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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to explore approaches to the study of the bureaucracy, records-keeping, and records of the Department of Indian Affairs (DIA) and its predecessors, from 1755-1950, within the framework of the policy of assimilation of the First Nations peoples of Canada. The thesis employs a "contextual" approach in its description of the organization and functioning of the DIA. First it discusses the writings of archivists who have called for the study of the context in which information is used to be at the heart of archival theory and practice. It proceeds to analyze the works of scholars who have written about the power of records to shape reality, specifically focusing on the DIA bureaucracy and the records it produced. In the nineteenth-century the DIA expanded from a small group of military officials to a large impersonal bureaucracy which eventually controlled many aspects of the lives of Canada's First Nations people. The evolution of the records-keeping methods, and records, of the DIA is described to demonstrate how they functioned within the department. Examples of how the records-keeping of the DIA was an integral part of the process of attempted assimilation are shown. The study concludes that archivists and historians have only started to explore this topic, although it can bring fruitful results. It is hoped that the thesis points out some interesting avenues of approach.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to my supervisor Dr. Tom Nesmith for his patience and guidance in the preparation of this thesis. I would also like to thank my parents for the gift of their time and encouragement. Thanks are also due to the University of Manitoba Graduate Fellowship Committee for financial assistance provided during the researching of this thesis, and to Queen's University at Kingston for the provision of workspace for the writing of some of the thesis. This manuscript is dedicated to my wife, Eileen, and our son, Xavier.
Introduction

This thesis explores the bureaucracy and records-keeping system of the Canadian Department of Indian Affairs (DIA) and its predecessors in relation to the attempted assimilation of the First Nations peoples of Canada. In Canada after Confederation, the major government agency responsible for relations with First Nations people was the DIA. The majority of its archival records are currently in the National Archives of Canada (NAC) in Record Group 10 (RG 10). The DIA's archival records are the single most important written record relating to Canada's Aboriginal people from the mid-nineteenth century to the present. First Nations Canadians interested in determining their band membership or in settling land claims, treaty negotiations, or questions of abuse or gross injustice have increasingly relied on them for the crucial information they need to re-establish their Nations as equals alongside the Euro-Canadian newcomers. The records of RG 10 are currently among the most intensely used records at the NAC. However, they were created by a bureaucracy that sought to eliminate Aboriginal cultural distinctiveness and absorb them into the general Canadian society. Recorded communication was an integral part of the process of assimilation and the archiving of these records aimed to preserve the record of this process. Archivists and historians have only occasionally studied the forces which lie at the heart of
records creation. They have rarely examined the bureaucratic and political context in which records are produced, although those at the forefront of archival theory have often indicated that only through such studies can the existing archival record be really understood.
Chapter 1
Approach and Theory

The thesis will employ a "contextual" approach in its description of DIA records-keeping practices in order to explain how they functioned within the social context and policy objectives of the DIA. It places the existing archival record in a particular framework of understanding. The DIA's highly centralized administration expanded over the nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries and extended its power into the lives of most of Canada's First Nations peoples. In the late 1820s the keeping of organized records in letterbooks was introduced. Modern records-keeping practices such as these were a technological tool and weapon, at the very point of Euro-Canadian/Native contact, which the DIA employed to capture information used to inform the decision making process at the headquarters level, with the ultimate goal of controlling and shaping Aboriginal people. Understanding this process is critical to understanding the records in the boxes of RG 10.

The first half of Chapter 1 will discuss the writings of those who have called for archivists to place the study of the context in which information is created at the heart of archival theory and practice. It then examines the works of the writers who have heeded the call and contributed to this approach. The second part of the chapter will examine
what scholars have written about the power of records to shape reality, specifically focusing on the Indian Affairs bureaucracy, records-keeping, and records, and their relationship to First Nations people within the period of this study.

Archivists in the last two decades of the twentieth-century have debated which approach, or conceptual framework, would ensure that the archival record is best managed and most fully understood. The consensus that has emerged in Canada is that a "contextual approach", which examines the context in which information has been recorded (or the societal framework, the administrative structures and functions, and the documentary forms which shape information content) is the best method to deal with the volume and complexity of records created by bureaucracies, as opposed to an approach based on the informational content of the record largely divorced from the environment which created it. (1) The contextual approach focuses on the "provenance" of the records, which has been defined as "the origins, original purpose, and organic characteristics of documentation." (2) Proponents of this concept maintain that archival records are not self-contained, and that they are part of a larger group of documents, all of which exist within a historical context. This framework of understanding results in a deeper understanding of the record's meaning.
Archivist Terry Cook has emerged as one of the leading proponents of this approach and is acknowledged as Canada's leading contemporary thinker in the field of archival theory. It is largely though his writings that the concept took hold. Cook has been a central figure in the intellectual movement of the 1980s and 1990s that has been committed to "the rediscovery of provenance" in archives. (3) Provenance was "rediscovered" in North America in the late 1970s and 1980s when the weakness of library-style classification systems (which largely ignore the context of records creation) became increasingly apparent. Library subject classification (which also assumes identifiable subjects) had gradually come to dominate all archival functions and especially archival arrangement and description. Cook's core premise is that provenance is the only viable conceptual framework on which to base modern archival theory and practice. His writing has been an exploration of the application of provenance in many aspects of archival work, including appraisal, description and public programming. (4) Cook has demonstrated that provenance is not only the best way to approach the archival problems of our time, such as the ephemeral electronic record, but also that it will enable us to move beyond a traditional reading of the information contained in the records to new levels of understanding of what the records convey. This will be explained in the following pages.
Before the 1950s, the principle of provenance was not widely known in Canada, although European writers had elaborated many of its basic tenets over the previous century. During the last five decades fresh interpretations of the application of provenance gradually filtered into North America from Europe, and were generally accepted in principle -- but rarely applied adequately in actual archival practice. Starting in the late 1970s there was renewed interest in provenance. Archivists began to see it as a way to deal with the emerging archival problems of volume (the growth and variety of records) and their increasing computerization. The Canadian debate in print seems to have begun in earnest when the Association of Canadian Archivists broke away from the Canadian Historical Association and founded its own journal, Archivaria. Cook and other Canadian archivists began to use the pages of the journal as a forum to debate archival theory. Cook's article "The Tyranny of the Medium," published in 1979-80, is one of his earliest articulations of the changes he believed that archives would have to make in order to prosper in the future. It was written as part of a debate with fellow archivist Andrew Birrell, who defended the existence of the NAC's separate media divisions -- such as the National Photography Collection.

Cook believed that this fragmentation of the record was
dangerous and essentially unarchival. Although he did not object to the practice of acquiring all media types, he did think that acquiring them in an uncoordinated fashion by separate media units would only further divide and undermine the integrity of the archival record. In Cook's opinion

the essential contextual information about the records was being eroded by continuing the media divisions. His solution to the problem was "to integrate all media more tightly into an archival whole, in place of the present isolation," and restructure archives "consistent with the principles of provenance."(6)

Cook thought archivists had to break down existing administrative barriers and develop holistic approaches to the management of the records. Cook further expanded this concept in a 1981 article in which he stated that archival work must be organized around the need to understand and protect knowledge of creators rather than the medium in which they are cast.(8) Archivists must strive above all to understand and preserve the knowledge of the broad context which forms given records rather then focus their work on acquiring and understanding the particular media in which records are created, also this also has its place.

Archival educator Tom Nesmith has called the Cook-Birrell debate "a turning point in the rediscovery of provenance in Canadian archival thought."(9) In 1982,
Nesmith took up the torch in his own writing with "Archives from the Bottom Up: Social History and Archival Scholarship." The article explained how the new emphasis on social history had changed the relationship between historians and archivists. The increasing interest of historians in social history led them to diversify their subject interests. They turned toward a wide array of voluminous and complex institutional and other records in scattered archives. This meant that historians (and other users of archives) needed much more knowledge of how these records had been created if they were to locate and understand the information they sought. This opened a new scholarly role for archivists in the study of the history of recorded communication. And, borrowing from the social historians, Nesmith thought such study should take the societal context of the records creation into account. (10) Nesmith argued that study of records creation in societal context was the foundation of archival scholarship and a scholarly niche which archivists could fill. (11) Two years later, Nesmith succinctly articulated the essence of this approach and stressed its importance by stating: "historical study of records is the cornerstone of the [archival] discipline...." and explained the role archivists must play in this study: "archivists must be historians -- historians of a certain kind, historians of records." (12)
Cook's writing in the 1980s clearly supported Nesmith and illustrated how his own approach evolved from that of a historian looking at archival records primarily for their informational content, to that of an archivist who treats the study of archives and records as a distinct field of intellectual inquiry which is closely related to other historical fields. Some of his ideas on this subject were outlined in the mid-1980s in "From Information to Knowledge: An Intellectual Paradigm for Archives," a response to an article by venerable Canadian archivist and archival theorist Hugh Taylor which contended that contemporary archivists, having been trapped in a "historical shunt", should leave behind their historical connections and recreate themselves as more present-minded records managers. Cook argued in reply that archives retain a profoundly historical orientation even though they also have a contemporary dimension and new techniques such as current records management had to be mastered. (13) He thought the techniques of analysis that historians use were essential to understanding the context of the creation archival records. Cook wrote that archivists need to maintain a close relationship with historians -- not, as in the past, in order to write particular varieties of scholarly histories on the subjects historians usually choose, but to facilitate the archivist's own study of records and archives. (14) Cook believed, for example, that there was much to be learned by
archivists and others about adjusting to the electronic age from studying the history of recorded communication of even ancient times. This study of the history of recording can be valuable not only to archivists but to other researchers in archives.(15)

Cook and Nesmith were not the first to suggest this to archivists in Canada, although they were perhaps the clearest and most articulate. Their writing came at a time when the principle of provenance was being debated anew. Previously published theory and application formed the foundation of their thoughts. Taylor himself used a short article in 1970 to plead with archivists to pay more attention to administrative history. In a lively piece written in typical "Tayloresque-style," he declared we are in the age of "instant" archives in which records appear to be well-organized and archivists knowledgeable about governmental organization and administration, but alas, he concluded, this may all be an illusion as archivists are often desperately trying to establish the "provenance" of the old records in their custody.(16) Taylor thought that there were two kinds of "administrative histories": the history of an administration (an internal study), and administrative history (how the internal workings of a department affected the public). Taylor believed the latter was more difficult, but that the first was most important
for archivists.

Perhaps even greater inspiration came from English historian M. T. Clanchy, whose book *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066-1307* (1979), is one of the finest studies of the context of the creation of written communication published in English. In the period 1066-1307, England experienced a fundamental shift from an almost exclusive reliance on oral communication to a much greater dependence on the written word. At the beginning of the era, oral communication was dominant and written records rare and suspect. By the end of this period the written record was ubiquitous and trusted at the highest levels of society and in the courts. Complex social and intellectual adjustments needed to be made to accommodate this change in society's means of communication. Interestingly, this shift is not unlike the current one from paper to electronic records, although it occurred over centuries, not decades. For the way his insights can guide our understanding of the transition to computerization, Clanchy's *From Memory to Written Record* and his Archivaria article "'Tenacious Letters': Archives and Memory in the Middle Ages" (1980-81), are impressive works of scholarship which showed what could be accomplished with a history of the record approach.

In "'P' Pen and Plough' at Ontario Agricultural College,
1874-1910" (1984-85), an examination of the efforts of rural educators at the Ontario Agricultural College, near Guelph, to persuade farmers to depend more fully on recorded communication to improve their productivity and social standing, Nesmith wrote a study of the historical context in which documents were made and used in order to study society and inform archival work. He found that rural educators at the college argued that through the very process of recording and using agricultural information Ontario farmers would enjoy greater intellectual, social, and economic power. In the article he concluded: "We require detailed studies of the relationships between the particular historical context in which various categories of documentation evolved and the specific characteristics of the documents." According to Nesmith it can then be determined how and why certain documents appear, evolve and disappear in historical contexts.(19)

Cook, too, considered an emphasis on social history essential to the archivist in order to flesh out the provenance of the record, but he has also emphasized intellectual history.(20) As he explained in 1981, Cook believes that intellectual history is "essential not only for the historian, but also for the archivist," if they want to understand the societal context of the creation of records, and so their full provenance.(21) In Cook's opinion
the ultimate reason for an archivist to establish the provenance of a record is not simply to discover the identity of the person or office which produced it, but also to try to understand the much larger themes of a society. Intellectual history also seeks to explain these themes which include the ideological paradigms and the nature of truth in a society. (22)

During the 1980s the arguments of Cook and others convinced the archival community in Canada to accept the primacy of the concept of provenance. A critical contribution to this was also made in 1986 by Americans Richard Lytle and David Bearman. In an article published in Archivaria they explained that archivists must use their knowledge of "how organizations, create, use, and discard information" to understand recorded evidence in context and to use it as a powerful means of information retrieval. Archivists, they said, should translate the subject queries researchers present into questions about organizational activity. Archivists should use function and form of material as access points in a retrieval system. (23) Lytle and Bearman believed that knowledge of the records creator's functions can direct us to the records of the agency (or department) which created the information sought, and that knowledge of the documentary forms can be used to find the specific document which carries the desired information. (24)
It is up to the archivist as a historian of recorded communication to research and explain the contextual provenance information which enables this to occur.

Cook took this advice, and along with his own ideas on provenance, applied them to archival subjects in several highly illustrative articles. In "Tyranny of the Medium" Cook was critical of map collections used primarily to demonstrate cartographic techniques or document works of individual cartographers. In his "A Reconstruction of the World: George Parkin's British Empire Map of 1893" (1984), Cook examined a turn of the century map of the British Empire commissioned by Canadian imperialist George Parkin. Cook went much further in his analysis of the map than limited conventional cartographic concerns. He studied its context and provenance to reveal the thoughts and values underlying the creation of the map. Parkin was a leading advocate of the "New Imperialism". In 1893 the map he produced stressed the power of the British Empire and Canada's central place in it. (25) Cook concluded that the map was "less a scientific presentation of geographic facts than a skilful manipulation of those facts to support a political program." (26) "A Reconstruction of the World" succinctly details the richness of a single archival document, and how its story can only be shown by a thorough study of its provenance.
In the late 1980s, Cook published important articles which remain his best application of provenance to a set of records. He focused on the Canadian Department of the Interior (DI), which was created in 1873 and abolished in 1936. Cook examined two important archival themes. "Legacy in Limbo: An Introduction to the Records of the Department of the Interior" (1987) was an attempt to understand the organization and the "administrative context" of the DI's records (27). "Paper Trails: A Study in Northern Records and Northern Administration, 1898-1958" (1989) was an in-depth study of the records-keeping in the Department of the Interior, specifically the department's northern affairs administration.(28) In "Legacy in Limbo" Cook outlined the administrative history of the department and mentioned its records-keeping system. From its beginning Interior abandoned the "docket-letterbook" system, which placed "incoming" letters in separate "dockets" for each one, and scattered copies of "outgoing" correspondence elsewhere across various "letterbooks". Cook maintained this system was well suited to the needs of a nineteenth-century "laissez-faire" administration, but was unable to cope with those of a modern interventionist government. A "subject file" system was later adopted which had the great advantage of keeping all the information on a single subject on a single file and thus single access point.(29) Cook saw a link between this records-keeping system and the
effectiveness of the bureaucracy in implementing its programs. (30) He believed it was important to examine this type of information, and speculated about "the very power of records-keeping systems as active, often biased agents of change instead of mere passive, neutral carriers of information." (31) In other words Cook suggested that a records-keeping system could actually limit or conversely significantly facilitate how well an agency worked.

Cook continued this line of thought in "Paper Trails," one of the best contextual studies of archival records written in Canada, one which expressly focuses on DI's records-keeping systems. Some of the same ground as "Legacy in Limbo" was covered, though in "Paper Trails" Cook went into more detail. Cook maintained that interventionist government needed "subject files" to be effective, and that the whole organization changed to adjust to the massive paper flow it began to receive. The adoption of "subject-block" systems by some of the DI's successor agencies in the 1950s, including the DIA, allowed them even more flexibility to respond quickly or formulate policy by bringing subject files together as needed. This is precisely the period in which the federal government began to intervene in the far north. A less effective system would have greatly hampered or changed the operations of federal departments. Cook showed how changes in the records-keeping system reflected
the differing mandates of the DI: "The early system not only reflected, but encouraged limited regulatory government whereas the new underlay active, interventionist administration."(32) He concluded that "records are not neutral forces" but part of a department's development "often shaping and restraining it." Cook believed that the creation of records, not just the information in the records, was worthy of study.(33) His look at the DI's records tells us a great deal about the records of the department entirely outside any examination of their contents, or the information they contain.(34)

Other archivists followed Cook's lead. One of the finest studies of the context of records creation during this period is Bill Russell's "The White Man's Paper Burden: Aspects of Records Keeping in the Department of Indian Affairs, 1860-1914," (1984-85) which won the W. Kaye Lamb Prize for the best Archivaria article of 1985. It deals with the records of the DIA and RG 10. It examines their origin as administrative documents and then traces the path they followed into the NAC.(35) The last decades of the nineteenth century witnessed the evolution of the modern Canadian industrial state and its bureaucracy. As this bureaucracy expanded it was forced to change to cope with the explosion of paper documentation it produced, or what Russell termed its "paper burden," but which was also
conversely its bloodstream and "memory," a concept he borrowed from J. E. Hodgett's history of the DIA from Confederation until World War I. (36)

Russell's focus is the process by which the records of the DIA first came to be in the NAC. He begins with a general description of the records-keeping systems which were employed by the department and its predecessors from the early nineteenth-century "docket-letterbook" to the long enduring "Red" and "Black" series of filing systems. These series were introduced in the DIA just before the explosion of paper in the 1870s, when the correspondence the department handled increased over one hundred percent. As more and more paper piled up, the officials of the department became increasingly conscious of their role as guardians of what they believed to be the sole recorded heritage of a "vanishing" people. The notion that these records had historical value came to the forefront at the turn of the nineteenth century when the DIA realized it was experiencing storage problems and some sort of "disposition" plan was necessary. Because the department was unwilling to destroy many records (something which had been done in some other branches of government) the DIA's interests coincided with those of the young NAC (then known as the Public Archives of Canada). In 1907 the first of the DIA's records was transferred to the archives, and by 1914 a formal
"disposition" plan had been made. Russell concluded that one way the DIA responded to the paper explosion it faced was by transferring the old records which it wanted to preserve to the archives. Interestingly, Russell concludes that the DIA archived its records because it thought this would protect evidence of the benevolent treatment by Euro-Canadians of Native people and their progress toward "civilization".

By the 1990s, Canadian archivists, following the lead of Cook and others, had firmly re-established, and indeed recast, the idea of provenance as the basic tenet of archival theory. They revised the concept of provenance from a limited notion centred on identifying the originator of the records and providing very basic administrative and biographical information about the originator to an expanded view which encompassed the broad context of the creation of the records or of the societal, administrative/functional, documentary, and records-keeping contexts in which information is recorded. These archivists showed that they could explore provenance as historians of records and contribute valuable and stimulating original research on records creation and records-keeping. The articles of Cook and Russell remain two of the best histories of the records-keeping systems of Canadian government bureaucracies. They are fundamental to any further archival study of the DI and
the DIA. They clearly focus on the provenance of the record, and they reflect the view that an archivist is a type of historian, not a historian dealing with standard historical themes, but one who writes the history of the context of records creation -- that is of provenance.

Cook's and Russell's articles have influenced both the contextual approach adopted in this thesis and its particular subject. Cook, especially in "Paper Trails", suggested that records-keeping systems could shape a bureaucracy. Russell in "The White Man's Paper Burden" explained that the officials of the DIA wished to preserve their records in archives because of the "historical importance" of the record. Russell says the DIA bureaucrats believed the records showed how their wards were being "civilized" or assimilated into Canadian society. This thesis goes further to show that the records-keeping practices of the department were actually active participants in this process. In a sense it turns Cook's idea, that records can shape an organization, on its head to say that records can also shape an organization's understanding of its clients, and thus their very lives. In order to do this, the ideas of other writers who have also written about bureaucracy, records, and how these interacted with First Nations people, will be examined.
American archivist Michael Lutzker wrote that archivists need a basic framework of analysis to understand how and why records are created and that this might be provided by examining bureaucratic theory. He wrote that: "we must examine the most appropriate analytical studies of the administrative process for the light they can shed on the significance of those records." (38). Lutzker followed this advice by examining the ideas of German-born Max Weber, the first prominent theorist to examine modern bureaucracy. Weber studied bureaucratic structures in both Germany and the United States, and realized that they were fundamentally different from those existing from ancient times. He defined the new bureaucracies as hierarchical, impersonal, centralized, machine-like, and created to be efficient, speedy, and precise. Weber wrote that they characteristically follow rules, have divisions of labour, areas of responsibility, and rewards, all of which necessitate that written instructions be created and detailed records kept. (39) Although these ideas have been widely accepted, Weber's exclusion of non-rational factors in bureaucratic behavior has attracted the criticism of many. Lutzker believed that we can build on the ideas of Weber in order to deal with records in a more perceptive manner.

The theoretical framework of Weber was built upon by
Americans Alfred Chandler and James Beniger. Chandler wrote in *The Visible Hand* (1977) that modern business activity is not just a response to market forces (the "invisible hand" of Adam Smith), but also a response to another powerful force at work (the "visible hand" of management). Chandler believed that contemporary American capitalism was born with the advent of railways which, because of their size and complexity, had to be divided into subdivisions run by professional managers. Over the course of the nineteenth-century this sort of organization spread to manufacturing, and then retailing and consumer goods. Chandler showed that the multi-unit business did not exist in 1840, but within the next decade banks and, most importantly, the railways adopted this form of organization. Telegraph and telephone businesses soon followed them. When these companies also began to distribute and retail goods they experienced rapid growth, to which managerial organization responded by becoming large, complex and hierarchical. He believed the managerial function was a major but ignored "...factor in the modernization of the American economy."(40) Chandler created an excellent framework for examining commercial and government bureaucratic structures.

Archivist Francis X. Blouin, Jr., in his review of Chandler in *The American Archivist* (1979), wrote that the book was not intended as a contribution to archival theory
but that it would assist archivists to understand the changing structure of business. (41) When Chandler explained how railways and manufacturers changed to advance their activities, he also indicated how the purpose and structure of records-keeping changed. At the start of the nineteenth-century records-keeping was relatively unsystematic, in most organizations, but because of the changing nature of business, according to Blouin's interpretation of Chandler, "Record keeping thus shifted from serving a descriptive function to serving as an analytical tool". (42) Blouin explained that for archivists the most important aspect of Chandler's study is the concept that as an organization changes the records-keeping system also changes, just as patterns of labour, capital, and management change. Chandler indicated that records can be seen to facilitate institutional development in two ways: as communications devices they expanded the geographical reach of modern institutions; and as analytical tools (to use Blouin's phrase) with the means of handling vast amounts of information they enabled institutions to pursue increasingly complex and ambitious purposes. And this, of course, is what the Canadian government was to do in Indian Affairs administration. As Blouin perceptively summed it up: "The study points to a clear relationship between organizational structure and record keeping (sic)". (43)
James Beniger, building on the work of Chandler, believed that, despite the pronouncements of "futurists" the "information revolution" in which we find ourselves is not a recent phenomenon. Indeed, as he wrote in The Control Revolution: Technological and Economic Origins of the Information Society (1986), he believed we are in the middle of a process which began in the 1830s -- the start of the true "information revolution". Beniger found that the increased size and productivity of American firms, and the great distances of the American continent, caused a "crisis of control" for business which was alleviated by applying "controls". He defined "control" as a piece of technology or procedure, such as improved communication, which facilitates or guides a business operation. (44) The most important of these "controls" was a formal bureaucracy, of the type defined at the turn of the century by Weber. In his analysis Beniger went beyond business, and speculated that the essence of this "revolution" consists of efforts at societal control on a global scale. (45)

Weber was the first to recognize that the Industrial Revolution had created a new more powerful bureaucracy than had existed before, but Beniger extended this analysis. He believed that bureaucracy filled the void when "face to face" communication broke down during the Industrial Revolution, but that society was able to start maintaining
"control" with information technology by 1870. Beniger thought it was no coincidence that during the period 1830 to 1923 most of the communication technologies we currently rely on were invented (though not yet perfected or accepted on a mass scale). The single most important technology was bureaucracy, which directed people towards impersonal goals and created rules and procedures to replace direct human contact. Bureaucracy is found in the ancient world, as Weber wrote, but for the first time it became extraordinarily large and powerful. In the period in question it exploded in size. For example the staff of the American government went from 700 employees in 1830 to 13,000 in 1880.

"Control" technology fundamentally changed how society dealt with information. As Beniger wrote, there are two ways in which information can be controlled: a) by decreasing the amount of information received ("rationalization"); or b) by increasing the amount of information that can be processed (the "computerization" of our time).(46) Bureaucracy developed procedures to control the information flow in both ways. For example, the development of standardized forms "rationalized" information, while more sophisticated filing systems could process more information. Communication technology (e.g., the telephone), which Beniger believed is steadily merging with information technology (e.g., the computer) also developed rapidly.
As the railway advanced across the continent it brought the telegraph, and the postal system. The telephone, radio, tape recorders, and phonographs followed. Although business led the way, Beniger tells us that the state was not slow to introduce these forms of communication into its own bureaucracy. Governments now could collect information from the "bottom" (agents), process it at the "top" (headquarters), and then assess (often statistically) progress towards institutional goals. If Chandler showed us that records-keeping changed with bureaucratic structure, Beniger provides the researcher with a theoretical framework in which to understand modern records-keeping systems. Both these authors' works are fundamental to approaching the records created by business or government departments such as the Canadian DIA. JoAnne Yates has built upon the work of Beniger by focusing on the rise of information processing technology (e.g., the typewriter) in the modern office and how it contributed to the effectiveness of organizational control. Yates clearly demonstrates the fruitfulness of this type of study. (47)

Sociologist Graham Lowe examined Canadian developments within the same context. (48) Lowe believed that, at the turn of the century, there was a major change in the bureaucracies of Canadian business and government. Lowe described how the one-room office evolved into the multi-
departmental organization where speed and efficiency were stressed. In the opening of the Prairie West, and the development of new resource industries, Lowe found the equivalent of Beniger's "crisis of control". Canadian offices were transformed in what he calls the "administrative revolution." Like Beniger and Yates he found that: "Control is perhaps the dominant theme in our discussion of how the framework of the modern office was forged."(49). This need for control created a mountain of paper. Managers, swamped by records, dealt with the situation by introducing new records-keeping techniques that enabled them to exercise more and more control.(50) Lowe concluded that archivists need to study the evolution of records-keeping systems to understand the records they administer. Lowe's writing confirmed that some of the ideas of American scholars who write on bureaucracy may be applied to the Canadian experience.

In recent decades scholars have established that the ultimate goal of the Department of Indian Affairs was to eliminate the distinct cultures of First Nations people through assimilation into Euro-Canadian society. The department used several tools to try and accomplish this assimilation: the reserves; the attempt to transform Indians into peasant farmers; the banning of religious ceremonies and prohibitions against the tribal system; and the
residential school system. These policies have been examined in depth by historians such as Olive Dickason, J. R. Miller, Sarah Carter, and John L. Tobias. They have examined the programs of assimilation administered by the DIA's bureaucracy but not the bureaucracy itself as a factor in this process.

Two sociologists, Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliott, have developed a framework to analyze the bureaucracy of the DIA within the context of post-colonial theory. They believed that it operated as an "internal colonial system," ostensibly to administer government policy and protect and assist First Nations people, but actually to control and dominate them for the purposes of the state. The bureaucracy of DIA acted in the "national interest" or in pursuit of its own "bureaucratic imperatives", but not for the Indians -- indeed it had an entirely different view of the world from that of First Nations people. Following the criteria set down by Weber, Fleras and Elliott believe that since Confederation the department has built a large bureaucracy and achieved administrative control by: a) reinforcing rules (going by the book); b) ensuring "proper" channels of communication (get it in writing); c) enforcing conformity (do not make waves); and d) developing an all pervasive hierarchy (go through proper channels). Indeed, the DIA bureaucracy has been labelled the "ideal-
typical" Weberian bureaucracy.(55) This structure attempted to ensure the submission and compliance of the Indians, although it did not always succeed and resistance did occur. After Confederation the DIA entered into all aspects of the lives of most of the Indians in Canada through the implementation of the Indian Act (1876), which legitimized the power of the DIA. This allowed the department to regulate, standardize, define, and bureaucratize relations between Canada and the First Nations.(56) In 1983 historian John L. Tobias summed up this process very well. By 1890, he wrote, the DIA was well on its way to making Canadian Indians "an administered people."(57)

The collection of information by the DIA was an integral part of this system. J. Rick Ponting, in 1986, described the importance of records to the First Nations/DIA relationship. He said that the flow of recorded information illustrated both literally and symbolically how power was distributed between the two.(58) However, the records-keeping of the department not only illustrated power relationships it was a substantial source of power on its own. Michel Foucault found that records and records-keeping began to be used as a form of domination in the eighteenth-century. Foucault wrote that the "accumulation of documents" and the "keeping of registers" and records could shape, track, categorize, and classify people for the purposes of
the state and the domination of individuals. Statistics began to be used to establish norms and averages and measure individuals against them. (59) He asserted that "one should look into these procedures of writing and registration...."

(60) Records and records-keeping cannot be considered to be neutral. They must be studied as active agents of the bureaucracies they serve. (61)

Writers such as Foucault have shown that communications do not just passively document an objective world, they construct and shape it and thus they help shape what later archivists and researchers can know about the past. This construction is done in many ways. Among the most important are the choices records creators make when they decide what to record, how to record it, how it is filed, and what to transmit to superiors. As these records are used in daily operations and they accumulate in massive filing (and later archival) systems, these records act as surrogates for reality, which means they become reality, or what is taken to be real about the world. Indian people were viewed by the Ottawa headquarters through the lens of the reports and documents of field agents. The records in question are naturally selective and, like the participants in recording processes, cannot be in all places at all times to document or see the full reality. What is recorded helps form the surrogate reality. This grasp of a surrogate reality also
then shapes further records creation and keeping. (62)

The construction of reality through recorded information is obviously a very complex process, and its complete exploration in the DIA is beyond the scope of this thesis. Much more groundwork needs to be done in order to make that possible. Some archivists and historians have begun to lay this groundwork in either the study of recording generally or in study of the record made of Native peoples and by Indian Affairs administration. (63).

This thesis contributes to this joint effort. It offers a general overview of the history of record creation and management by the Canadian DIA and places these records in societal context, as they proliferated in the Indian Affairs department across the nineteenth- and into the twentieth-centuries, as a key means of implementing Canadian society's new social goal of the assimilation of First Nations people. The history of these records is also seen in administrative context. As this increasingly ambitious social goal required a far-flung national bureaucracy to achieve it, a growing volume of recorded information enabled the bureaucracy to function. These records are seen in their records-keeping context, as documents assembled, thereby acquiring their meaning and thus power, in relation to their placement in complex filing or records-keeping systems.
Chapter 2

The Bureaucracy

Although the DIA was only officially created in 1880 as a branch of the Department of the Interior, which itself came into being on 1 July 1873, the roots of the department stretch back to the old British colonial administration and more immediately to its pre-Confederation antecedents. This chapter will describe how the colonial Indian Affairs Department expanded to become the chief point of contact between Euro-Canadian society and the First Nations people. The chapter provides a history of its administration and bureaucratic structure. The growth of this bureaucracy followed closely the path described by the theorists examined in Chapter 1. Although there is a rich and growing body of writing on Canadian Aboriginal policy, few studies have specifically dealt with the administrative side of the Indian Affairs/Aboriginal relationship. This chapter shows how Indian Affairs expanded from a tiny group of military men who had direct, personal contact with First Nations people, to a vast impersonal bureaucracy, and how its initial narrow jurisdiction was broadened to control almost all aspects of the lives of the Indian people of Canada.

The fifteenth of April 1755 is the accepted date for the genesis of what was to become the Department of Indian Affairs. In that year Sir William Johnson was appointed
"Indian Superintendent of the Northern Department", or District, by the British commander-in-chief in North America, General Sir Edward Braddock. Johnson, who had been Chief Indian Agent for New York and "Colonel of the Forces of the Six Nations of Indians" in the period 1745-1751, and Edmund Atkins, Superintendent of the Southern Department, were the first British officials responsible for the implementation of British Indian policy on more than a local scale. Johnson and Atkins reported to the British "commander of forces" in North America, and theirs were clearly military appointments. Johnson, based in the Mohawk Valley of New York, was responsible for securing the alliance of the Six Nations of the Iroquois for the war against the French in Quebec, and Atkins was similarly responsible for gaining as allies the tribes of the south, such as the Creeks and Cherokees. In other jurisdictions, in response to war, similar arrangements were later created, as in the case of Michael Franklin, appointed Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the colony of Nova Scotia in 1777.

Johnson's tiny "staff" reflected this military focus, and his agents held military appointments in the regulars or militia. They included: Christian (Daniel) Claus, deputy superintendent (or "secretary") of Indian Affairs, 1755-1775, and after the fall of New France, deputy agent to the Canadian Indians; George Croghan, deputy for the Ohio;
Johnson's nephew Guy Johnson, deputy for the Six Nations; and a couple of translators. (2) Like Johnson, who maintained a long lasting liaison with Iroquois Molly Brant, most of his staff had extensive and intimate personal connections with Indian groups they dealt with. These connections were essential for carrying out their responsibilities. Agents were not selected for their administrative skills but for their personal contacts with Indian groups. Johnson and his staff could not be strictly controlled by the metropolitan authorities because of time and distance, and they did not in any sense "control" the Aboriginal people who were motivated and acted according to their own self interest. Historian Colin G. Calloway wrote that the department was the sole link between the Indians and the British, but he might have added the department was not the only link between Indians and the white world. (3) They also continued to interact with white traders, missionaries, soldiers, and others on an independent basis.

In 1763 Johnson's geographical jurisdiction was extended by the addition of the "Old Province" of Quebec. (4) But in times of peace British attention to Indian Affairs waned. By 1768 central British control of Indian Affairs was allowed to lapse and each American colony developed policy as it saw fit. Johnson now worked closely with his own Colony of New York. (5) On 11 July 1774, Sir William died. He
was replaced two months later by his nephew Guy. Guy Johnson's appointment ensured the continuity of the Johnson family's firm relationship with the Iroquois.

The Southern Department lacked any such continuity and was ultimately doomed by the American Revolution. Edmund Atkins was replaced in 1762 by John Stuart, and, like the Johnsons in the north, Stuart attempted to forge an alliance with the tribes under his jurisdiction. He had much less success, although his Indian agents and commissaries formed liaisons with friendly tribes: Alexander Cameron with the Cherokees; David Taitt and William McIntosh with the Creeks; James Colbert with the Chickasaws; John McIntosh with the Choctaws; and Henry and Charles Stuart with more westerly groups.(6) After John Stuart's death in 1779, the Southern Department experienced a variety of leadership changes before, upon the defeat of British forces in the American Revolution, it was disbanded in 1784.(7)

The Revolutionary War also played havoc with the administration of the Northern Department. Guy Carleton, then Governor of Quebec, used the transition of 1774 to attempt to control the department more tightly. Against the wishes of Guy Johnson, Carleton dismissed Daniel Claus and replaced him with Captain John Campbell, who incompetently supervised the Indians involved in the ill-fated Burgoyne
expedition of 1777. Carleton also made other arrangements and new appointments, but many of these were latter overturned when Claus, Guy Johnson, and Mohawk Joseph Brant (Thayendanegea) sailed to England to plead their case. Colonel John Butler assumed the leadership of the department in their absence. This state of affairs ended when Carleton was replaced by Frederick Haldimand as Governor of Quebec in 1778. By then there were still only about 21 officials on the Indian Affairs payroll in the north, excluding Guy Johnson, Daniel Claus, and Campbell. There were possibly 50 officials in total in all of British North America.

Guy Johnson's administration did not outlast the war. When he returned to England to deal with his financial affairs in 1782, he was replaced on 14 March 14th 1782, by Sir William's son John, who received the new title of "Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs and Inspector General of the Six Nations Indians and those in the Province of Quebec." Sir John continued the tradition of the Johnson family as the pivot of British Indian administration in the North. Now based in Montreal, his staff grew somewhat despite the loss of the Thirteen Colonies. The 1775 "Instructions to Governor Carleton", issued from London, had envisioned a hierarchy of agents, superintendents, deputy superintendents, commissaries, interpreters, and missionaries. The agents and superintendents were to visit
and "...transact all affairs relative to the said Indians," and be the direct contact of the Indians with Royal Authority. Indian Affairs was to be the "means" of the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which is considered the basis of Canadian Indian treaties and legislation.(12) Because of the disruption of the American Revolutionary War the creation of this administrative structure was delayed, but over John Johnson's tenure it gradually emerged. In 1794, the office of Deputy Superintendent General (DSG) was created to assist Johnson. The first incumbent was Colonel Alexander McKee, a man of great influence with the Shawnee until his death in 1799. From 1799 to 1826, William Claus, son of Daniel, held this position.(13) Other agents and deputies and superintendents included: John Butler at Niagara; Thomas McKee (son of Alexander) at Fort Joseph; Mathew Elliot at Amherstburg; and Robert Dickson, agent west of Lake Huron. Infamous in American folklore, Simon Girty was a translator and liason with the "western" Indians, with whom he had extensive familial connections. Not all these agents were white, and Aboriginal leaders such as Joseph Brant and John Norton were, at various times, in positions of influence or on the payroll.(14)

In 1796, responsibility for Indian Affairs in Upper Canada was transferred from the commander of forces to the lieutenant-governor, and four years later the same
responsibility was given to the governor-general in Lower Canada. This change not only split the administrations it also indicated a technical transfer of Indian Affairs to civil control, an expected development in a time of peace with the Americans. This transfer, however, made little practical difference as military men who maintained personal relationships with First Nation groups continued to oversee the Indian Department and the British relationship with the tribes was still primarily rooted in military necessity. In 1816, following the War of 1812, jurisdiction for Indian Affairs in the Canadas was transferred back to the commander of forces in British North America, thus acknowledging the military essence of the relationship. Ironically, the military policy of the British government towards the First Nations people was about to change for good.

Sir John Johnson retired on 25 June 1828, and died in Montreal two years later. Johnson was immediately replaced by Major Henry Charles Darling, who had been his last DSG. Darling was given the new title of Chief Superintendent of Indian Affairs, and Colonel James Givens was appointed his Deputy. The same year, Governor-General Sir George Ramsay Earl of Dalhousie urged an end to the department. Dalhousie saw no usefulness in Indians as allies and, ever cognizant of reducing costs, wished to rid the government of this expense. But Darling, to save his position, successfully
opposed the plan in a 1828 report. By this time those in government had generally concluded that Indians did not fit into the pattern of development which the British envisioned for North America. The Indians were no longer very useful in war, and appeared to be dying of disease and unable to sustain themselves by hunting. Many British authorities thought that Aboriginals would need drastic measures to assist them to survive, and many began to believe that only assimilation with what was believed to be the superior Euro-Canadian culture could accomplish this. Darling's 1828 report, which proposed a "civilizing" programme supervised by the Indian Department, has been called the foundation of Canadian policy from the 1830s to the 1960s. By the end of the 1840s the notion that the Indians should be "civilized" was firmly entrenched within the Indian Department. Churches and schools were being built, and reserves were set aside to isolate Indians from the nefarious influence of bad whites. However, because of the government's desire to contain costs, little was done. There remained an unwillingness to add to the budget by employing more staff.

On 13 April 1830, the administration of Indian Affairs was again split between Upper and Lower Canada, and placed under civil control, this time for good: "In both parts of the Province the military character of the Department was in
great measure changed and civil duties were imposed upon the
Officers...."(17) Although still run by army officers for
several decades, this administrative change was of great
importance as it gradually rid the department of its old
military character, although neglect and its decentralized
nature continued to make it largely ineffective.(18) In
Upper Canada control was given to the lieutenant-governor so
Lieutenant-Governor Sir John Colborne became titular head of
the department, while Colonel James Givens was appointed
Chief Superintendent. In 1837 he was succeeded by Colonel
Samuel Peters Jarvis. In Lower Canada, Indian Affairs was
administered by the Military Secretary of the Governor-
General. In 1830, this was Lieutenant-Colonel Couper, while
Lieutenant-Colonel D. C. Napier of the Militia was removed
to the military secretary's office to act as secretary, with
the pay and allowance of superintendent general.(19) This
cumbersome arrangement allowed the administration to do
little more than distribute the annual presents to the
Indians, but Canadian nation building was accelerating and
Indian Affairs was soon to be swept into the process.

In 1841, Upper and Lower Canada united, and Kingston
was selected as the first, if very temporary capital. Chief
Superintendent Colonel S. P. Jarvis and his minuscule staff
followed the government to the town on the shores of Lake
Ontario. The administration was divided by province:
**Upper Canada**

1 Chief Superintendent -- Colonel S.P. Jarvis.
1 Clerk -- George Vardon
4 Superintendents
2 Assistant Superintendents
4 Interpreters
3 Missionaries
2 Schoolmasters
1 Surgeon

**Lower Canada**

1 Secretary (supervising the department) -- D.C. Napier
1 Superintendent -- James Hughes
1 Resident Agent
3 or 4 Interpreters
5 Missionaries
1 Schoolmaster
1 copyist (20)

In 1844, as a result of the Bagot Commission of Inquiry (1842-1844), both provincial offices of the department were placed under the civil secretary of the governor general, who was designated superintendent general of Indian Affairs. The position of chief superintendent was abolished. (21) The headquarters staff now consisted mainly of clerk George Varden and an accountant, to implement its still somewhat
ill-defined policies. This completely inadequate organization lasted until the new arrangements of July, 1860.

The 1845-1860 period of limbo for Indian Affairs was largely the responsibility of the home government. Before 1860, the colonial governors acting with the British government through the colonial secretary, the Army, and the Treasury, had paid for and set policy for Indian Affairs. (22) Before Confederation, this responsibility rested on Lord Grey, Secretary of State for War and the Colonies from 1846-1852, and Herman Merivale, Permanent Undersecretary from 1847-1860. (23) The British dearly wished to abolish the department or transfer jurisdiction. From 1856 to 1860 the Colonial Office debated giving the complete responsibility for the Indians to the colonial administration. A commission which investigated the matter recommended the termination of Indian Affairs, but Merivale, who had favoured regional policies and seemed to encourage at least some Native consultation, succumbed to pressure from local officials and gave responsibility for the department to the non-Native colonials. (24) No Aboriginals were consulted.

In 1860, Euro-Canadians took control of Indian Affairs from the British, who finally divested themselves of this
"white man's burden."(25) The Canadians had in place a small centralized administration and all the possible components of a bureaucracy, including finance. The small department had complete authority to carry out a new mission. It had lost its military character. The last vestige of practice from the military era, that of giving presents to the Indians, had ceased in 1852. It was now to be directed towards the goal of forging a modern nation state.

J. E. Hodgetts, in his examination of the evolution of administrative structures in the pre-Confederation period, linked changes to the development of responsible government, or state formation. Hodgetts found that in this period an administrative machinery developed that included Aboriginals as "clients." As Hodgetts realized, this was significant because "the very existence of a special administrative agency to service the Indians -- and only Indians -- also resulted in setting them apart."(26) Hodgetts believed that the Indian Affairs Department developed as a bureaucracy to "care" for the Indians so that Euro-Canadian settlers could occupy their supposed "vacant" lands.

In 1860, the new Indian Department was in the Department of Crown Lands, with the commissioner of Crown Lands designated as chief superintendent. The four commissioners in order of succession were: P. N. 
Vankoughnet; William George Sherwood; William P. McDougall; and Alexander Campbell. In 1860, William Spragge, a good administrator who wished to make Indian Affairs a model department, was appointed the first DSG. In this period the main purpose of the department was the disposal of Indian lands for use by settlers, so its inclusion in Crown Lands was hardly surprising.(27) Indian Affairs ceased to be a branch of Crown Lands on 30 June, 1867.

On 1 July 1867, the new Dominion of Canada took over provincial administration of Indian Affairs, under the powers listed in the British North America Act, Section 91, Number 21, "Indians and lands reserved for Indians," including those of the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. All provincial acts were repealed in 1868 and replaced with a national act. At Confederation, Indian Affairs was attached to the Department of the Secretary of State of the Provinces. The Secretary of State was to became the superintendent general, much like the contemporary Minister of Indian Affairs. He held parliamentary responsibility for Indian Affairs until 1 July 1873, when the Department of the Interior was formed with the "Indian Branch". After 1873, the Minister of the Interior held the parliamentary responsibility for Indian Affairs. The department had found its home for the next 60 years.(28)
These administrative changes, however, did not immediately expand the size or the range of its activities. That only came following the passage of the "Indian Act," and the signing of the numbered treaties in the Prairie West from 1871-77, after the purchase of Rupert's Land from the Hudson's Bay Company. In 1876, Indian Affairs was given the responsibility to administer the Indian Act.(29) The act sought to isolate and control Indians in a reserve system in order to assimilate them. Aboriginal ways of life were prohibited or barely tolerated, and later Native religious ceremonies were banned. The power of traditional chiefs was undermined, as the DSG could impose elected chiefs on bands. West of Lake Superior agents were given the powers of justices of the peace to enforce sections of the Criminal Code relating to vagrancy in order to keep Indians on reserves. The agents cooperated with the North-West Mounted Police in enforcing the "Indian Act."(30) There was no pretence of the administration dealing with Indians as equals: "Fundamental to reserve policy was a consolidation of government power."(31) Treaties 1 to 7 which covered much of present day Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and part of the present Northwest Territories not only increased the size of Canada's Aboriginal population several times, it encompassed First Nations who had had less contact with settled whites and whose economy, with the disappearance of the bison, was on the brink of collapse.(32) Given this
expanded and more complex mandate, policy considerations came to the forefront and promoted the creation of a separate Department of Indian Affairs within Interior in 1880. Its minister and superintendent general of Indian Affairs was none other than the Prime Minister, Sir John A. Macdonald.

In the early 1880s, the Department of Indian Affairs consisted of the Ottawa headquarters, or the Inside Service, and its two branches (the Lands Sales Branch, and the Accountants Branch) and those in the field, or the Outside Service. The Ottawa office was soon to be expanded but the first requirement was a functioning field staff. The Outside Service consisted of agents and superintendents, and lesser figures, including farm instructors and teachers, who had direct contact with the Indians and who implemented departmental policy. Initially, in 1873, a "Board of Commissioners" was established in the Prairie West and British Columbia to deal with the specialized problems of these new regions. In 1875 this organization was abolished and David Laird, Minister of the Interior, created a system of superintendencies (Victoria, Fraser, Manitoba, and North-West), each with two Indian agents, which resembled the one that had developed in Upper Canada (Ontario). Ontario and Quebec each had seven superintendencies, and the system was also extended to the Maritimes, and later the office of
inspector was added. (34) The offices of superintendent and inspector acted as a middle tier of bureaucracy between the DSG and the field agents, but over time their powers were gradually eroded and the positions eliminated by Ottawa's centralizing tendencies.

In the field, the number of Indian agents grew until each was responsible for administering departmental policy on a daily basis for an agency, usually a group of three or four reserves. They collected the masses of information the department needed to create policy. They also had to know their clients in order to operate efficiently. As Hodgetts wrote, a small army of Indian Agents was sent to gather information, "...agents who had to work only with Indians could acquire the necessary special information and insight to deal effectively with their charges in their own localities." (35) The information was then compiled by central headquarters in Ottawa for future reference. This administrative arrangement remained essentially unchanged long into the twentieth-century. The Indian agents were often at first former North-West Mounted Police, military men, or Hudson's Bay Company traders who had personal knowledge of their clients, but increasingly these gave way to clerks who were valued for their administrative abilities and records-keeping skills. All their activity was duly recorded and submitted to headquarters, a process which will
be elaborated on in Chapter 3.

The Ottawa official who administered and largely determined the policy of the DIA was the DSG. In 1874, Lawrence Vankoughnet was appointed to this post upon the death of William P. Spragge. A man with a long Tory pedigree, he competently, in the government's view, directed the department in its early period of expansion. According to historian Douglas Leighton, Vankoughnet lived up to Victorian ways as he was hard working, serious, intolerant, and adhered to fixed standards -- exactly the right person to transform a provincial office into a great federal bureaucracy. (36) A hard worker, Vankoughnet had risen quickly, joining the Indian Department as a junior clerk in 1861, and only a dozen years later became chief. He possibly worked too hard, probably because of his unwillingness to delegate. (For example, he personally read all his agents' correspondence.) In early 1883 he collapsed and needed three and a half months in the southern United States to recover.

Vankoughnet forged a highly centralized department. He eliminated the position of central superintendent for Ontario, for example, held by William Plummer from 1873 to 1882. He was appointed commissioner of Indian lands as compensation. Vankoughnet made the decisions and administered by the book. He was always keen to economize.
In one case, even though communication with the west and Maritimes was poor because of slow mail service he would not allow the department to use the telegraph as he believed it too costly. Yet even he realized that more staff was needed to deal with the amount of work the department was required to do.

In the mid-1880s the Ottawa staff still only had 38 people. Housed in the East Block of Parliament the department lacked office space. When the Deputy Superintendent of the Interior, Lindsay Russell, suggested that the older records of Indian Affairs, a department sometimes not held in the greatest esteem by the rest of the government, be burned, Vankoughnet sent a letter of protest to Prime Minister Macdonald. It resulted in the department moving to the old offices of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway, although they eventually returned to the East Block.(37) In 1885, the expanding department went through significant structural changes. To the Accountant’s Branch, and the Land Sales Branch, were added four new divisions: a Statistics and Schools Branch; a Technical Branch; a Correspondence Branch; and a Registry Branch.(38) Indian Affairs now had a fully developed bureaucratic structure, with two branches just to handle its records: the Correspondence Branch, which created all outgoing correspondence, prepared reports, and issued stationery; and
the Registry Branch, which received, registered and filed correspondence, looked up old records and indexed the official letterbooks. (39) In 1886 the Inside Service staff consisted of the DSG a chief clerk and accountant, an assistant accountant, a clerical staff of thirty or so, and a number of unskilled messengers, box packers, and janitors. (40) The overall quality of this staff improved because Vankoughnet looked for good employees and the recently introduced civil service examinations kept standards high, but patronage remained rife. (41)

In this period, the single most important and costly function the department performed was Indian education. This effort was focused on the west. (42) Education occupied a central role in Indian Affairs policy and activity during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-centuries, as it was a crucial element in the general goal of the government to turn Indians into brown Euro-Canadians by "civilizing" them. (43) The department's education program was based on paying the major Canadian Christian denominations a per capita grant to hire teachers and run Indian schools, except in the case of the model department-run industrial schools.

The "Outside Service" by 1890 had grown to 460 employees (some part time), including agents (the most numerous), surveyors, teachers, farm instructors, clerks, medical men, messengers, cooks, and some clergymen. (44) This
small army of civil servants sought to regulate virtually every aspect of Canadian Indian life. This was facilitated by events such as the North-West "Rebellion" of 1885. Although it generated criticism of the DIA, the "rebellion" created a climate of acceptance of the view that Indian Affairs could be left to take care of the "Indian Problem," especially in the West, with measures as repressive as it deemed necessary. (45)

In 1897, Thomas Mayne Daly, Minister of the Interior, under the new Liberal government of Wilfred Laurier, restructured the department and forced Vankoughnet to leave office. (46) Vankoughnet had brought a small department from its nineteenth-century slumber to a nation-wide organization with an expanded mandate. Indian Affairs was efficient and competent, but more oppressive, authoritarian, and remote to its Native "clients." (47)

In October 1893, Hayter Reed was appointed the new DSG, but his tenure was brief. Reed had worked his way up from agent at Battleford (North-West Territories), to the middle level of management (Indian Commissioner for the West), and then into the Ottawa office. As DSG, Reed continued to help "pacify" the West and prepare it for settlement. He improved salaries of employees, although the quality of agents was still not top notch. (48) Reed was unable to do more to put
his stamp on the department before he was replaced by Deputy Minister of the Interior James Smart in July 1897. This change was the decision of Clifford Sifton, new Minister of the Interior. Sifton and Smart were more interested in immigration and the settlement of the west than they were Indians. (49)

Sifton reorganized the department in an effort to reduce costs. He established three branches: the Secretary's Branch; the Accountants Branch; and the Lands and Timber Branch. (50) Sifton slashed wages in the department and fired staff. In 1897, the headquarters staff was 144 persons, and by 1898 it was 115. However, even Sifton could not halt the expansion of the bureaucracy for long. By 1904-1905 it was up again to 133, and it continued to climb in the following decades. Initially, salaries were cut. For example, an agent's yearly pay dropped from $1400.00 to $1000.00 or $900.00. However, salaries soon bounced back, as the budget grew. (51)

In the 1870s and 1880s, the idea prevailed that Indians should be protected and allowed to assimilate slowly and efforts were made to protect their reserve lands, although the vast tracts released by treaty were opened by the government to settlement. The general popular attitude was that Indians impeded progress, and if their reserve lands
were sold it would not only help settlers to build the country, it would also force Indians to adapt and "progress". Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior following Sifton, reported that 724,517 acres had been sold from July 1st, 1896 to March 31st, 1909.(52)

Part of Smart's cost cutting and reconstruction of the department involved reducing the middle tier of management. In 1897, he moved the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the North-West Territories, Manitoba and Keewatin to Winnipeg and turned his jurisdiction into an inspectorate. Historian David Hall outlined this official's new duties: "...the Commissioner was expected to occupy himself with overseeing the inspection of western agencies and schools, and preparation of estimates for western operations. The agencies and schools were now to receive their direction mainly from Ottawa."(53) Reed, Smart, and Smart's replacement in 1902, Frank Pedley, continued the centralization of the department which had been increasing since 1860.(54) Sifton made the department more efficient, and more centralized, but his men had even less knowledge of and contact with "real" Indians and their wishes. The concern of the civil servants was cost-cutting, the sale of land, and settlement.(55)

Francis Pedley, a Toronto lawyer and former deputy
minister of immigration, took on the job of DSG in 1902. An efficient administrator, he initiated a new round of administrative change, with an eye to exploiting the mineral wealth of the North. He reorganized the department again in 1909. (56) The DIA now consisted of: the Secretary's Branch; the Accountant's Branch (Duncan Campbell Scott was appointed chief accountant); the Land and Timber Branch; the Survey Branch; the Records Branch (under G. M. Matheson); and the School Branch. (57) Martin Benson was appointed clerk of Schools, and D. C. Scott superintendent of Indian Education. (58) This was the beginning of Scott's rise to dominance of the department. He had begun as a copy clerk in 1879, was promoted chief clerk and accountant in 1893, and was promoted again in the 1909 reorganization. Scott supervised the termination of the industrial schools (run by the department) and the expansion of the less expensive day schools (run by religious denominations). Benson, who was appointed superintendent of Indian Education in 1913, under Scott's direction, closed the Industrial Schools at: Battleford, SK; Elkhorn, MB, and Red Deer, AB; and High River, AB. (59)

Scott, better known as a poet, became DSG of the DIA in 1913. He occupied the post for almost twenty years and is generally considered the most important departmental official of the twentieth-century. Efficiency and economy
were the two great hallmarks of his administration. (60) By World War I the Indian Affairs bureaucracy covered all of Canada except the present Northwest Territories and Nunavut (north of 60 degrees latitude). The Inside Service had six branches, with 76 employees. The largest was the Secretary's Branch, headed by John D. McLean, assistant deputy superintendent general and secretary, which had 25 employees. The Accountants Branch was headed by Frederick H. Paget, chief accountant, and the Lands and Timber Branch, by William A. Orr, clerk and registrar of lands. The Survey Branch, chief was Samuel Bray, chief surveyor, and as before, M. Benson was clerk of schools, and head of the School Branch. The newest division was the Architects Branch, under R. M. Ogilvie. George M. Matheson, the registrar, who headed the Records Branch, was becoming a key figure in preserving the records of the department.

The Outside Service had 651 employees. Agencies were headed by field agents, and agencies had one or two clerks, a medical officer (often a physician who practised in the community and who could be put "on call"), and, in the Prairie West, farm instructors, stockmen and blacksmiths. With rare exceptions, these positions were not held by First Nations people, and if so, never by one who could be culturally identified as Native. This is in contrast with the Indian department of the eighteenth-century which was
bound by personal ties to the Indian world. In Scott's department some Indians held jobs on the lowest rung of the ladder -- constables, interpreters, or labourers.(61)

The reorganization of 1909 created two superintendencies for the Maritimes, two for Ontario and Quebec, and two for the West. The Prairie Commissioner's office had already been closed. For supervision of the agencies and schools the department relied heavily on a series of inspectors who reported directly to Ottawa. By 1915, the Prairies had a chief inspector, three inspectors for Manitoba, two for Saskatchewan, one for Alberta, and one for the Northwest Territories (Treaty 8 area), with one inspector for agency accounts in Saskatchewan and Alberta. In British Columbia there were three inspectors of agencies, and one for schools, and in the Yukon a single inspector. Their jobs were summed up thus: "All inspectors report direct to the deputy minister of the department. When their reports are dealt with at headquarters the agent's report is subject to either praise or blame and a copy of the letter based on the reports is sent to the inspector himself. The inspector is kept in contact with the work of the agencies by monthly reports which are transmitted by the agent to the department through the inspector's office."(62)

The Prairie Commissioner's position made something of a
comeback in 1920. This was largely due to the efforts of the ambitious W. W. Graham. Graham had entered the service as a clerk at the Moose Mountain agency in 1885, and then moved on in 1895 to the Indian Commissioner's office in Regina. His most productive years, however, came first as acting agent, and then in June 1897 as agent at the File Hills colony in southern Saskatchewan. Intended to be a model farm and community which would convince the Indians to become "civilized" white farmers, the colony gradually in the 1930s. But Graham was promoted to "Inspector of Indian Agencies for the South Saskatchewan Inspectorate," and then in 1920 to "Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Prairie Provinces." A rival of D. C. Scott, Graham fought for the job of DSG when it appeared Scott would retire. In the 1932 reorganization, Minister of the Interior Thomas Murphy closed the Regina commissioner's office to save money and Scott supported this for purposes of centralization and economy. Graham was forced to retire when Scott did.

In the 1920s, the department experienced an expansion of its geographical jurisdiction and client base which resulted in a further northern orientation. In 1921, Treaty 11 was signed adding some groups of Aboriginals in the Northwest Territories to the jurisdiction of Indian Affairs. Important too was the 1924 amendment to the Indian Act which placed Eskimos (Inuit) under the DSG, but did not subject
them to the rest of the act or create a new range of agents. They continued to be watched over by the Mounted Police and agents of the Ministry of the Interior. As these developments came at the same time as the discovery of oil at Norman Wells, the eyes of the bureaucracy did shift to the North for a time, but an ambitious northern affairs program did not take shape for over twenty years. In 1930, Inuit were placed under the Northwest Territories Branch of Interior, and out of the control of Indian Affairs. (64)

In the 1920s, D. C. Scott continued to concentrate on the consolidation of the day school system as the tool to educate and assimilate Indians at the lowest possible cost, but there were few other significant policy initiatives (65) In 1932 the era of Scott finally came to a close. By then there were 75 DIA staff in Ottawa, and the field staff consisted of one commissioner on the Prairies (soon to be gone) and one in British Columbia, in addition to inspectors, Indian agents, medical officers, teachers, farming instructors, constables, and assorted others. (66) They administered 116 agencies which held approximately 108,000 Indians on 2,000 reserves. Each agency was responsible for one to thirty of the 600 bands under Indian Affairs jurisdiction. The system had continued to grow and cost a total of $2,754,395.47 for the last full year of Scott's administration. The 1867 department had cost only
about a fifth as much. (67) In 1893 expenditures dipped slightly, the result of the depression, but soon rebounded. In his final writings as department head, Scott expressed pride that in 1927 a Health Branch with a health service had been added. It foreshadowed things to come. (68)

In the period immediately following Scott there was slight change, and the department continued to administer the Indian Act, and oversee the Indian school system. (69) Policy was not in the public eye and First Nations people still lacked influence with the government. This meant that bureaucrats could decide policy and an exchange of letters over a couple of months between a field office and headquarters could result in legislation and changes to the Indian Act. Parliament, except for the issue of British Columbia Indian lands and Native enfranchisement, took little notice of Indians and Indian Affairs, and power rested with the DSG. (70)

On 1 December 1936, the DIA was reduced to a branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, and a new reorganization followed. The Field Administration of the Branch now consisted of one Indian commissioner for British Columbia, four regional inspectors, and 115 Agents. Each agency had an agent, a medical officer, clerk, farm instructor, field matron, nurse, constable, stockman, and
The Ottawa bureaucracy divided into a Medical Welfare and Training Service (schools), a Reserves and Trust Service (for land), and a Records Service. In 1943, the Ottawa office only employed 65 employees out of a total of about 1,000, but the number of staff soon increased sharply. Many of those in the field helped run the 275 day schools, and 78 residential schools, which contained 17,000 pupils supported by the department. Dr. H. W. McGill, who replaced Scott as DSG, was designated director of the branch. The Records Service, which dealt with both current and historical records, was now run by A. E. St. Louis ("registrar-cum-archivist") who had replaced the very capable G. M. Matheson in this position. McGill and the department had abandoned the idea of a quick solution to the "Indian Problem," and now hoped over "several generations" to make the Indians "civilized" and self-supporting. While Indians Affairs continued to pay more attention to the North and its riches, general Indian policy still drifted and was not a focus of the public's or Parliament's attention.

The period from the late 1940s to the mid 1960s was to be a period of great change for Indian Affairs. In 1947, the department went though yet another internal reorganization: the Education Division, a Welfare Division, and as a result of the war a Veteran's Land Act administration were split.
off from the "Welfare and Training Division". Two years later a Construction and Engineering Service was created. Indian Affairs was clearly supervising the transformation of the administration along the principles and programs of the new "social welfare state" with welfare projects, relief, family allowances, and rehabilitation of Indian veterans. (77) The following year, Major D. M. Mackay became the new director, just in time to supervise the transfer of the branch to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. (78)

The ideological environment of the late 1940s still favoured assimilation of Indians into the fabric of Canadian society. However, fundamental change was in the air. By the 1950s First Nations people had begun the road to self-government, which today seems to threaten to eliminate the very bureaucracy of Indian Affairs as it has evolved over two centuries. (79) This may result in Canada's First Nations controlling their own administration and destiny, and perhaps creating their own forms of records, but as Max Weber wrote, once fully established, bureaucratic organizations are among those social structures which are the most resilient and hardest to destroy. (80)
Chapter 3
Records-Keeping and Records

This chapter provides an examination of the records and records-keeping systems used in the Ottawa headquarters of the DIA and its predecessors, and in the Indian agencies scattered over the country which reported to Ottawa. It is important to examine the means of records-keeping and how it evolved within the DIA. The intention is to demonstrate how records-keeping interacted with First Nations people under the DIA's "care" to facilitate their assimilation. First, however, records-keeping methods in general should be examined.

Helen Chatfield's article, "The Development of Record Systems" is a good starting point as it gives a descriptive outline of the essential features of what she calls "record systems". She does not articulate a theoretical framework for understanding them, but clarifies many issues focusing on the "nut and bolts" of such systems. Chatfield explains that "...the record system is the means by which we gain control over the information contained in the documents."(1) For her a "records system" contains several features: a) it must meet the reference needs of the office which creates it; b) it must bring related records together, but there must also be a means of locating non-related material; c) it must allow expansion; d) material must be in units which are
capable of ready identification; e) material must be dated for disposal; f) records of enduring value must be identified; and g) the system must be economical and easy to learn. (2)

"Records systems" are comprised of two basic elements. First is the "unit," which may be a "case" or "subject" file. Secondly, there is the "classification plan," which brings together like material, and is known by its classification type, for example "decimal," "subject-numeric," "alpha-numeric" or the "index plan" (e.g., alphabetical). (3) Chatfield divided classification plans into a few basic types which have evolved over time. In the "chronological" type, the earliest, correspondence was divided into "incoming" and "outgoing" categories. "Incoming" letters were folded together in chronological order and placed in boxes (alphabetical indexes were later made for them), and "outgoing" letters were copied into blank books for later reference once the originals had been sent. In the Canadian government this is known as the "docket-letterbook" system.

This system was revolutionized when "incoming" and "outgoing" correspondence began to be filed together as a unit. These letters could now be consolidated into "subject" files relating to a subject, and "case" files relating to a
person. However, this fairly haphazard method was gradually replaced by systems in which there is a categorization using subject matter codes and indexes. Decimal systems like the "Dewey Decimal" began in the library world and then spread to government. "Alphabetic" files arranged vertically, invented in the 1890s, found frequent employment as "case" files. Chatfield mentioned that there are other systems with mixed alphabetic and numerical codes. In 1950 when she wrote, the U.S. government was on the verge of adopting the "subject-numeric" system based on subject codes for the large divisions and serial numbers for the subdivisions.

These records-keeping methods can be seen in the DIA and its predecessor agencies. In the eighteenth-century records-keeping in the Indian Department was extremely informal. Sir William Johnson and his successors were practical men of action, not professional administrators: "This lack of concern for administrative details showed in the Indian Department, which was as haphazardly managed and maintained as any other part of the loosely organized eighteenth-century British colonial system." When the department was headquartered at Fort George (Niagara) there is mention of a "records room" with no desk or shelf. It was later moved to York (Toronto) where all the records were lost when the Americans burnt the town in the War of 1812,
as were those at Amherstberg. Some records were also kept in Montreal. (7) Before this period no ledgers or vouchers, or accounts were kept, and there was no registration of documents. They were bundled together and might be placed with the draft of the letter sent or a note that a reply had been made. Records, for all practical purposes, were treated as the private papers of individual officials.

The letterbook system, in which copies of letters were made for reference, began in the department in 1829. But the critical feature of letter registration did not start until recommended by a commission on 1 February 1840. This formed the "docket-letterbook" system in which "incoming" letters were numbered, folded, and then tied together chronologically in packages called "dockets." Eventually indexes with abstracts were prepared for this correspondence so they could be accessed. (8) The indexes were organized by the awkward system of the personal names of the writers, and only the scantiest details were included in the abstracts. (9) The "outgoing" letters were, with laborious clerical effort, copied chronologically in indexed letterbooks (books of copies of correspondence) (10) The two parts of the correspondence ("incoming" and "outgoing") were kept separately, thus creating a bifurcated record.

At the same time as these changes in records-keeping,
the staff of the DIA office was centralized at the seat of government. These changes in office location, however, did not mean either the records-keeping or the working conditions were ideal.\(^{(11)}\) In the 1840s, when Kingston was briefly the capital of Canada the small staff of the DIA worked in cold, ill-ventilated offices lit by candles.\(^{(12)}\) After the capital was moved to Montreal it was said the headquarters files kept by the chief clerk and accountant were maintained in "a desultory manner" and only "loose records" were kept of finances.\(^{(13)}\) In the period before active and intrusive government this system was acceptable. State correspondence dealt with limited and sharply defined issues -- cases opened, quickly closed, and then were seldom looked at again.\(^{(14)}\)

The post-Confederation department that William Spragge supervised kept the system that he had used in the old Crown Lands Department, but when in 1873 the Department of the Interior was created (and with it the Indian Lands branch) it was operating using a distinctly different records-keeping system.\(^{(15)}\) This was the "subject-file" system which was in place in time to meet the paper explosion, and attempted to a much greater extent to keep "incoming" and "outgoing" correspondence better connected.\(^{(16)}\) Letters that were received by the department were numbered and then placed in subject-oriented numbered files. These letters
were also registered chronologically and indexes were later prepared to access them.(17) "Outgoing" correspondence was as before copied chronologically in letterbooks, but drafts of the letters were also placed in the subject files along with the relevant "incoming" letter. This was a system much better suited to dealing with ongoing issues because documentation on a single issue could be examined together.(18) The subject files were arranged by topics that indicate the orientation of the department: reserve lands, agencies, schools, annuities, timber, minerals, and bands.(19) This method of organizing correspondence became part of the central filing system of DIA headquarters called the "Central Registry System". Until the 1920s, it consisted of two major components: the famous "Black Series" started in 1882, which included the agencies from British Columbia, Manitoba, and the North-West Territories (and its successor jurisdictions, Saskatchewan and Alberta); and the "Red Series," founded in 1872, which covered the rest of Canada, and after 1907 the Maritimes, which was transferred from the "Black Series."

The DIA Annual Report for 1875 indicated what was being recorded: "...the number in each band or tribe, value and description of their property, area of reserve, improvements, crops, fish and fur obtained, amount of money distributed by the department, number of children attending
school, etc." The department also promised to present, in statistical form, more information on schools "...in regard to subjects, attendance, and general progress of the pupils, which will enable the Department, in next year's Report, to give further particulars on these heads, in connection with educational institutions among the Indians." (20) This was part of the "civilizing" mission of the department, which required more more more and more records to carry out. (21)

Government organizations like the DIA adopted a multi-departmental organization to deal with the deluge of paperwork. In 1885 the department added four new branches: 1) the Statistics and Schools Branch; 2) the Correspondence Branch; 3) the Registry Branch; and 4) a Technical Branch. (22) The second and third branches were specifically created to deal only with paperwork. The first also had a significant role in this regard. This burden of paperwork quickly became crushing -- going from 3,754 letters received, docketed and registered, and 3,427 letters written, docketed and registered in 1875; to 7,920 letters received, and 6,747 letters written in 1880. (23) As Bill Russell noted, in the period just mentioned the DIA's "incoming" letters increased 111%, and "outgoing" 97%. (24) It is no wonder DSG Lawrence Vankoughnet wrote in 1879 that there was a "huge quantity of work to be done" and that it was beyond the ability of his present staff to do it. (25)
More staff were hired (clerks to do copying) but the amount of work continued to increase. (26)

A brief examination of the Annual Reports of the late 1880s illustrates this point. In 1886, it was reported that 1,555 files passed through the Statistics and School Branch to the Deputy Superintendent General, an increase of 167 files over the previous year. Six hundred and twenty-two quarterly school returns were examined, and entered in a book, an increase of 41. The "Correspondence and Registry Branches" received 18,796 letters, an increase of 2,271 over 1885. The number of letters written was 15,334 written (over 19,885 pages), an increase of 1,319 letter and 1,646 folios over 1885. The copied memos, reports and miscellaneous documents covered 2,311 folios, an increase of 567. The report also mentioned some documents were never counted. These included memos for letters to be written and things to be done, the preparation of forms of contracts, and so on. (27) The next year's report shows the overwhelming increases in the flood of documentation. The Statistics and School Branch dealt with 1,850 files (involving reports, and recommendations) an increase of 300 from 1886, and 100 Quarterly School Returns examined, and 402 requisitions prepared. In the same year, the Correspondence Branch copied 15,454 letters, covering 20,960 folios, an increase of 120 letters and 1,075 folios; and memos and reports covering
2,265 folios, a decrease of 46 folios. The Registry Branch received 17,565 letters, a decrease of 1,231. These last decreases stand out, but the report was quick to explain: "This diminution in number was accompanied by the introduction of a new system of acknowledgement of letters containing cheques addressed to the Indian Commissioner for Manitoba and the North-West Territories." In the old system each letter and cheque was acknowledged in an individual letter by the Commissioner, but now one letter did for 30 or 40. The department was clearly attempting to deal creatively with its burden of correspondence. The 1887 Annual Report concluded soberly: "There has been no decrease in the number of other letters received by the Department."(28)

At the time the 35 full- and part-time staff who toiled to conquer this mountain of paper were housed in the East Block of Parliament Buildings, although in the early part of the decade they had moved for a time to the offices of the St. Lawrence & Ottawa Railway. The pay of these workers was said to be the lowest in the civil service, and so, it was said, the department did not attract the best possible personnel. Besides DSG Vankoughnet there was a chief clerk, an accountant, a small clerical staff, and the unskilled, messengers, box packers, and janitors. The clerks had one basic job: "Most of the clerks did little more than copy voluminous correspondence into letterbooks, a process
carried out in time-consuming longhand until the advent of the typewriter in the mid-1880s."(29)

Records-keeping in the DIA did adjust to cope with the stream of paper. In 1893, the Correspondence Branch was reorganized. Now each branch prepared and wrote the letters directly pertaining to its own business. The general letters were prepared by the clerks in the Correspondence Branch.(30) In 1894, A. N. McNeill was "Clerk in charge of Correspondence" and Samuel Stewart ran the Registry Branch and supervised one 2nd class clerk and one 3rd class clerk.(31) Second class clerk M. Benson was in charge of the School Branch (with a salary of $1,400). He supervised two third class women clerks, I. H. Wilson and Alice M. S. Graham (who were paid $800 each). This configuration followed the general male/female division labour in the period.(32) The following year the Registry Branch (sometimes called the Records Branch) introduced a "file subject index," which was said to be a great improvement at the Ottawa headquarters.(33) Staff increases in the branch were dramatic: in 1890 it employed five clerks; in 1892 seven clerks; and in 1895 ten clerks.(34) These staff increases were short-lived and by 1896-1897 Clifford Sifton was making staff cuts in the department. That year 29 employees were let go, the next 57. By the middle of the next decade, however, the numbers had almost entirely
rebounded, and expenditures continued to rise. (35) No matter how many staff were laid off or how much was cut from the budget the volume of paper never decreased. The DIA Annual Report for 1895 detailed that the Correspondence Branch produced 2,618 pages of typed foolscap and reported it had the responsibility for copying into letterbooks the correspondence sent out by others "...the number of folios [pages] so treated aggregated 12,607 during the year." (36) The Registry Branch, which held many "old records," was busy researching cases under arbitration between the federal and provincial governments, railway rights of way in the older provinces, and creating an index of recent correspondence of the last 20 years. In addition, the letters copied into the official letterbooks had "been indexed by the branch." The Annual Report also delineated the increase of correspondence since 1880, when 6,970 letters were received and registered, to 1895 when the number was 26,063 letters, cheques, and memos. The report mentioned that the memos were now also registered and increasingly were taking "the place of letters." (37)

This steady volume of headquarters communication was directly related to the expansion of the DIA in Western Canada, as a result of the signing of the numbered treaties (Treaty 1 in 1871 to Treaty 11 in 1921) which covered over half the Aboriginal people in Canada. From 1870 on a network
of agents was established in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Initially, this bureaucracy was very small and ineffective, but it grew steadily and began the intrusion of the government into the lives of First Nations people in the west.

This administration began in Manitoba in 1871 with Indian commissioner W. Simpson. In 1873, he was replaced by political appointee J. A. N. Provencher who joined self-styled "agent" Molyneux St. John in Winnipeg. Initially these men were the whole DIA presence in the West, but in 1875 Provencher was made superintendent of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Good records were not being created. In 1876 departmental accountant Robert Sinclair came to inspect the office and found that no ledgers had been kept, and that the accounts were so sloppy and unordered that there was practically no accounting. Sinclair gave Provencher instructions on how to do "record keeping", but he reported to Ottawa that the incompetent Provencher lacked the skills to do this. In June 1876 more agents were appointed: M. G. Dickieson and A. McDonald became responsible for Treaty areas 4, 6 and 7 of the Manitoba and North-West Superintendency.

It was soon apparent to DIA officials that the few agents in the field could not provide headquarters with the
information it needed. Letters of instruction to agents in the late 1870s and early 1880s indicated that administration and the keeping of agency records was an important and new responsibility. (40) Many times, however, the agents simply did not have enough time and the extent of this information could be considerable. After 1875 all agents had to submit reports to Ottawa, via their commissioner, concerning the Indians under their charge. Agents were told to keep diaries, annual reports, travel journals, statistical reports, tabulations of departmental properties and equipment, budget estimates, letterbooks and all manner of ledgers, which could include lists of products (fish, fur, gold, berries, and crops), and of course land and dwellings. Anything of interest was to be reported. All financial transactions of bands were handled by the agent who had to submit monthly transactions as recorded in cashbooks and receipts to headquarters. (41) The department required "meticulous records" of annuity payments. (42) The property, including the livestock and grain of each Indian, had to be recorded. As an American observer later reported, the agents attempted to record: "...every transaction of the individual Indian that is done in this country". (43)

In 1879 the government sent more agents to the West. They were immediately engrossed in the records which they had to process and not all fared well. Colonel James Green
Stewart was appointed Indian agent at Edmonton, and the following year DSG Vankoughnet admonished him for the way he kept his books and records, stating he did not follow departmental policy concerning his transactions. Stewart was soon replaced for irregularities and overexpenditure. Saskatchewan's first Indian agent, M. G. Dickieson, was replaced at Battleford in 1879 by Walter L. Orde, of the headquarters finance section. However, Orde was a careless administrator, with illegible handwriting, and much to the DIA's consternation, wrote memos with more than one subject! He was transferred in 1880 and left the department in 1881.

Originally, when hiring its agents the department had looked for men who "knew Indians" (like those of the old eighteenth-century Indian department), for example, they could be former North-West Mounted Police officers, retired Hudson's Bay Company men, or ex-military. By the late 1880s, however, the department wanted former clerks who had administrative and management skills, and could efficiently keep books and correspondence. Their job was not to negotiate or even really communicate with First Nations people but make annuity payments and keep records. By 1893, 71 percent of agents in Treaty 6 area had started as clerks. The clerks were noted as doing good work when mentioned in the inspector's reports. This was the case when DIA inspector T. P. Wadsworth visited the Duck Lake agency
in 1889, and found that the clerk, a Mr. McNeil, was keeping
the books in good order in the absence of R. S. McKenzie,
the agent.(46) When Orde left Battleford he was replaced by
Hayter Reed, who was later briefly DSG. Reed, known to the
Indians as "Iron Heart", was considered an excellent
administrator and records-keeper who was soon promoted to
the commissioner's office in Winnipeg.(47) Reed has been
blamed in part for the rising of some First Nations people
during the troubles of 1885. In 1883, J. M. Rae took over as
agent at Battleford, by then the centre of Native unrest in
the North-West. Rae was also a good administrator, although
he thought it was impossible to do all the paper work in the
office without an additional clerk, and so he was given a
part-time one on a temporary basis. Rae sent in glowing
reports concerning annuity payments, education, health,
clothing and housing, and dismissed Indian complaints.(48)
Rae impressed his superiors (DSG Vankoughnet and Indian
Commissioner Edgar Dewdney), but apparently not some of the
Cree and Assiniboine people of the area who in 1885 sacked
the office and destroyed all its records.(49)

The DIA's field agents did not follow standardized
procedures when keeping records.(50) By the 1890s the
"Outside Service" of the department, in all areas of Canada,
consisted of about 460 employees (farm instructors, agents,
contract labour, and so on), although many were
The individual agencies used their own records-keeping systems. As archivist Bill Russell explained:

Most importantly, there was no system parallel to that at headquarters uniformly applied to all offices. Just such a standard - which would have seen the introduction of letter registers, uniquely number subject files, and file indexes - was recommended in 1914 but was "put by for the present." In lieu of such a filing system, agents seem to have created their own arrangements which usually meant a combination of letterbooks for copies of outgoing correspondence and omnibus Shannon files for broad subject categories of incoming letters. It was not until the late 1940s that file classification was standardized for field offices and headquarters.

The configuration of most of these agency filing systems will never be known because the records have not survived. However, the DIA Annual Report for 1882 did outline what the Qu'Appelle Agency did with its records. T. P. Wadsworth, an inspector of Indian Agencies, described in detail how the agency kept records. The "work" of the office consisted of stamping "incoming" correspondence and placing it in baskets for attention. All departmental letters were registered in a book with their number, name, and address, subject, date of receipt, and possible action. Letters from all agents, inspectors, contractors, and others were treated in the same way. Departmental letters were divided into subject headings and then placed in pigeonholes. Each month the new letters were placed in pasteboard covers and backed. If a letter required a response to Ottawa it was copied and sent along with the reply. The new letter
was then copied in a letterbook; any circulars were also copied and sent on. If a letter could not be replied to quickly it was registered, pigeon-holed, and then entered in a book which listed the number of letter, date, date of receipt, the information asked, action, date and synopsis of reply, although the inspector wrote that unfortunately the procedure was not always followed. "Outgoing" letters were treated with care. These letters were registered, the telegrams filed, the letters copied into letterbooks in books labelled A to G (each corresponding to a block of years). In the past year a total of 6,034 pages had been sent out (including farm matters which were separate and indexed daily). Irregular items, such as pay sheets, contracts, school reports accounts paid, surveys, and semi-official correspondence were filed separately. Wadsworth ended his report approvingly by noting: "...a large amount of work has been kept up so well with so small a staff."

There was no mention of Indians. (53)

The records-keeping of a field agency can also be closely examined in one other case -- the Manitoulin Island Agency at Manitowaning, Ontario. The island of Manitoulin in Lake Huron had been part of a plan in 1835 by the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, John Colborne, to move local First Nations people to the isolated location and "civilize" them through education and farming. (54) After
this project was abandoned after 1862 the island developed into a regular agency which went through many administrative changes in the following years. The records of the agency form the largest group of surviving field office records in RG 10 and so are a useful source of records-keeping practices outside Ottawa.

Before 1884, letters received in the agency were not given a unique identifier or registered in letter registers. (55) "Incoming" letters were registered chronologically, and folded into "dockets", and then indexed by the author's name. (56) On 3 July 1884, William Plummer, a DIA official in Ottawa sent instructions to J. Phipps, superintendent of the Northern Superintendency, Division 1, at Manitowaning, on how to keep his records. (57) After this "outgoing" correspondence was to be copied into letterbooks. (58) The method of registering "incoming" letters is described in the RG 10 Inventory:

As letters were received in the Manitowaning office they were allocated a unique letter number, and the following other information was recorded: the author and place of origin; the subject; the "Red Series" file numbers of letters from headquarters was (sic) noted; the date on the letter and its date of reception; and finally the number under which the letter would be filed, or its file number.... Periodically the letter registers would be indexed alphabetically, utilizing nominal or subject classifications. The letter number and the file number was (sic) also noted. The index could be used by its creators to locate the letter summaries in the registers (using the letter number), or locate the actual letters (via the file number, and then the letter number). After 1893-1896...indexes were no longer created". (59)
Around 1914 some copies of "outgoing" correspondence were added to the linen file jackets on which these letters were spiked -- creating a true file system. (60) In 1896, the office at Manitowaning received a "Notice to Agents" from DSG Hayter Reed, which included an "Application to Department for Stationery & Blank forms". It shows the massive number of forms the department used to capture information. "Indian Schools" required seven forms (monthly and quarterly forms, a form for day schools, and forms for salaries). "Forms of Accounts and Printed Forms" had twenty varieties, including those for the Indian Trust Fund, paylists, annual reports, letterbooks for copying, index book, and patents. Other forms were for paylist books and one for "Return of Labour". There were also forms for timber, including "Timber Books" and "Settlers License". (61)

The collection of this information had an impact on First Nations people. Margaret Stieg, in her article "The Nineteenth-Century Information Revolution" (1980), examined a process which she believed was a revolution, not a corporate revolution, but a governmental one concerned with the state collection of personal information. Stieg examined the establishment of the census and labour inspection in nineteenth-century Britain and concluded that in the period 1800-1836 a fundamental change occurred in English attitudes towards census-taking which allowed the public to accept a
periodic census, when it had opposed one in 1753. The British census began as a government project to collect national population information in order to counter the French threat and within a few decades a census was conducted on a decennial basis by paid government "enumerators." The "enumerators" began to use special forms and reports to send a steady flow of information back to London.(62) Few individuals in society resisted the collection of this information. The collection can be seen to have been done by a society for itself. The goals of the collection of census data were agreed upon, and most of the information collected was common knowledge, but had not yet been codified by an increasingly information-hungry government. The most notable resistors were people who believed the facts gathered would be used for taxation purposes (fears that were probably justified). Despite that the general feeling was that the gathering of most of this knowledge was not threatening.(63)

This classification of individuals within the modern nation state has also been described in the context of colonialism.(64) A modern society finds it acceptable and normal to conduct a census, although it undoubtedly extends the power of the state, but to extend this to another society or dependent nation is another matter. The census forms relating to Indians appeared in the 1890s are
described in the following:

The census lists appear in different formats over the years covered by these records. The earliest ones (pre-1893) usually record the head of household by name but provide numbers only of other family members. Some record the children in each family in age range groupings. For some bands and some years statistics are provided for such things as crops raised, fish caught or fur trapped, and livestock, farming implements, boats and nets owned by each family. From 1893, the census information is recorded on a standard Department of Indian Affairs form (Form 63). From that date, the record is a full nominal census (i.e. it includes not only the names of heads of households but also the names of other family members). Frequently there are comments concerning family relationships included on the lists. For the years 1893-95, the record also includes information on each family's religion, houses and buildings maintained, farming implements and livestock owned, acreage cleared and crops produced, and fish, fur, berry, and sugar production, while the lists for 1883-1885 ... also include information on crop production.(65)

The collection of this census information was a critical part of the process to assimilate First Nations people. Its collection, centralization, and analysis were critical to the program of assimilation. The census clearly indicates the power relationships between the state, which knows all or tries to know all about its citizens, and the citizens who have much less information.(66) The power to locate, name, and identify Indians was essential to control and then change them and change how they viewed themselves. Legislation that could create policy to manipulate the First Nations would follow and the results could be recorded statistically.(67) For the DIA this statistical information was often presented in the Annual Report.
Contemporary Aboriginal researchers have complained that the archival record of their people often distorts history and reflects the ideas and superficial judgements of their white creators.(68) Terry Cook noted that records-keeping will certainly deny, or exclude, certain subjects and activities.(69) Christopher Bracken, in The Potlatch Papers, an intriguing study of DIA records, dealt with a case of the Euro-Canadian conceptualization of the "potlatch" -- a rite practised by Aboriginals in western British Columbia. Bracken has written an articulate post-modernist deconstruction of the "texts" of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century DIA officials. Bracken found that in order to define Aboriginal culture as barbaric and undesirable, and then eliminate it bureaucratically, DIA officials first had to locate a traditional practice they could define in this manner and then ban it, as a step on the road to civilization.(70) They chose the "potlatch," but then proceeded to misrepresent the activity as something un-European.(71) As Bracken wrote: "When it was enacted the statute banning the "`Potlatch'" and "`Tamanawas'" (a dance) prohibited two words rather than the practices"; and "When Indian agents and police enforced the antipotlatch statute they condemned what it had given them to condemn, not the practices that aboriginal people were performing."(72) Ultimately, Bracken concluded that the banning of the "potlatch" was probably less about Canada's effort to bring
the First Nations to civilization than it was to define "Europe-in-Canada" as different from the Aboriginals. There could then be no questioning of the treatment of Aboriginal people by the dominant society. Throughout this process the Aboriginal people involved protested that whites had misrepresented the "potlatch". (73)

The conceptualization of the First Nations people according to Euro-Canadian criteria is only one aspect of how the record is distorted. There could also be mistakes and direct falsification and fraud. David Hume, in his Archivaria article "Life's Embarrassing Moments -- Right Treaty, Wrong Adhesion," gave a somewhat humorous account of an honest mistake. In 1908, the Reverend John Semmens, part-time treaty commissioner, took adhesions to Treaties 5 and 10 in Northern Manitoba, one for bands at Split Lake and Nelson House, and the other for Cross Lake, Norway House, and Fisher River, but switched the documents so that the signatures were mixed up on the respective treaties. (74)

More serious are the cases of outright fraud and the creation of false documents as described by some researchers. (75) Rhonda Telford wrote about the corruption of Indian agent and surveyor John W. Keating, who, between the 1830s and the 1860s, used misinformation to manipulate chiefs of the Walpole Island and Batchewana First Nations and incorrectly defined reserve boundaries. (76)
The DIA became even more remote from First Nations people during the tenure of D. C. Scott as DSG (1913-1932). Scott seemed obsessed by statistics which showed the progress of assimilation, and his staff spent much of their time amassing and compiling them, a trend which had been apparent since the turn of the century and the time of Clifford Sifton. (77) The prime function of the field offices was to gather information in the field for headquarters to classify and analyze, in order to determine the effectiveness of programs, and issue new directives. This process follows closely the pattern described in studies of classic bureaucracy. (78) In the case of the DIA the compiling and presenting of statistics had little to do with new policy initiatives. For the first four decades of the twentieth-century there was little in this regard. It had more to do with demonstrating the increasingly slow progress of assimilation.

The most compelling case of this was the presentation of evidence concerning educational institutions and agriculture over which the DIA had authority. The DIA annual reports meticulously reported school enrollment and increases in attendance, even very small ones. The 1900 Annual Report declared that from 1898 to 1899 school enrollment went from 9,606 to 9,634 pupils, and attendance went from 6,167 to 6,193. (79). The 1910 Annual Report
stressed that the appropriate officials were to make reports "as required". (80) These reports helped make up the "School Statement" in each annual report which tabulated attendance and number of pupils and then displayed the increasing percentages. Agriculture received a similar if somewhat less intense treatment. Just before a table showing "...the increase of land under crop, the amount to grain, roots and hay harvested, and the value of these products", the Annual Report for 1921 declared proudly: "For a good many years this steady advance has been maintained and although no particular industry has shown any unusual advance, the steady but certain steps in this continuous progress are marked." (81) Census numbers and property were also subjects for statistical analysis.

When Scott became DSG in 1913 the Department of Indian Affairs Annual Reports themselves ceased to centre on the band or agency (and so somewhat focused on the struggle of the Native people as human beings) but started to concentrate on one cog in the bureaucracy -- the provincial inspectorates, and then they were described only in short paragraphs. More than ever before, as historian S. D. Grant wrote, the Indians were being "...measured in terms of the white man's standards." (82) The "Indian Problem" was now only to be considered collectively, carefully measured and eliminated. All activity, especially economic and cultural,
was reported through the agent and sent back to Ottawa.(83) The statistical information the agent did send in could be altered to confirm progress. Comparisons of agents' letters with the published Annual Reports reveals that on occasion unfavourable information was removed. Even what reached Ottawa from the field might not be what it seemed. Ambitious DIA official William Graham was very selective about what was sent down the line.(84) More seriously the DIA headquarters resorted to false statistics. Maureen Lux has reported that the Annual Report for 1895 listed Indian death rates lower that those reported by the agents in the field.(85)

The department seemed adept at creating new forms to catch any fresh activity it could present as evidence of the advance of "civilization". When Canada went to war in 1914 there was no record kept of Indians who joined the Canadian Expeditionary forces (technically status Indians could not be obligated to fight for Canada). However, very soon the department created a new form, "Return of Indian Enlistments", to be filled in by each agent for recruits in their agency.(86)

The "Black Series" was formally abandoned by the DIA in 1923 and three years before the clerks had ceased to copy correspondence into departmental letterbooks, although parts
of the system lasted until 1950. (87) This, of course, also meant the end of the registers and the indexes to the registers. In the DIA headquarters "... two new filing systems were established - a duplex numeric system and a modified Dewey classification with number ranges assigned large subject areas." (88) The "duplex numeric" system was a great improvement over systems such as the "Black Series," consisting of a number for every main subject group heading (e.g., finance), then secondary and tertiary numbers to narrow the classification. (89) Terry Cook has noted the effect of this type of more flexible filing system was to bring scattered files together, and it indicated a transition from limited government to an interventionist government interested in the mineral wealth of the North. (90)

These changes were similar to those made in large offices and bureaus all over Canada. In the 1920s and 1930s, changes were made to deal with the crushing masses of paper that were ever increasing and must have seemed endless. (91) In 1922, the DIA reported that in the previous year 71,668 letters, vouchers, and so on, were received, and 23,600 letters, returns, and telegrams went out. This did not include circular letters, acknowledgements, cheque letters, or receipts. Added to this were 1,212 registered letters received, and 1,460 unregistered money letters received.
The department, ever more conscious of the historical nature of the material it had produced, also did searches for historical material, both in the then Public Archives of Canada and the departmental records.(92)

Increasing standardization was a hallmark of the 1940s. By the end of the decade the DIA had developed a large range of standard forms and applications such as the "Application For Leave of Absence (1948)," "Physicians Certificate of Inability to Perform Duties," and "Retirement Fund Application Fund." As important was the new duplex series system which was introduced in the period 1946-1952 and lasted until 1980.(93) The series was characterized by a three digit responsibility code (the agency), followed by a subject code, with an extension for the band in question (e.g. 156/1-1, this would be for the Kwawkewlth Agency of British Columbia).(94) This system was extended to all the field offices in about 1950.(95) This change was only one of the many profound changes which altered the government/First Nations relationship in the 1950s and 1960s.

Some of these records eventually came to form the archival record which we have today, especially that in NAC's RG 10. The first transfer of records to the Archives (then part of the Department of Agriculture) occurred on 6 November 1907. This amounted to nine bound volumes of
manuscripts containing reports and minutes of the Indian Commissioners at Albany, New York, with material relating to Indian Councils. The largest early transfer occurred when the Department moved from the East Block to the Booth Building on 17 October 1913. This included most pre-1872 records. (96) The definitive article on this subject is, without a doubt, Bill Russell's "The White Man's Paper Burden". Russell wrote an excellent description of the history of the transfers of records from the offices of the DIA offices to the archives. He concludes that Indian Affairs officials believed the records of their department should be kept for "historical" purposes because they documented the assimilation of Canada's First Nations. (97) Writing of the records in 1937, DIA registrar, A. E. St. Louis, noted: "They contain an almost continuous record of our Indian wards progress...what these men [agents, inspectors, farmers, and superintendents] have done for its wards and these records should be kept intact for historical purposes and as an example to future generations." (98)

Christopher Bracken wrote in the Potlatch Papers of the positive attitude of D. C. Scott to museums and archives. For Scott First Nations cultures only had a place in his world if they consented to "die and leave their remains...in national archives and museums to be remembered by future generations of homogeneously white citizens." (99) This is an
obvious continuation of the policy to document the "civilizing" progress of the DIA in their annual reports. Archivists have yet to carefully examine their place in this process.
Conclusion

This thesis attempts to demonstrate that, in the period 1755-1950, the expanding bureaucracy of the Department of Indians Affairs, its records-keeping systems, and the records it produced were powerful tools in the hands of Canadian attempts to assimilate First Nations people. In documenting the progress of assimilationist programmes (e.g., education or the alienation of reserve land) the records-keeping systems of the department were also a key enabling tool in this "civilizing" process. This conclusion results from approaching the study using methods advocated by archivists such as Terry Cook, and others, who have been employing a "contextual" approach to the study of recorded communication. As has been shown in this thesis this approach invites an examination of the societal context and underlying assumptions involved in records creation. It asks us to look at more than just their informational content.

This thesis also attempts to contribute to the small but growing body of literature on First Nations people which is "theoretically informed". (1) How a view of reality is created by recorded information is obviously a complex process and its full explanation is beyond the scope of this work. More studies such as those done by Terry Cook, Bill Russell, and Tom Nesmith are needed, as are those of scholars like Christopher Bracken. Their work parallels the
ideas of writers, such as Michel Foucault, who reject the view that records are passive recorders of information.

The conclusion of the thesis has another important implication for archives and archivists. As other such studies have shown, archivists can no longer assume that records and documents are neutral carriers of information. Archivists can no longer passively dole out records they believe to be the total objective, unmediated truth. The archival profession must proceed to study, write, and inform its work in ways which attempt to overcome the structural biases and weaknesses in archival records, including those concerning Aboriginal people, while at the same time being aware how the interests and concerns of our era also colour how we view the records. It has been suggested that this situation requires archivists to approach records in entirely different ways. We must try to "read the silences" in existing records, and, perhaps more importantly, accord oral tradition the same weight critical attention as standard written archival sources.(2) This last issue is taking on both an increasing legal and historiographical importance. Others have suggested that it is now also critical to encourage the establishment of Aboriginal archives which would collect records which reflect the activities of Native creators and not just the dominant Euro-Canadian society.(3)
This thesis explores some approaches to the records of Indian Affairs which may be usefully developed in the future. The possibility of making important contributions to the study of archives and First Nations people is great.
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