2000).
21 Child Welfare League of Canada, *The Welfare of Canadian Children: It's Our Business* (Ottawa: Child Welfare League of Canada, 2007).

Part 1
Wanted Kids? Institutions, Fostering, and Adoption

"Every Child a Wanted Child" has long been the slogan of Planned Parenthood. Its message has angered opponents of women's access to birth control and abortion, who dream of good homes for every child. However, as the chapters in this section remind readers, children have never been regarded as equally desirable. Even when public enthusiasm for adoption has been at its height, numerous youngsters have gone unparented. As Karen Dubinsky and Veronica Strong-Boag demonstrate, differences of race, gender, class, religion, ethnicity, and disability have all affected the prospects of girls and boys in need of assistance.

A long history of childhood neglect and abuse within families and in varied societies provides ample evidence of human shortcomings across generations. Today, lower child mortality rates and shifting sensibilities tend to make the unequal experiences of children across lines of difference even more visible. At the same time, history shows that adult champions of children and youth, inspired variously by religious and personal values, have advocated on their behalf in varied contexts. The emergence of a sentimental version of childhood in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Western world drew on compassionate impulses; indentures, orphanages, reformatories, and hospitals have everywhere acted to discipline and control, but they have also embodied reformers' hopes for children.

Karen Dubinsky explores the changing parameters of transracial and transnational Canadian adoption in the postwar years. Contrasting the adoption of Aboriginal and black children by white parents, Dubinsky examines significant differences in parental intent and community support in these two cases, and the effects of these specific adoption climates. Veronica Strong-Boag, meanwhile, examines the changing ideals of "worthiness" through which Canadian children have been fostered, institutionalized, or adopted. As she argues, the history of children with disabilities suggests the challenges of parenting, as well as the vulnerability of some of the most needy.

1
A Haven from Racism? Canadians Imagine Interracial Adoption

Karen Dubinsky

Children suffer the paradoxical burden of both over- and under-representation. The under-representation of children is what brings this book together as contributors explore how children have been excluded, marginalized, and ignored in everything from playgrounds to political economy, past and present. Yet, over-representation is, in a sense, the flip side of powerlessness. Because what is socially peripheral is often symbolically central, children strike it rich in symbolic power. The insight that women have acted historically as "bearers but rarely makers of social meaning" applies even more so to children.[1] Through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, "childhood" was invented and then universalized, so much so that, today, nations are increasingly judged on the basis of their ability to provide for their citizens a universal (and highly circumscribed) "childhood." I argue that the relatively recent (and by no means uncontested) creation of a single, global meaning of "child" explains much about the contemporary controversies accompanying transracial and transnational adoption. In this sense, the adopted child joins other globally controversial children, including the labouring child and the child soldier, who are understood to be subject to adult imperatives.[2]

My current project is a history of interracial and international adoption in various locations in the Americas. My main theme is the extraordinary symbolic power of children, and my goal is to try to move our understandings of interracial and international adoption past the binaries of "kidnap" versus "rescue." Adoption controversies are never just about children. The history of interracial adoption provides enormous scope for those interested in both the social and the symbolic history of children and childhood. In the latter part of the twentieth century, as mainstream adoption policy and practice moved from matching and secrecy toward a degree of openness, the placement of black and Aboriginal children in white homes, and the subsequent creation of visible, multiracial adoptive families, sparked significant and ongoing debate. Adopted children merit more than a mention on the list of so-called emblematic cases of childhood, because their circumstances have

triggered such intense, and often contradictory, responses. Here I want to consider two such differing histories from Canada: the adoption stories of black children in the 1960s and Aboriginal children in the 1970s and 1980s.

It is widely held in Canada that the adoption of Aboriginal children by white parents has been an almost unmitigated disaster. Individual horror stories of Aboriginal kids "gone wrong" – abused, addicted, and acting out – circulate widely. One of these horror stories involves the troubled son of Canada's former prime minister – adopted from an Inuvik orphanage in 1970 when Jean Chrétien was minister for Indian Affairs. The sad life and legal troubles of Michel Chrétien have become the elephant in the room in the production of commonsense knowledge of Native adoption in Canada. The adoption of Aboriginal children in Canada in this era is popularly known as the "Sixties Scoop": the timing is a bit off, but the politics are clear.[3] "Cultural genocide" is another common term, given mainstream legitimacy by a Manitoba government inquiry into Native adoptions in 1983.[4] The adoption of Aboriginal children by whites is now invoked, constantly and almost automatically, by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal writers and scholars alike as an instrument of colonization. To activist and writer Winona LaDuke, for example, adoption joins eugenics and blood quantum as "the new mechanisms to cause the elimination of nations of indigenous peoples."[5] Social workers and other adoption professionals acknowledge the profound lack of empirical research on the lives of cross-culturally adopted Aboriginal children. Yet, anecdotal evidence and practical experience lead many high-profile Aboriginal adoption professionals to oppose cross-race placements. For Kenn Richard, social work professor and director of Toronto's Native Child and Family Services Centre, "far too many Aboriginal to non-Aboriginal adoptions break down ... and cultural dynamics must play a significant role in this process."[6] Here the United States looms as the more progressive country; a rare thing indeed in Canadian political discourse, especially on social welfare or race relations. Opponents of Aboriginal adoption in Canada cite the US Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (a product of a decade-long struggle by US Aboriginal groups appalled by the high rates of children "in care"), which limited cross-racial adoption of Aboriginal children, approvingly and enviously.[7]

Less well known today but just as emblematic in its day is the history of the adoption of Canadian black children by white parents.[8] This tale plays very differently. The decision by a Montreal agency to cross adoption's colour bar in the 1950s and place black children with white parents led to the creation of an integrationist discourse of adoption, which positioned interracially adopted black children as innocent bearers of racial reconciliation. The high media profile of this version of adoption was initiated by an enthusiastic group of white adoptive parents, the Open Door Society, formed

in Montreal in 1959. In this story, Canadians saw interracial adoption as a hopeful sign of cross-racial tolerance and a measure of our progressive values.[9] Here Canadians occupied the more familiar (and definitely more comfortable) role of moral superior to our southern neighbours. American liberals, including an approving Martin Luther King Jr., looked longingly at Canada's adoption pioneers. As one American journalist noted, "Only in Montreal are mixed race adoptions an honor, not a stigma."[10] Although a few Canadian blacks saw this as a story of the political weakness of their community, including persistent discrimination by the child welfare system, this version of interracial adoption was rarely mobilized as a symbol of racism or colonialism. This story disappeared from public view as adoption's era of integrationist fervour subsided in the 1970s. But this narrative still makes the occasional appearance, including a recent feature in the *Globe and Mail,* in which Canada was positioned as a land of "racial tranquility," more suitable for US adopted black babies than the "muggy heat and segregation of the Deep South."[11]

Adoption historian Ellen Herman writes that adoption is "good to think with."[12] In this chapter, I want to use the subject of adoption to think about the different trajectories of Aboriginality and blackness in Canada – a huge project, to be sure. Fifty years of transracial-adoption debate in this country shed light on what US adoption scholar Sara Dorow calls "flexible racialization." In her work on Chinese adoptions in the United States, Dorow illustrates how, to many adoptive parents and adoption professionals alike, the "rescuability" of Chinese children stands in stark contrast to the abjectness and general hopelessness of domestic black children. As she puts it, to many, both Chinese and black children need to be rescued, "but it was easier to imagine the former being absorbed into White kinship."[13] What makes one group a "model minority" – and hence a good "bet" for adoption, and another a risk? Reflecting on his troubled adopted son, former Prime Minister Chrétien told his biographer, "Nobody told us there was a big problem to take Indians, that their record was not good."[14] Another white adoptive parent of a Native son gone terribly wrong, and author of a recent book about "adoption breakdown," sadly recalled the words of her father when she announced her adoption: "You can't make a White man out of an Indian."[15] In stark contrast to the discourse of black adopted child as harbinger of racial peace, the Aboriginal adopted child seemed, to some, almost freakish. "By treating him White, [they] rubbed away his native soul," one reporter has explained the unfortunate Chrétien family.[16] In what follows, I want to try to take these stories past such essentialist territory, and explore how transracial adoption can mean both cross-racial solidarity and colonial conquest.

We cannot contrast the various commonsense understandings or public narrative of Native and black adoption with an objective truth from the

adoption case files.[17] It would be simplistic indeed to suggest that the adoption of black children by whites was inherently progressive while the adoption of First Nations children by whites was wholly reactionary. Relations between birth parents, adoptive parents, and social workers narrated through the framework of "the case file" – the official dossier of adoption – confirm and depart from these public narratives. It would be naive to believe everything one reads in an adoption file. In the era of closed adoption, social workers were like directors in a strange drama in which the actors were unseen by each other. The historical traces left in the case file are mostly told to and through the social worker. When the perspective offered by adoption's private, official record seems out of sync with adoption's public profile, the issue is not which story is wrong. Rather, I want to explore why such different ranges of understandings and beliefs about interracial adoption emerged at all. The intense emotional attachments between adults and children in our world are too complicated to fit into simple binaries; certainly, almost none of the hundreds of adoption case files I have examined could be described in the stark terms of "kidnap" or "rescue" alone. What accounts for such different public understandings of interracial adoption? Despite the universality of the concept, the symbolic child in the case file had many faces. The black child in Montreal meant something very different from the Aboriginal child in northern Manitoba.

The most obvious difference between the adoption of Aboriginal and black children in Canada is numbers. About 350 children labelled "non-white" (mostly black) were placed for adoption in Montreal between 1955 and 1969. These are figures from one agency in one city, although as Montreal's Children's Service Centre was widely recognized as an interracial adoption pioneer, these figures probably represent the apex of black placements in Canada. Even the province of Nova Scotia, home to a sizable black community, placed adoption ads in Montreal newspapers.[18] The statistical picture for Aboriginal adoption is complicated, but by whatever measure, Native children have been vastly over-represented in the child welfare system since the 1950s. Native children have been placed in state care at a rate as high as four and a half times that of other Canadian children; in the four western provinces they represent at least 40 percent of the children "in care." Thus, here we are speaking of thousands, not hundreds, of adoption placements. Manitoba recorded the highest number of adoptions in the country. An internal file review conducted by the Manitoba Department of Family Services in 2004 calculated that between 1960 and 1980 almost five thousand children were placed outside Manitoba, two-thirds within Canada, the rest to the United States.[19] Encounters between Native children and child welfare systems mushroomed during the 1960s, when Aboriginal social welfare was transferred from the federal government to provincial governments.[20]

Thus, it is in no way surprising to discover a wealth of stories of apprehension in the Aboriginal case files. Children took many routes into the world of child welfare, for Aboriginal families imploded in ways that ranged from the dramatic to the mundane. Fathers shot mothers and/or themselves. Fathers abandoned families. Fathers lost their jobs. Mothers went to jail. Parents responded to the pressures of poverty and violence by neglecting or bullying their children; they beat them, they abandoned them, they did not feed or clothe them. In one instance, parents locked their children in a car overnight because they could not stand their crying. Children responded to such dysfunctional and abusive behaviour in kind.

In approximately half of my sample of two hundred files, direct intervention and apprehension by social workers is discernable. What makes these stories different from other encounters between the poor, their children, and the state?[21] Numbers provide part of the answer: over-representation is simply the racialization of poverty. But so too are the historical interactions of colonialism, which have consistently produced infantilized relations between Aboriginals and the Canadian state. These infantilized relations, enacted in encounters between social workers and Aboriginal families (as they were in other realms with police, doctors, and teachers, to name a few) worked to undermine one of the mainstays of North American culture: that the family takes care of its own. "Children have historically been the battleground on which the struggle between Indigenous People and newcomers has been waged," declared the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs in 2002. The child welfare system simply replaced residential schools as a mechanism for removing and assimilating Native children.[22] In what other circumstances can we imagine children living with their grandparents described as "deserted"? What is necessarily "irresponsible" about leaving one's children with one's own parents? Why was it not even possible to redeem good-parent status when children were in the care of grandparents while parents were away working?[23] That in such situations some grandparents turned to the state for assistance was not necessarily a referendum on permanent custody. In a perceptive study on shared parenthood among the Brazilian poor, Claudia Fonseca asks whether the basic premises of legal adoption are intelligible to those who are most involved: "the poverty-stricken families from which adoptable children are drawn." Are "abandonment," "foster care," and "adoption" – presented as obvious in the offices and courtrooms of the child welfare system – understood in the same terms by all?[24] Did the widowed birth father who requested temporary care for his son while he spent a summer looking for work expect to lose permanent custody? Even the potentially more ambiguous tales from the social work archive, such as the parents whom, according to caseworkers, "would simply drop the children off with anyone who would look after them," appear startling when the trajectory

leads from this to legal apprehension, sibling separation, and adoption to families in Minnesota and Pennsylvania.[25]

Child welfare systems normalize and promote a universal definition of parenthood and family life in which the experiences and cultures of the Anglo middle class are privileged. This applies to Aboriginal people in Canada, and to poor people all over the world.[26] Nothing explained this better to me than a jolting personal/archival moment as I was doing this research. During my research time in Winnipeg, at the offices of the Department of Family Services, I began my day, as was customary, by opening an adoption case file from a large pile. This birth mother, described, incidentally, as "an unkempt woman who presents herself as being quite dull and confused, and looks like she has just come off a binge" seemed to "require time out from parenting, so would leave the children with whomever would look after them."[27] That very morning I had left my then three-year-old son, who accompanied me on the research trip, at a new daycare. Sure, he was in the company of the child of a friend, in a perfectly reputable, state-licensed daycare, to which I paid a lot of money. But these truths did not change the fact that I, too, needed "time out from parenting" and had just left my child with someone who would "look after him." (I had not, I realized, even caught the name of his caregiver that morning.)

The contradictions in (and profound racialization of) the production of normative parenthood leap from almost every page of the social work archive. Consider this description of a birth family in the malevolent terms it was intended to invoke: "A large collection of extended family living in one house."[28] What did it mean to describe Aboriginal parents who consistently "drifted," "wandered," or "rambled from one place to another," and how might this contrast to other parents – like me, perhaps - who "travel"? In cases of severe family implosion, such as the deaths of birth parents, why were extended family deemed inappropriate, their motives for wanting custody, questionable?[29] Indeed, why were extended family not contacted at all, in some cases learning about parentless children only after adoptions had been finalized? When social workers described someone who had a "higher degree of responsibility to their children than most Métis," or warned potential adoptive parents that Métis children have a "lower mental potential" because it was usually "a low class White man who would rely on Indian women for his sexual gratification," or attributed the repeated and increasingly hostile attempts of a birth father to regain custody of his children to "more [of] an ego blow than anything else," the compelling force of the kidnap narrative comes into view.[30] "Cradle snatchers. That's the whole long and short of it, nothing more than common kidnappers!" declares a character in Drew Hayden Taylor's play *Someday,* describing her experience as a birth mother whose child was apprehended in the 1960s. Children were taken simply "cuz we were Indians. Things were different way back then."[31]

At the same time, Native women were, in some areas in North America, subject to forced sterilization at rates twice as high as poor white women, and so it is not surprising that the politics of reproductive rights looked different in these communities.[32] The full story of the First Nations response to adoption and child welfare issues has yet to be fully told. Certainly, within the child welfare system some social workers, at least, were aware of Native opposition since the early 1970s, and some took pains to at least appear sensitive to Aboriginal concerns.[33] First Nations women voiced their public opposition to transracial adoption placements in various national and provincial women's organizations in 1974. That same year, the North American Council on Adoptable Children, a lobby group, approved a Native-initiated resolution that asked agencies to work "WITH" [sic] Native communities to strengthen families, find Native adoptive homes, or, in the last resort, "find good people" to care for Native children.[34] First Nations communities, especially women, also worked locally to provide shelters and other forms of housing for Native women with children, in order to keep their children out of the child welfare system.[35] Aboriginal publications constantly stressed the need for Aboriginal adoptive and foster homes, and many published lengthy stories, complete with photographs, of children in need of adoptive homes.[36]

No wonder, then, adoption as a form of colonial kidnap came to characterize the discourse of Native activism in the 1970s. Aboriginal politics, particularly the Red Power variant, drew inspiration from global movements for decolonization in the era, and children have always been stark and powerful symbols of anti-colonial solidarity.[37] A cartoon printed in the Aboriginal publication *Akwesasne Notes* tells the story of the "rescue" of Vietnamese children by US forces from the perspective of those on the losing end, by depicting an American couple shopping for orphans as though for souvenirs. The accompanying story was headlined "Another Native People Lose Their Children."[38] This transnational solidarity perhaps explains why when child welfare issues hit the political radar, the so-called export of Aboriginal children to adoptive homes in the United States seemed to sharpen the pain of child apprehension, particularly as interracial placements in the United States were coming to an end, and it was thus more difficult for white parents south of the border to adopt domestically. Almost all political interventions by Aboriginal activists on child welfare issues highlighted the exportation issue. In March 1976, for example, fifty Aboriginal and Métis people occupied the office of the deputy minister of social services in Saskatoon. Their general concern, about what they termed the "rapid increase in the intrusion of social workers into Native family life," was triggered by one especially high-profile case of Native children recently sent from Aboriginal foster parents in Saskatchewan to adoptive parents in Michigan.[39] The forced removal of Aboriginal children for adoption to the United States

fit easily into a general discussion of imperialism and colonialism when Montreal's Black Power student-leader Rosie Douglas toured Indian reserves across Canada in the summer of 1975.[40] One Aboriginal publication, *New Breed,* even featured an Aboriginal cartoon superhero, who rescued Native children from US adoptive parents.[41]

Virtually the same conditions applied in the United States: high rates of Aboriginal children in state care; the popularization of transracial placements through an active promotion program by the Child Welfare League of America; horror stories of unjust apprehensions, which occasionally made the papers; and Aboriginal organizations increasingly committed to resisting what they saw as the incursions of the child welfare system. This resistance caught the attention of James Abourezk, senator from "Indian Country," South Dakota. Abourezk, the first Arab American elected to the US Senate, had an affinity for unpopular causes – he left politics after one term to found the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. But he did some remarkable things in office, including helping to organize Senate hearings on Aboriginal child welfare in 1974, in which dozens of Aboriginal people told their stories of forced removal of their children. In 1978, the United States' Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), which made the adoption of Aboriginal children by those without tribal affiliations extremely difficult, became law.[42]

This legislation, clearly a political victory for Indian tribes in the United States, had immediate reverberations. Researcher Patrick Johnson stressed the enormous symbolic importance of ICWA, the very existence of which, he argued, "increased the demands made on the Canadian government to find solutions." Canadian commentators and activists cited the US precedent sympathetically. At the same time as Canada appeared as a bastion of multicultural harmony for encouraging cross-racial adoptions of black children, the United States appeared as the more progressive place for prohibiting the same thing for Aboriginal children.[43]

The highlight of the kidnap narrative was the multi-year Kimelman Inquiry (the Review Committee on Indian and Métis Adoptions and Placements) in Manitoba, which began in 1982. Justice Edwin C. Kimelman and his committee spent many months touring the province, and issued an exhaustive and hard-hitting final report – referred to by historian Veronica Strong-Boag as a "wake-up call" – in 1985.[44] The committee provided a forum for a steady stream of Aboriginal people from across the province to speak publicly, and often bitterly and sadly, of their experiences with the child welfare system. Isaac Beaulieu of Brandon spoke for many when he declared, "In the eyes of our people, the agencies that care for children are looked upon as policemen, not a helping agency."[45] Here, too, the pain of losing children to American adoptive homes dominated. Peter Kelly, veteran Red Power activist from northern Ontario, was blunt: "What is objectionable is to take some dried up old prune in a suburb of Philadelphia who couldn't bear a child

and take an Indian child from Canada and place them with that prune in Philadelphia. That kind of trafficking is what is objectionable."[46] While Kelly harnessed sexism to buttress his point, a particular form of anti-imperialism fuelled the issue. "Big shiny American cars would come onto the reserve, followed by the social worker's car," an Aboriginal social worker in Manitoba recalled; "when they left, there'd be a little Indian child sitting in the back of the American car bawling their eyes out."[47] It is possible to argue – as the *Winnipeg Free Press* did – that it was this trope of adoption that created the Kimelman Inquiry itself. In March 1982, the newspaper published a series of sensational stories about "child export" to the United States. It found a voluble foil in the form of Richard Zellinger, a former Ontario childcare worker turned director of a private Louisiana adoption agency. Zellinger claimed to have a long waiting list of Americans who wanted "those beautiful Canadian children," most of whom, he went on, "take to their new homes like a duck to water." The press dutifully reported that such talk "riled" and "stirred up" local Native leaders and quoted a chief who "condemned Zellinger and said he should be 'hanged.'"[48] A week later, out-of-province placements were banned, and Kimelman's committee was convened.[49]

Yet, we need to make room in this discussion for the less straightforward tales for which "kidnap" – always an abstraction – is also a distortion. Of the almost one hundred life stories of adopted Aboriginal adults gathered by researchers in recent years, a small minority – 8 percent – believe their adoptions were illegal or improper. The vast majority were either relinquished or apprehended as a result of neglect, abuse, or some form of family dysfunction.[50] These stories, of course, represent a tiny fraction of the total, and, in making the argument for a more complicated understanding than the discourse of "scoop" provides, I in no way diminish or disbelieve the pain of those who had horrific experiences. But "scoop" is heavy-handed and leaves out a lot.

Birth parents tend to disappear when adoption is narrated in the abstract terms of either cultural genocide or humanitarian rescue, and none more so than the Aboriginal birth mothers who requested adoption for their children. A relatively unambiguous request for adoption is discernable from about a quarter of my sample. Birth mothers of Aboriginal children had some of the same reasons for requesting adoption as did other women of the era. Their boyfriends – Native and non-Native – abandoned them. They had affairs with married men. They were raped. They had several children and could not cope with more. "She is not content being a single parent on welfare," a social worker reported of one woman who had two children and a dysfunctional husband. "She would like to improve her conditions by furthering her education. Her family is not in favour of the relinquishment." Adoption promised secrecy, even from immediate family who, as one single woman explained, "would put considerable pressure on her to keep the

child."[51] Some of the birth mothers were white woman with Native boyfriends and furious, racist parents. Here, too, the secrecy promised by adoption in this era was paramount.

Historian Veronica Strong-Boag warns us not to glamorize what she terms the "classical family of Native nostalgia," which can, of course, both inspire and homogenize.[52] To some Manitoba young women, the bonds of Aboriginal community felt closed and restrictive. One woman entered a maternity home in order to hide her pregnancy and refused to register her child as Indian so as to leave no trace for her reserve. Some were students who did not want to interrupt their studies. "This is the most heart-breaking decision I have had to make," explained one such young woman, surprised by a pregnancy as she was about to enter nursing school.[53] "As she is Indian I feel she is showing a great deal of initiative in choosing adoption and should be encouraged to continue her education," wrote a social worker of another woman in 1966, a rare indication that adoption as a strategy of upward mobility – common for single white girls of the era – was occasionally seized by others.[54] Others relinquished their children after trying, and failing, to raise them on their own. One such mother said she wanted adoption but also feared that her child, being Native, would never find a secure adoptive family (a fear echoed by many Montreal mothers of black children.) In all these examples, the circumstances that produced such narrow choices should not be conflated with the absence of adult subjectivity itself.

Historical memory is always complicated, and women reflected on their experiences as birth mothers differently with the passage of time.[55] The archive of Native adoption often brings the story forward as parties attempted to find each other later in life. In a trove of remarkable stories, these offer a kaleidoscope of emotions – among them chiefly grief and forgiveness – and testify to the immense continuing damage this era of adoption inflicted. But here, too, the lines between kidnap and rescue are sometimes difficult to see precisely. Fifteen years after her children were apprehended by the state, one mother wrote what she titled "A Mother's Anguish" and asked the Children's Aid Society (CAS) to send it to her sons. In it she recounted her story of severe abuse by her husband, divorce, poverty, and serious alcoholism. "I had no right to drag my beautiful babies to my level, so I got up the last bit of decency in me and took them to the CAS and left them there to be put up for adoption," she explained. "All the people I knew told me what a horrible person I was, even drunken women threw it in my face: 'at least they kept their kids.' But for what? Those kids with the drunken mothers turned out to be hoodlums and prostitutes, which I had not wanted for my boys ... I know in my heart that I made the right decision at the time."[56] That even a handful of Aboriginal women narrated their stories of relinquishment like this, as decency, obliges historians not to let such voices disappear.

The kidnap narrative of Aboriginal adoption relies on a unitary view of Native birth mothers. The notion that the adoption of black children was unambiguously heroic also functions on half-truths. One of the long-standing, and highly romantic, beliefs about interracial adoption in this era is that most of the "black" adopted children circulating through the agency in Montreal were mixed race, the offspring of liaisons between white women and black men. This narrative of doomed interracial romance certainly fuelled media interest in and public representations of needy black children, especially as interracial dating was emerging as an issue of civil rights. Yet, even as adopting a black child was becoming an act of goodwill, giving birth to one signified immorality.[57] White women with black boyfriends and those same scandalized parents produced about a third of Montreal's adopted black children. Of course, when the public face of interracial adoption was the mixed-race child, white adoptive parents found another claim upon which to base their parenthood. In all of this, however, almost no one saw the extraordinary struggles of black birth mothers (of whom there were twice as many); many of them assisted immigrant domestics, newly arrived from the West Indies. The very existence of a global black underclass in Canada complicated our beloved national narrative of anti-conquest; no wonder their tale has been eclipsed by feel-good stories about the rescue of their children.

Despite what a Montreal social worker described as a "strong cultural need" among West Indian women to keep their children – ironically in this instance because the unmarried mother in question arrived at the agency having survived a botched abortion – half of my sample of black women in Montreal did not keep their children, and opted instead for adoption. This is despite that black birth mothers were generally encouraged by social workers to plan to keep their child, advice rarely dispensed to white women. Usually, this took the form of repeatedly warning them that their child – particularly if "full Negro" – would fare poorly in the adoption system and might stay in the foster system indefinitely. Even during the high point of integrationist fervour in Montreal, when interracial adoption activism seemed everywhere, pregnant black women considering adoption were told they should wait until after birth to decide, when "the full force of her emotional feelings will have a different meaning to her."[58] Hundreds of case files later, I simply cannot imagine a young unwed white woman of the era hearing this. Black women, such as the twenty-two-year-old Barbadian who arrived in Canada pregnant and who wanted neither single parenthood nor even marriage because, as she said, "people in the West Indies get married too early," often had to fight their way into the adoption system.[59] Too much social welfare for some, too little for others; this is one of the great paradoxes of the child welfare system historically.

These varied experiences of birth mothers point toward fundamental distinctions in the discourses of adoption in different communities. These differences include vastly contrasting circumstances of adoption, differently motivated adoptive parents, and different agency practices. All of these suggest a different cultural and political understanding of the meaning of race as applied to different racialized groups.

Most Aboriginal children experienced the ragged edges of adoption practice: multiple placements, at an older age. Two or three placements in foster care was average, and as many as six was in no way unusual. The high number of apprehensions, of course, also determined a very different pattern of adoption: adopted Native children were older, and often more than one child was involved and many siblings were separated. Montreal's black children were spared most of these problems.

There were also fundamental differences in the demographic profile, motivation, and politics of adoptive parents, all of which produced different cultural milieus for adopted children. To simplify, the typical destination for a black adopted children was a middle-class family, headed by a teacher or an engineer, in Montreal's West Island suburbs. Native kids were adopted by families headed by electricians in small-town Ontario or small businessmen in rural Minnesota. Also to simplify: secular humanism became the idiom of Montreal's adoptive parents. They described themselves as "freethinkers," "internationalists," or "rebels at heart." One mother was described by her social worker as "inclined to get on a soapbox."[60] Social workers looked for signs – generally expressed in what we might now call the language of therapy or personal growth – that parents understood interracial adoptions were different from same-race adoptions. "I went into their attitudes towards Negroes quite fully with them and found they did not have the strength," wrote one social worker of a couple she rejected. Wrote another, approvingly: "They have the necessary streak of independence and unorthodoxy, they are not concerned about what other people think."[61]

In the case of Aboriginal-adopting parents, it was more common to hear religious, rather than secular, motivations. Adopting an Indian child, explained a Presbyterian couple from West Virginia, was possible only because they had attained sufficient "faith." A Baptist couple in North Carolina had recently undergone a religious conversion, which, as they described it, saved their marriage and started them thinking about adoption. "Their recent success in business and recent discovery of Christ made them feel strongly that they need to share what they have with an Indian child," their social worker explained, approvingly.[62]

Perhaps the greatest difference in these stories is how race was conceptualized. Here we see both similarities and differences, and I do not want to overstate either. Culturally shared ideas about what I call the "racelessness of babies" was alluring and no doubt comforting for many adoptive parents

as they contemplated their voyage across the chasm of race in North America. "Both parents agreed they were not adopting a child of native background but a human being," wrote one social worker.[63] "You've got to accept them as babies and forget about the rest," declared a Montreal mother of two black children.[64] To aid in this forgetting, some adoptive parents tried to reimagine their black child's bodies as white, likening their skin, for example, to a tan. The belief that children had mutable racial beliefs and boundaries – that "children have no prejudice" – is obvious in these debates about interracial adoption but also evident in this era in discussions of desegregation in the American South, for example, where it was believed that "children were particularly vulnerable to the effects of integration."[65] It's not surprising, therefore, that people who believed themselves to be behaving honourably, as I think white adoptive parents did, found some solace, at least temporarily, in race transcendence. It's more interesting that some, especially parents of black children, did not and instead attempted to raise racially conscious children. And this stemmed from politics; the different ways in which adoption and race were imagined by various protagonists.

Montreal's Open Door Society quickly outgrew its origins as a white parent support group and became an active civil rights organization, dedicated to a unifying politic of adoption. This group maintained for almost twenty years an extensive international communications network, lobbied governments, and organized international conferences. Most significantly, it worked with Montreal's black community to promote civil rights and teach black history and culture. It helped to organize a school for black children of white parents, taught by blacks; members held workshops in black beauty salons to learn how to care for their children's hair, they maintained a library of multiracial children's literature, they organized community Christmas parties and picnics at Montreal's Negro Community Centre. Members also maintained an unusually close association with the Children's Service Centre, the Montreal adoption agency. They became, effectively, part of the screening process, as parents considering cross-racial adoption were directed by the agency to attend Open Door Society functions and read its literature. Probing the race consciousness and politics of prospective parents became part of the casework at this agency, and it constantly encouraged parents to "stretch" – a favourite social work word.

So in these various ways, something like a community of interracial adoption was created in and around Montreal. This community believed that the families they had created through adoption embodied the possibility of racial equality. The social meaning of "blackness" and "race" were fluid and certainly non-unanimously understood, but notions such as "race pride"; respect for black knowledge, history, and culture; and the importance of relations with other black people were paramount. The force, and uniqueness, of this community of interracial adoption was evident particularly in contrast

to other communities with other politics. For years, Open Door Society parents in Montreal received requests from anxious American white adoptive parents who wondered which US hotels and restaurants might welcome mixed-race families, and even which US cities had integrated neighbourhoods. In the early 1970s, during a period of highly contested adoption politics, a black social work consultant from Missouri approached the group, offering his services to educate white adoptive parents. He was politely rebuffed, the group noting that it had already had such an education program in place for several years and had no trouble finding speakers from Montreal's black community. It encouraged him "to continue to offer services to parent groups in the US."[66] On one rare occasion, a kidnap narrative was voiced by a Canadian black organization, in an article critical of transracial adoption first published in the *Village Voice,* then reprinted in *Contrast* in 1972. The Open Door Society's letter to the editor extolling the virtues of how transracial adoption was practised in Canada was printed with a polite note: "Your points are sincerely well taken."[67] Again, the United States functioned as Canada's racial foil, to reflect back multicultural tolerance.

For all the reasons I have explored, there was little sense of a community of interracial adoption created around Manitoba's Aboriginal children. They were widely disbursed geographically, often in rural areas and small towns. While individual families may have aligned themselves with adoption advocacy groups, there was no Open Door Society equivalent operating in Manitoba.[68] Adoptive parents never spoke with one voice (in Montreal or in Manitoba), but the defensiveness of some white parents of Aboriginal children is striking. A Brandon-based group of adoptive parents testifying at the Kimelman Inquiry in 1985, for example, rebuffed the arguments of Aboriginal spokespeople as "making the issue into a racial confrontation."[69] The institutional practices of agencies working with prospective adoptive parents of Aboriginal children were extremely different. Social workers rarely engaged prospective parents in extended discussions on racial identity or racism. Indeed, in many case files, race was barely mentioned, and when it was, it was simply another way of saying "appearance." Parents might explain, for example, that they were willing to adopt an Aboriginal child because others in the family had dark hair or a swarthy complexion, and thus the child would not feel different. If the idiom of Montreal was that the parents should "stretch," in Manitoba the favoured phrase was that the children should "fit in." An adoptive father declared his intention to send his son to Boy Scouts and Sunday school in order to "learn to mix with White children at a young age, so he could function effectively in White society."[70] In this climate, it is not surprising that discussions of race pride and consciousness could take superficial forms. Were the parents who dressed their child in an Indian chief costume for a party and explained this to their social worker as an example of pride in heritage typical? It's difficult to know, for

the discussion of this topic, among my sample of social workers and adoptive parents at least, was barely audible. In a perceptive reflection on the "Sixties Scoop," adoption scholar Raven Sinclair has argued that it's not just that the occasional weekend foray to a powwow was an insufficient basis for cultural learning. The issue is that such idealized versions of Aboriginal culture do not square with the rest of life. "What the adoptee may not know," writes Sinclair, "is that they are not seeing Aboriginal culture; they are seeing the vestiges of colonization and a neo-colonial society's construction of Aboriginal culture."[71] But who was going to explain that?

As comforting as the "haven from racism" model might be to Canadian sensibilities, these different moments of adoption politics in this country suggest that how one imagines children, race, and racial hierarchies is more significant than where. The differences in perceptions of black and Aboriginal transracial adoptions cannot be accounted for solely by a "progressive" record on the one hand, and a "failure" on the other. How can black children in white families be bearers of reconciliation, but Aboriginal children in white families be monuments to colonialism? Perhaps the problem lies in the inherent instabilities of using symbolic children to gauge, illuminate, and solve adult social problems?

Acknowledgment

Thanks to Susan Belyea, Karen Dyck, Roberta Hamilton, Scott Rutherford, and Barrington Walker for their help with this work. Thanks also to the editors of this volume for their help and their patience.

Notes

1 Judith Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 21. On the symbolic links between women, gender, and nation, see also Anne McLintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

2 Elizabeth Chin, "Children Out of Bounds in Globalising Times," *Postcolonial Studies* 6, 3 (2003): 312. See also Jo Boyden, "Childhood and the Policy Makers: A Comparative Perspective on the Globalization of Childhood," in Allison James and Alan Prout, eds., *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood* (New York: Falmer Press, 1990), 184-215.

3 Patrick Johnston, *Native Children and the Child Welfare System* (Toronto: Canadian Council on Social Development, 1983), 23, takes the phrase the "Sixties Scoop" from a self-reflective BC social worker, herself a participant in the removal of Native children from their communities, on what she later referred to as "the slightest pretext." Other important commentaries on the politics of Aboriginal adoption in Canada are Margaret Ward, *The Adoption of Native Canadian Children* (Cobalt: Highway Book Shop, 1984); Brad McKenzie and Pete Hudson, "Native Children, Child Welfare, and the Colonization of Native People," in Kenneth L. Levitt and Brian Warf, eds., *The Challenge of Child Welfare* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1985), 125-41; Suzanne Fournier and Ernie Crey, *Stolen from Our Embrace: The Abduction of First Nations Children and the Restoration of Aboriginal Communities* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1997); Patricia A. Monture, "A Vicious Circle: Child Welfare and the First Nations," *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 3, 1 (1989): 1-17; Geoffrey York, *The Dispossessed: Life and Death in Native Canada* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1990); Christopher Bagley, "Adoption of Native Children in Canada: A Policy Analysis and a Research Report," in Howard Alstein and Rita Simon, eds., *Intercountry Adoption: A Multinational Perspective* (New York: Praeger, 1991), 55-79; Marie Adams, *Our Son a Stranger: Adoption Breakdown and Its*

Effects on Parents (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002); Shandra Spears, "Strong Spirit, Fractured Identity: An Ojibway Adoptee's Journey to Wholeness," in Bonita Lawrence and Kim Anderson, eds., *Strong Women Stories* (Toronto: Sumach Press, 2003), 81-94.

4 E.C. Kimelman, *No Quiet Place: Review Committee on Indian and Métis Adoptions and Placements* (Winnipeg: Manitoba Department of Community Services, 1985).

5 Winona LaDuke, Forward to Bartholomew Dean and Jerome M. Levi, eds., *At the Risk of Being Heard: Identity, Indigenous Rights and Postcolonial States* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003), x.

6 Kenn Richard, "On the Matter of Cross-Cultural Aboriginal Adoptions," in Ivan Brown, Ferzana Chaze, Don Fuchs, Jean Lafrance, Sharon Mckay, and Shelley Thomas-Prokop, eds., *Putting a Human Face on Child Welfare: Voices from the Prairies* (Regina: Prairie Child Welfare Consortium, 2007), 189.

7 See, for example, Renate Andres, "The Apprehension of Native Children," *Ontario Indian* 4, 4 (1981): 32-46; McKenzie and Hudson, "Native Children, Child Welfare," 137. On the campaign for the Indian Child Welfare Act in the United States, see Laura Briggs, "Communities Resisting Interracial Adoption: The Indian Child Welfare Act and the NABSW Statement of 1972" (paper presented at the Adoption and Culture Conference, Tampa, Florida, October 2005).

8 Karen Dubinsky, "We Adopted a Negro: Interracial Adoption and the Hybrid Baby in 1960s Canada," in M. Fahrni and R. Rutherdale, eds., *Creating Postwar Canada: Community, Diversity and Dissent, 1945-75* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008), 268-88.

9 At the same moment in Sweden, some of the first formal mechanisms of international adoption were created, which also confirmed to their proponents Sweden's egalitarian ideology. See Barbara Yngvesson, "'Un Niño de Cualquier Color': Race and Nation in Inter-Country Adoption," in Jane Jenson and Boaventura de Sousa Santos, eds., *Globalizing Institutions: Case Studies in Regulation and Innovation* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2000), 182.

10 Claude Rose, "Should White Parents Adopt Colored Babies?" *Coronet,* December 1964: 42.

11 Jane Armstrong, "A Canadian Haven for Black U.S. Babies," *Globe and Mail,* 1 October 2005. See also the response by Karen Balcom and Karen Dubinsky, "Babies across Borders," *Globe and Mail,* 13 October 2005.

12 Ellen Herman, "Modern Culture and the Many Meanings of Adoption," keynote address, Conference on Adoption and Culture, University of Tampa, 17-20 November 2005.

13 Sara K. Dorow, *Transnational Adoption: A Cultural Economy of Race, Gender and Kinship* (New York: NYU Press, 2006), 55-56.

14 Brad Evenson, "The Sixties Scoop," *Calgary Herald,* 19 April 1998.

15 "I deliberately chose to downplay his warning, not because I believed he was necessarily wrong, but because I had faith in the current belief that the environment was more important in the upbringing of all children. His comments still haunt me." Adams, *Our Son a Stranger,* 104.

16 Brad Evenson, "The Sixties Scoop," *Calgary Herald,* 19 April 1998.

17 This work is based on a 20 percent sample of case files from the Montreal Children's Service Centre between 1956 and 1969 (approximately eight hundred cases) and a 13 percent sample of the extant files of the (former) Manitoba Children's Aid Society, from 1961 to 1980.

18 Charles Saunders, *Share the Care: The Story of the Nova Scotia Home for Coloured Children* (Halifax: Nimbus, 1994), 138.

19 The figures are as follows: total number of children placed outside Manitoba, 4,824; total within Canada, 3,649; total placed in the United States, 1,149; total outside North America, 16. Of these placements, 274 were Caucasian, 170 were of unknown racial origin, the rest were Aboriginal or Métis. Manitoba Department of Family Services, "Out of Province Adoptions," internal report, 2004.

20 Suzanne Fournier and Ernie Crey report the following national statistical trend: in 1959, Native children represented 1 percent of children "in care"; by 1969, this figure had climbed to between 30 and 40 percent. Fournier and Crey, *Stolen from Our Embrace,* 83. See also Canada, *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples,* vol. 3, *Gathering Strength* (Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1996), 24-26; and Marlee Kline, "Child Welfare Law: Best Interests of the Child; Ideology and First Nations," *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 30 (1992): 375-426.

21 Another statistical survey of Aboriginal adoption in Manitoba found a higher rate. Using a list from the Department of Indian Affairs in Ottawa, Josette Lukowycz sampled ninety-five adoptions of Aboriginal children between the 1950s and 1984 and found that 80 percent were non-voluntary relinquishments. Josette Lukowycz, "An Exploratory Study of the Adoption of Indian Children in Manitoba" (MA thesis, University of Manitoba, 1985), 48.
22 Ardith Walkem, "Calling Forth Our Future: Options for the Exercise of Indigenous Peoples' Authority in Child Welfare" (Vancouver: Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, 2002), 9. See also the various articles in D. Memee Lavell-Harvard and Jeannette Corbiere Lavell, eds., *"Until Our Hearts Are on the Ground": Aboriginal Mothering, Oppression, Resistance and Rebirth* (Toronto: Demeter Press, 2006).
23 All citations from Manitoba Children's Aid Society Case Files (hereafter cited as CAS file).
24 Claudia Fonseca, "Patterns of Shared Parenthood among the Brazilian Poor," in Toby Alice Volkman, ed., *Cultures of Transnational Adoption* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 157. This point has also been made by commentators on Aboriginal adoption; see Pauline Turner Strong, "To Forget Their Tongue, Their Name, and Their Whole Relation: Captivity, Extra-Tribal Adoption, and the Indian Child Welfare Act," in Sarah Franklin and Susan McKinnon, eds., *Relative Values: Reconfiguring Kinship Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 468-94.
25 CAS file.
26 Boyden, "Childhood and the Policy Makers," 184-215; Erica Burman, "Local, Global or Globalized? Child Development and International Child Rights Legislation," *Childhood* 3, 45 (1996): 45-66.
27 CAS file.
28 Ibid.
29 In a particularly tragic example, children were given instead to an adoptive family that used torture, sexual and physical, as discipline. CAS file.
30 CAS file.
31 Drew Hayden Taylor, *Someday* (Saskatoon: Fifth House, 1993), 14.
32 Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2005).
33 In 1973, the director of the Adoption Resource Exchange of North America (ARENA, an extension of the Indian Adoption Project, which promoted cross-border and cross-racial placements) underlined that "since the Indian people have the same resistance to their children being placed transracially as the Blacks, we continue to use the resources of ARENA to make known the need for Indian families." Karen Balcom, *The Traffic in Babies: Cross-Border Adoption, Baby-Selling and Child Welfare in the United States and Canada, 1930-1972* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, forthcoming), 451.
34 "Good Intentions Not Enough!" *Akswesasne Notes,* Early Summer 1974, 41. Resolutions calling for Aboriginal control over the child welfare system were passed by the National Association of Native Women and the Indian Homemakers Association of BC in 1974. "Native Women Exhorted to Become More Active," *Thunder Bay Chronicle Journal* 26 (August 1974); Walkem, "Calling Forth Our Future," 15.
35 Nancy Janovicek, "Assisting Our Own: Urban Migration, Self-Governance, and Native Women's Organizing in Thunder Bay, Ontario, 1972-1989," *American Indian Quarterly* 27, 3-4 (2003): 548-64.
36 See, for example, the "Today's Child" column in the *Toronto Native Times,* which ran in the mid-1970s.
37 Scott Rutherford, "Canada's Other Red Scare: The Anicinabe Park Occupation, Indigenous Radicalism and the Circulation of Global Culture and Politics, 1965-1975" (PhD dissertation, Queen's University, n.d.).
38 "Another Native People Lose Their Children," *Akwesasne Notes,* Early Summer 1975, 26.
39 "Department of Social Services Steals Children," *New Breed,* September 1975.
40 Library and Archives Canada, RG 146, RCMP files, Native People's Friendship Delegation, vol. 1, 14.
41 *New Breed,* November-December 1975.
42 The most complete account of the Indian Child Welfare Act campaign is found in Steven Unger, "The Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978: A Case Study" (PhD dissertation, University

of Southern California, 2004). See also Laura Briggs, "Communities Resisting Interracial Adoption: The Indian Child Welfare Act and the NABSW Statement of 1972" (paper presented at the Adoption and Culture Conference, Tampa, Florida, October 2005.)

43 Patrick Johnston, *Native Children and the Child Welfare System* (Toronto: Canadian Council on Social Development, 1983), 90; Renate Andres, "The Apprehension of Native Children," *Ontario Indian* 4, 4 (1981): 32-46; and McKenzie and Hudson, "Native Children, Child Welfare," 137.

44 Veronica Strong-Boag, *Finding Families, Finding Ourselves: English Canada Confronts Adoption from the Nineteenth Century to the 1990s* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2006), 169.

45 Review Committee on Indian and Métis Adoptions and Placements, *Transcripts and Briefs* (Winnipeg: Manitoba Community Services, 1985), 15.

46 Review Committee, *Transcripts and Briefs,* 464.

47 Fournier and Crey, *Stolen from Our Embrace,* 89. The "foreign car" is shorthand for a globalized fear. See, for example, Luis White, "Cars Out of Place: Vampires, Technology and Labor in East and Central Africa," *Representations* 43 (Summer 1993): 27-50; Abigail Adams, "Gringas, Ghouls and Guatemala: The 1994 Attacks on North American Women Accused of Body Organ Trafficking," *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 4, 1 (1999): 112-33.

48 Maureen Brosnahan, "Child Export for Adoption Riles Natives," *Winnipeg Free Press,* 4 March 1982.

49 Mary Ann Fitzgerald, "Judge to Review Native Adoptions," *Winnipeg Free Press,* 13 March 1982. One of the dramatically failed Louisiana placements, the story of the Gott children, is explored in Colleen Rajotte's documentary series "Confronting the Past." See http://www.rajottedocs.com.

50 Raven Sinclair, "All My Relations: Native Transracial Adoption; A Critical Case Study of Cultural Identity" (PhD dissertation, University of Calgary, 2007), 258.

51 CAS file.

52 Strong-Boag, *Finding Families, Finding Ourselves,* 138.

53 CAS file.

54 See, for example, Strong-Boag, *Finding Families, Finding Ourselves;* Ricki Solinger, *Beggars and Choosers: How the Politics of Choice Shapes Adoption, Abortion and Welfare in the United States* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001); Barbara Melosh, *Strangers and Kin: The American Way of Adoption* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); and Julie Berebitsky, *Like Our Very Own: Adoption and the Changing Culture of Motherhood, 1851-1950* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2000).

55 See Ann Fessler's sensitive collection of interviews with birth mothers, *The Girls Who Went Away: The Hidden History of Women Who Surrendered Children for Adoption in the Decades before Roe v. Wade* (New York: Penguin, 2006).

56 CAS file.

57 Renee C. Romano, *Race Mixing: Black-White Marriage in Post War America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003), 75.

58 Montreal Children's Service Centre Case File (hereafter cited as CSC file).

59 Ibid.

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid.

62 CAS file.

63 CSC file.

64 Chris Davies, "Society Discusses Aims and Problems," *Lakeshore News,* 2 June 1960.

65 Romano, *Race Mixing,* 161.

66 Open Door Society correspondence files, 1972.

67 "Article Considered Disservice," *Contrast,* 2 February 1973.

68 Project Opikihiwawin, a group of adoptive parents of Aboriginal children, started in Winnipeg in 1979.

69 Review Committee, Michael Malazdrewicz, Westman Adoptive Parent Group, *Transcripts and Briefs,* 12.

70 CAS file.

71 Raven Sinclair, "Identity Lost and Found: Lessons from the Sixties Scoop," *First Peoples Child and Family Review* 3, 1 (2007): 73.