University of Windsor
Scholarship at UWindsor

Major Papers | Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

October 2021

Indigenous Self-Determination Rights and The Role of Municipality

Anh Lam
University of Windsor, lam41@uwindsor.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/major-papers

Recommended Citation
Lam, Anh, "Indigenous Self-Determination Rights and The Role of Municipality" (2021). *Major Papers*. 193.
https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/major-papers/193

This Internship Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in Major Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

Indigenous Self-Determination Rights and The Role of Municipality

By

Anh Lam

An Internship Paper
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Political Science
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts
at the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2021

© 2021 Anh Lam

Indigenous Self-Determination Rights and The Role of Municipality

by

Anh Lam

APPROVED BY:

J. Sutcliffe
Department of Political Science

R. Major, Advisor
Department of Political Science

September 14, 2021

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

ABSTRACT

Since the release of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission there has been a growing interest in how municipal governments can contribute to the reconciliation process and accommodate the self-determination rights of Indigenous People in the urban setting. Urban Indigenous communities have attempted to wield greater influence in municipal planning and policy-development processes. One way this has been accomplished is through coproduction, which facilitates meaningful and respectful partnership between urban Indigenous communities and cities. This research explores how the coproduction concept is applied in municipal-Indigenous governance in two cities: Toronto and Saskatoon. By examining two case studies, this study seeks to contribute more meaningful municipal planning practice to expand sustainably Indigenous collective rights in the city.

Key words: self-determination, coproduction, municipal-Indigenous governance

DEDICATION

In dedication to my dear family and friends.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would first like to thank my supervisor, Professor Rebecca Major, for providing me the great opportunity to perform research under her guidance. Her unwavering support and inspiration along with her invaluable expertise in Indigenous issues have helped me greatly during the writing of this report.

I would also like to thank Dr. John Sutcliffe for his guidance during my placement as well as for serving as a committee member of my oral defense.

I am thankful to Gayle Jones for providing me the chance to work as an intern at the City of Windsor that becomes a great source of inspiration for this report.

In addition, I would also love to thank you to Graduate Secretary Jennifer Forde, and all the knowledgeable, enthusiastic and caring professors of the Political Science Department of the University of Windsor who have been sharing their knowledge and inspiring me throughout my graduate journey.

Finally, I owe a thank you to my parents for their encouragement and unconditional love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY iii
ABSTRACT iv
DEDICATION v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCING INDIGENOUS SELF-DETERMINATION RIGHTS IN THE URBAN CONTEXT 1
1. Introduction 1
2. Literature review 5
Unequal power relation in the city 5
Self-determination in the urban setting 9
Towards Co-production in municipal planning 14
3. Methodology 16
CHAPTER II: DEFINE THE PROBLEM 19
1. Settler Colonialism and Treaty Relationship 19
2. Indigenous people in the city 20
3. Urban Indigenous governance 23
CHAPTER III: CASE STUDIES 27
1. City of Toronto 27
2. City of Saskatoon 31
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION 36
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION 40
REFERENCES 42
VITA AUCTORIS 52

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCING INDIGENOUS SELF-DETERMINATION RIGHTS IN THE URBAN CONTEXT

1. Introduction

In Canada, a majority of Indigenous peoples reside in urban centers (Statistics Canada, 2016). However, they experience disproportional poverty compared with non-Indigenous Canadians and "tend to be viewed solely as marginal populations in need of assistance, not as valued assets or productive contributors to urban localities" (Horak, 2012: 148). Therefore, there has been a call to focus on urban Indigenous community development that can promote wellness and success, as well as cultural retention and transformation (Walker & Belanger, 2013). In addition, this development is also crucial to the nation-wide reconciliation journey that Canada has recently started to work on. The most meaningful and promising step therein is perhaps the establishment of the TRC (Truth and Reconciliation Commission) in 2008, engaging and educating all Canadians about the obliterated history of the residential school system and fostering the process of reconciliation. The fruit of the TRC is the publication of the TRC Calls to Action including 94 points of action which involve all levels of government (federal, provincial, municipal) to collaborate on changing policies and programs to meaningfully advance reconciliation with Indigenous Peoples (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015). While there is no formal legal relationship between Indigenous Peoples and municipalities, there has been a shift towards recognizing the important role of municipalities in responding to the discourse of Indigenous self-determination, considering the increasing responsibilities of cities regarding shaping policy (Walker & Belanger, 2013). Indeed, sixteen of 2015 TRC calls to action are relevant to municipal levels of government. Meanwhile, most major cities are located in Indigenous territories from which the Crown and successive Canadian governments forcibly excluded Indigenous people through different regulations and policies (Peters and Andersen, 2013:4). Altogether, it is time for the local governments to take steps to promote Indigenous people' rights to self-determination so that they can thrive as distinct people in the urban society.

Characterized by an embracement for diversity and inclusion, Canada's public policy discourse has always fostered the expression of cultural difference, while Canadian city planning is culture-responsive (Qadeer, 1997). However, Qadeer (1997) does note that the planning in his research focus is on the multiculturalism of immigrants, old and new only, claiming planning

issues relating to Indigenous communities are a topic by themselves. Noting the particular historic and political attributes of Indigenous people, Walker (2003) argues that this group deserves a more particular specification than the work of Qadeer (1997) because they are not simply an ethnic group contending for cultural preservation in the mainstream society. His argument is based on the work of Kymlicka (cited in Walker (2003)), which underscores that there is a marked difference between Indigenous People and other immigrant ethnic minority groups by virtue of the former's prior occupancy, treaties, and constitutional recognition. Indeed, Kymlicka (1998) notes that prior to the Canadian state, Indigenous people were already self-determining societies with distinct societal cultures. Therefore, the rights of self-determination and self-government had to be taken into account in urban planning practice in all municipalities and not just Indigenous reserves.

However, the Canadian government has historically been hesitant to create policies specifically addressing urban Indigenous People due to disagreements over the unclear and controversial question of legislative authority, resulting in negligence for urban Indigenous People (Hanselmann, 2001: 4). This could be attributed to the fact that municipalities are legally "provincial creatures" (Sancton, 2011:28), and thus there is no formal legal relationship between Indigenous Peoples and municipalities. Section 91 of the Constitution Act 1867 grants Parliament exclusive legislative jurisdiction over Indigenous affairs (Library of Parliament, 2019). Alongside the federal government's exclusive jurisdiction over Indigenous people, provincial laws of general application can still apply to this group (Library of Parliament, 2019). Simply put, municipalities have power only in those areas delegated to them by their respective provincial governments, which do not include Indigenous affairs. However, it does not mean that municipalities are out of the picture in the advancement of reconciliation with Indigenous communities. Municipalities are, in contrast, more than ever well-positioned to facilitate meaningful Indigenous participation to build community aspirations and capability at the local level into strong national policy.

With the migration of both people and economic activity to cities, there has been a consensus on the necessity for more urban-municipal independence (Courchene, 2007). In terms of Indigenous affairs, urban municipalities are taking steps in adopting new policies and ways of working, learning about Indigenous ways of living, developing mutually beneficial agreements with local Indigenous communities, and implementing services developed through collaborative initiatives since the 1990s (Wall, 2016). Indeed, not the province but cities know their problems

best, and should therefore be enabled to implement suitable measures to meaningfully engage with their local Indigenous groups. Besides, local governments may help to reinforce Indigeneity through local initiatives to teach the language, promote Indigenous values and symbols in the city landscape. Accordingly, there has been a shift towards recognizing the important role of cities in the discourse of Indigenous self-determination and reconciliation.

In order to have meaningful actions contributing to the nationwide acknowledgement of Indigenous rights, it is important for municipalities to adopt a completely different approach with the current multiculturalism which is denied by many Indigenous people. Given the fact that urban Indigenous People experience disproportional poverty, there has been an excessive focus on this socioeconomic marginalization, which is likely to perpetuate negative stereotypes of urban Indigenous People as merely impoverished without considering the historic context of their poverty (Peters, 2012:7-8). It is of no surprise why the Canada government's solution to Indigenous poverty and associated problems has always been integration, pursued through various initiatives designed to incorporate Indigenous people as any needy ethnic group into the mainstream society (Cornell & Jorgensen, 2019). Reconciliation can only be achieved when municipalities consider Indigenous people's inherent collective rights to self-determination in planning practices while not overlooking the far-reaching effect of colonization, including land and culture dispossession as well as the traumatic experience caused by the residential school system. In addition, Peters (2012:9-11) underscores the importance of recognizing and tapping the capacities of urban Indigenous People as well as incorporating Indigenous principles, beliefs, traditions in the municipal planning process for more effective Indigenous policies and services. Besides, Walker (2008) suggests that municipalities can consider urban Indigenous identities as a municipal asset. In essence, it is imperative for local governments to replace their multicultural inclusive policies by putting forward policies addressing Indigenous populations on the basis of respecting and acknowledging their distinct cultures and rights. separate and distinct polities within the nation state.

While more municipalities have taken steps on working with Indigenous communities, an increasing number of scholars have aimed to look for more meaningful engagement between these two in ways that recognize Indigeneity (Tomiak (2010), Fawcet, Walker & Greene (2015), Heritz, (2016, 2018), Bouvier & Walker (2018)). Nevertheless, any meaningful recognition of urban

Indigenous governance can be impeded due to colonial assumptions about where Indigeneity is legitimate under settler state jurisdiction (Porter, 2013). This is why Indigenous People in urban areas have been emphasizing their right to play a substantial role in setting public policy and defining and delivering programs and services to urban populations and distancing themselves from policies of multiculturalism. In such a context, it is useful to look at the idea "deep federalism as process" introduced by Christopher Leo (2006), who states that there are possibilities for the state and community actors to work together for relevant local solutions. With an emphasis on the role of non-state actors, Leo's concept of deep federalism reinforces the role of Indigenous community aspirations in urban affairs.

Further, many scholars have arrived at the concept of co-production as a theoretical premise that can guide urban Indigenous policies and address urban Indigenous self-determination (Walker, Moore & Linklater (2012), Walker & Belanger (2013), Ouart (2013). In the context of not yet formal engagement of the Indigenous population in municipal policy formulation, there has been much work on how the municipal-Indigenous interface can be improved, and co-production is one of the most promising models. According to Walker & Belanger (2013), co-production refers to municipal-Indigenous policy engagement aiming to increase Indigenous input in municipal policy-making and planning processes. By involving external Indigenous actors from "problem or issue identification, to priority setting through to programs and services, and onwards" (Walker, Moore & Linklater, 2011:163), co-production goes beyond simply consulting the Indigenous population in policy-making discussions and functions as a means of ensuring Indigenous perspectives and ideas can contribute in an equitable manner during the whole process of municipal policy planning. By and large, Walker et al. (2011:164) assert that policy and programs co-produced with Indigenous communities show better results. Indeed, a co-production approach will give Indigenous organizations opportunities to argue for self-determining autonomy in urban affairs and advocate for specific measures to improve life quality on their own terms.

While Canada recognizes the Indigenous inherent rights to self-government through *The Government of Canada's Approach to Implementation of the Inherent Right and the Negotiation of Aboriginal Self-Government* first launched in 1995 (Government of Canada, 2020), this act is considered symbolic without a comprehensive endorsement of these rights to be expressed in policy planning. On the *Calls to Action*, there is little progress due to no legitimate enforcement

mechanism for these recommendations to be implemented. Without clear guidelines from the higher-level governments, municipal planning is often perceived as not in concert with the interests and rights of Indigenous communities living off-reserve, who share the space with municipalities. In the absence of such specific and apparent guidelines, I explore how municipalities can meaningfully engage urban Indigenous People and improve the interface and planning relationship between municipalities and Indigenous communities. I argue that applying co-production in city planning processes through authentic forms of partnership is the most effective way for municipalities to facilitate the rights of Indigenous communities.

2. Literature review

Unequal power relation in the city

There has been a lack of consideration of Indigenous people in Canadian urban environments. Peters (as cited in Edmond (2010)) observes that the Western city is often seen as a gendered, racialized, and heterosexual space that excludes Indigenous Peoples and their distinct cultures and experiences. In fact, Porter and Yiftachel (2019) note that urban studies often focus on issues related to inequalities derived from capitalism, globalization, gender, and immigration but often bypass the dynamics of power in settler-colonial contexts. Indeed, spatial planning and urban design have begotten Indigenous social, cultural, symbolic, and economic displacement in Canadian contemporary cities (Nejad, S., Walker, R., Macdougall, B., Belanger, Y., & Newhouse, D., 2019). Ironically, while cities assume a prominent place in displacement and destruction of Indigenous histories and geographies, they obscure Indigenous erasure at the same time. Indeed, cities are rarely discussed as the locations of claimed lands in global land rights issues (Porter et al., 2019). Even more important, the cities are located on Indigenous traditional territories, and their histories are precisely urbanization histories. Thus, it is imperative for them to have their own place in the city environment discourse, be it policy planning or placemaking, in line with the articulation of Indigenous aspirations, principles, and protocols.

Throughout history, Canadian policies, practices, and discourse rest with settler colonialism that has perpetuated the notion that Indigenous People are incongruent with the city. Proulx (2006) notes that in the settler-oriented dominant narrative, Indigeneity is consistently aligned with ‘primitive” culture and customs and spatialized in rural and remote reserves where Indigenous People live mystically and ecologically in the uncivilized and natural world. As such,

there has been a spatially-based stereotype that it is impossible for Indigenous People to live as urban dwellers because it defines their identity as only inhabiting remote rural reserves. Hence, Indigenous People were removed from urban areas and relegated to remote rural reserves (both in legislation and in the popular imaginary) (Hunt, 2020:98). Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier dictated that "where the reserve is in the vicinity of a growing town…it becomes a source of nuisance and an impediment to progress" (Hunt, 2020:98). Gradually, Indigenous People become alienated in their own lands by immigrant settlers. Thereby, the settler state's claims to land, citizenship and nationhood are reinforced.

In order to maintain the primacy, naturalize the unequal distribution of power and legitimize practices of land dispossession, the settler state has perpetuated the notion that colonial settlement is set as the beginning of history, whereas acquired land is justified by terra nullius and Indigenous People are "ghosts" or "shades of the past" (Edmonds, 2010). This notion rests on what Edmonds (2010) called stadial theory, which categorizes human development into four hierarchical, successive and distinct "stages" of historical progression. European society is considered the "highest" stage thanks to the ability to maximize the productive value of land and resources while Indigenous People are characterized as "hunters" without rights of land. This theory establishes "a powerful syntax of settler colonialism" in which the city is not merely a site but a process of reaching modernity, while "out of time" and "out of space" Indigenous People are marked specifically as "inconvenient, "incompatible wanderers," "nuisance," and "vagrant" (Edmonds, 2010). As such, the settler government has gradually and successfully erased the existence of Indigenous people from the city and confine them in the remote uncivilized reserves.

In addition, colonial constructions of Indigenous identities have alienated Indigenous presence in an urban setting and naturalized the Western view of urban Indigenous inferiority and depravity. Along with this, the rhetoric of superiority gives rise to an incorrect stereotype that Indigenous People are lazy, dirty, criminal drunkards that are not able to deal with the intricacies of modernity in an urban setting (Proulx, 2006). Altogether, the dichotomy of Indigenous identities and the urban setting is created and to dismiss the rights and entitlements of urban Indigenous Peoples and their nationhood (Andersen and Denis, 2003). Similarly, Proulx (2006) notes that urbanization accompanied with assimilation is utilized by the settler state to avoid engagement with urban Indigenous Peoples as persons with inherent rights. It is because the pervasive

misconceptions and stereotypes that "authentic" Indigenous Peoples can only be found on remote rural reserves but not in the city. Peters (2011) adds that when Indigenous People took residence in cities, they were perceived as making a decision to abandon their identities and communities. Given the fact that rights are principally tied to land bases conceived as lying outside the cities, urban Indigenous populations have been deprived of their identities and collective rights.

In both popular discourse and early academic work and policy making, there was a perception of incompatibility between urban and Indigenous cultures and identities as well as its resulting failure of Indigenous People in their urban life (Norris, Clatworthy & Peters, 2013:30). However, there was a shift in literature on urban Indigenous identity after 1996 when the Royal Commission on Indigenous Peoples (RCAP) affirmed that strong cultural identities play a crucial role in the success of Indigenous People in the urban setting (Peters, 2011). RCAP report states, "Crossing the city limits does not transform Indigenous People into non-Indigenous People; they go on being the particular kind of person they have always been – Cree, Dene, Mohawk, Haida." (cited in Peters (2011)). Given that the process of colonization is part of Canadian history, it is impossible to comprehend Indigenous identity without acknowledging the historical and ongoing impact of colonialism throughout several generations.

Discussing Indigenous identity, Frideres (2008) points out that colonization engendered economic dependency, the destruction of culture (including language), and social control that have altogether eroded Indigenous identity. He also underscores spatial identity reflected in the difference between Indigenous People in urban and rural settings. He argues that rural Indigenous People can develop a spatial identity on a daily basis (Frideres, 2008). In contrast, given long-standing Indigenous attachments to urban areas, urban Indigenous People are still struggling in reinforcing their identity (Andersen, 2013:46) in the face of the socially, economically, and politically destructive effects of colonization and the threat of assimilation. It is critical for them to reclaim their Indigenous identity through the revival of traditions, the retrieval of ancestor connections, and the preservation of cultural values and identities through art, literature, and other mediums.

In terms of contemporary municipal practices regarding decision-making and service delivery in urban areas, Peters (2011) notes that these have eroded Indigenous identities and undermined Indigenous communities' self-determining rights. One important theme is "municipal

colonialism' suggested by the history professor Jordan Stanger-Ross (2008), reflecting the role of city planning in removing Indigenous presences from the urban landscape to replace them with a settler presence. Colonialism has been reproduced by municipalities not only in terms of the physical occupation of settler cities in Indigenous territories but also in municipal planning tools in the maintenance of cities as settler-colonial spaces and the development of laws to protect settler rights to land and property.

Though conferred relatively limited power by Canadian legislation, municipalities have influential powers to marginalize the physical and political presence of Indigenous Peoples. For example, the regulatory and enforcement power of municipalities can authorize settler colonial claims to property and simultaneously illegalize Indigenous assertions of territorial authority (Dorries, 2018). Cities can mobilize their by-laws in what they deem their best interest by establishing planning authority as a proprietary right. Take the city of Brantford in Ontario as an example. By claiming that Haudenosaunee Development Institute (HDI) activities constitute a nuisance and pose a threat to the City's economy and its legal body, the City imposed by-laws that frame nuisance as something that threatens the city's economy and its legal body (Dorries, 2018). Meanwhile, the City capitalized on the jurisdiction that only federal and provincial governments hold obligations to Indigenous affairs and declined the authority to direct planning and development of the HDI.[1] From this example, it can be observed that colonialism is reinforced, whereas municipal limited but influential jurisdiction presides over the territory in question to the detriment of Indigenous collective rights.

Although just one example, this case illustrates the power of municipalities in controlling Indigenous people which puts municipalities in the spotlight of contemporary government discussions that ought to address the need to reconcile Indigenous Peoples and accommodate self-determination. Before this line of inquiry is fully articulated, the notion of self-determination, which is inextricably related to Indigenous identity, sovereignty, and governance, needs to be developed. According to Simpson and Coulthard (as cited in Charlie (2020)), Indigenous self-

[1] Both the City of Brantford and the HDI claim to have the authority to direct planning and development. The HDI assert that they have never surrendered jurisdiction over their territory, and consequently maintain the right to control development. Meanwhile, the City uses jurisdiction to distance itself from the claims of the HDI by arguing that Indigenous affairs belong to the federal government only. Thus, the City issued an injunction to end the activities of the HDI, claiming that the HDI's activities constitute a nuisance and pose a threat to the City's economy and to the rule of law.

determination refers to the project of revitalization of Indigenous cultural values and governance practices from colonial domination. As such, the principle of Indigenous self-determination would form a basis for urban Indigenous governance and appeal to more political space for Indigenous populations.

Self-determination in the urban setting

There is a discrepancy between non-Indigenous and Indigenous understandings of Indigenous self-determination. According to Coulthard (2007), the discourse of Indigenous self-determination efforts and objectives in Canada have increasingly been cast in the language of "recognition." Under the ongoing process of colonization, Indigenous People have been kept in circumscribed positions as people without histories and geographies beyond their reserves. Particularly in the urban setting, they have been relegated to a minority ethnic group suffering racial discrimination rather than people of nations enduring adverse effects of ongoing colonization. Therefore, Indigenous claims for self-determination are often construed as the request for the recognition of cultural distinctiveness as a marginalized group living in an ethnically diverse country.

When it comes to the politics of identity recognition, Indigenous self-determination strides are likely to be found framed in the stated-centered discourse existing within the colonial status quo. Coulthard (2007) argues that this kind of identity recognition is merely a form of expansive recognition-based models of liberal pluralism that ironically reinforce the core configurations of colonial power and normalize the Crown's sovereign rule over territories in question. Similar to Coulthard's push for self-recognition, Audra Simpson (2017) emphasizes persistent Indigenous presence and governance, and insistence on continuing jurisdiction over their territories. Indeed, she demands 'refusal' rather than seeking recognition. These two voices, among many other critical Indigenous scholars, advocate for a departure from state-based recognition operated within power structures rendering Indigenous People powerless. Indeed, the right and recognition discourse cannot radically address contemporary colonialism, and thus fail to advance a sustainable self-determination process that restores and regenerates Indigenous nations and identities, which are complicated to identify, given the fact that many generations of Indigenous people have been living under the effects of innumerable social, economic, political and legal forces of settler colonization.

Considering the dire need for a transformative change in the government's relationship with Indigenous peoples, identity recognition can only serve as a temporary measure. Corntassel (2007) also shows a concern that mobilization based on rights discourse may end up in the state-centric "illusion of inclusion". He notes that "Consequently, a system that once denied an Indigenous rights agenda now embraces it and channels the energies of transnational Indigenous networks into the institutional fiefdoms of member countries." (Corntassel, 2007:161). He advocates for "sustainable self-determination" by bringing evolving indigenous livelihoods, food security, community governance, connections to the land and the nature, and ceremonial life into daily life practices without mobilizing state political and legal recognition. In essence, all these Indigenous scholars advocate for a different approach than state-centered rights and identity discourses that have shortcomings in addressing matters of Indigenous community resurgence.

When it comes to self-determination which is beyond the politics of recognition, the 1996 RCAP proposes it as the foundation for the revised relationship between Indigenous nations and the state of Canada (Green, 2020:248). Indigenous scholars conceive of it as independence and power to navigate their political landscape and form political entities outside of colonial frameworks (Green, 2020:248). Coulthard (as cited in Charlie (2020:91)) argues that self-determination is theoretically a "resurgence" of Indigenous ancestral values, principles, cultural practices that enable a "contemporary political and economic reality". It is essential to shift further beyond merely political awareness and symbolic gestures to practices of resurgence on a daily basis. Therefore, Corntassel (2012) notes that Indigenous communities should reject right discourse based on state affirmation and recognition to embrace a daily existence actualized by place-based cultural practices. It is because daily processes of truth revelation and resistance to colonial forces are also central to the struggles to reclaim, restore, and regenerate Indigenous "political and economic reality" mentioned above.

As such, Green (2020) notes that Indigenous self-determination will appear unsettling to the settlers who reject Canada's past of colonization and see Indigenous Peoples as assimilated Canadians. It is this widespread uncertainty and discomfort that makes Indigenous self-determination still looks obscure and inconclusive in the municipal context, even though the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), stating that reconciliation requires "Indigenous People's right to self-determination" (Green, 2020:249), addresses to the involvement of all government

levels, including municipalities. As the municipal government is closest and most accessible to people and thus can promote direct citizen involvement in its policy planning, Walker (2008) believes that municipalities are well-situated to be more responsive to Indigenous communities' needs and rights. Indeed, though scholarship attending to Indigenous self-government and self-determination at the local level is limited compared with research at nation-state and reserve-territorial scales, it is growing (Fawcett, Walker & Greene, 2015). It may be because more Indigenous people have come to live in municipalities and particularly in larger urban centers, thus, more and more public policies affect them and are targeted towards them. In this vein, Young (2012:214) insists that ensuring Indigenous representation at the municipal level is important because "Indigenous People are different from the majority society. They have different histories, different cultures and different political traditions; most important, they have different rights" (214). As such, it is high time that the municipal government integrated Indigenous voices into making local policies, particularly those that affect and target them.

Having said that, Andersen (2013:272) observes that government in urban centers has rarely positioned urban Indigenous People "as a distinct object of governance," but rather associated them with other matters such as homelessness, joblessness, domestic violence, and child welfare. As such, urban Indigenous People are addressed by social inclusion policies, without consideration for their inherent self-determination rights. Cornell & Jorgensen (2019) emphasize that the liberal principle of social inclusion, when applied to Indigenous People, harbors a desire for assimilation into mainstream culture and society and treats Indigenous People as just a disadvantaged group. There are inadequacies derived from the settler's exclusive interpretation of needs imbued in inclusion policies, as these identified needs are seldom drawn from Indigenous perceptions or aspirations but more likely reflect settler assumptions about what should matter. One noteworthy shortcoming of inclusion policies is that its lens is individualistic, aiming to include Indigenous Peoples in the larger settler society, thus eroding the bond among Indigenous People sharing indigeneity and undermining their collective rights (Cornell et al., 2019). According to Frideres (2008), while Indigenous identity is complex, it is ultimately associated with Band, linguistic or cultural collectivities, and definitely not personal identity. Before being a Canadian, an Indigenous person identifies themselves as a member of their own community or nation, such as Mohawk or Métis. Therefore, inclusion in the Indigenous perspective should be based on the nation-to-nation relationship. A need-based social inclusion approach to urban

Indigenous populations without recognizing their inherent collective rights merely reinforces the settler colonialism's principles which have ideologically anchored in municipal Indigenous policies.

Despite these obstacles derived from the ongoing colonization process, Indigenous Peoples across Canada have been making impressive strides in reclaiming cities as part of their traditional territories and demanding their inherent rights. Hence, it is likely that municipalities may be legally required to consult with Indigenous Peoples within the next few years as clarity occurs from legal proceedings (Fawcett et al., 2015). For now, the federal court case in Canada v. Misquadis (2002) legally recognized the off-reserve Indigenous People as a political community that was "self-organized, self-determining, and distinct, analogous to a reserve community" (Belanger, 2013: 69). Hence, there is a growing interest in the scholarship on urban Indigenous governance, which is used interchangeably with other terms of self-determination and self-government in the literature on urban Indigenous People (Tomiak, 2010). While all three concepts highlight the power and independence of Indigenous People in controlling their lives, administering their affairs, and making significant decisions for their communities, "urban Indigenous governance", due to its direct application in the urban context, is focused in this report as a way for urban Indigenous People to express their rights to self-determination. Specifically, Graham (1999) refers to urban Indigenous governance as a combination of "institutions, services and political arrangements dedicated to meeting and representing the needs and interests of the urban Indigenous population" (378). Given the disagreement between Indigenous self-determination and settler power structures, there is a growing interest (Belanger & Walker, 2013; Nelles & Alcantara, 2014; Peters, 2012; Tomiak, 2010; Walker, 2008) in how urban Indigenous governance, including various state and non-state actors, can accommodate collaborative relationships with the multilevel Canadian government in a way that ensure the well-being of urban Indigenous population.

It is imperative to note that there is considerable contestation of governance between Indigenous People and settlers. Charlie (2020) attributes this contestation to different ways of understanding the world (ontologies) and adds that such contestation is even exacerbated given a host of socio-economic pressures Indigenous People are dealing with. Meanwhile, theories on how Indigenous scholars navigate the contested political context of Canada are incommensurable (Charlie 2020, Jojola 2013). Some argue that there are ways to reconcile seemingly irreconcilable

settler and Indigenous governance by referring to the phrase "purposeful and productive juxtaposition" which can be done intentionally and creatively to reveal something new in their interconnections (Allen, as cited in Charlie (2020:85)). Generally speaking, there should be rooms for successful intercultural understanding and collaboration paving the way for planning processes that are open, participatory, and democratic.

Contemporary Indigenous planning paradigms have been reconstructed from traditional principles, such as kinship and land tenure (Jojola, 2000). In fact, though acknowledging Indigenous communities have been unable to capitalize on their philosophies to affirm their holistic practices, Jojola (2013:465-468) underlines the resurgence of Indigenous planning that prioritizes a culturally responsive and value-based approach to community development with the seven generations model. In that way, he articulates how contemporary Indigenous planning systems exist outside of and in relation to settler planning frameworks. Meanwhile, Peters (2005) notes that the matters of Indigenous self-determination rights have been mostly examined in rural and reserve-based populations, but not in the urban planning literature. It is critical to acknowledge that Indigenous planning, carried out by Indigenous nations has its own rights to be legitimate planning in the urban context.

Indeed, though the colonial project has undermined Indigenous identities, Indigenous communities have survived and retained an admirable clarity of their worldviews and principles based on the land, environment, and collectiveness. Therefore, many scholars have called for the creation of a political/institutional "third space" for indigenous planning to associate with state-based planning through transparent facilitated partnerships and collaboration, going beyond the dichotomy of two "false choices" – assimilation and independence (Bruyneel (2007) and Bhabha (1994) (as cited in Smith & Bruyneel (2011)). The framework of third space, first conceptualized by Homi K. Bhabha, refers to the practice of cultural hybridity that connects two separate cultures and thus relieves cultural differences. Bartmes and Shukla (2020) say that the application of this framework has challenged the dominant Western perspectives, redefining Indigenous-settler relationship differences and encouraging the emergence of new cultural forms and meanings. In terms of planning, while one of the most devastating consequences of colonization is to erase Indigenous knowledge and ways of life, such a transformative approach in bringing the two

planning systems together will pave the way for decolonization and advance a meaningful reconciliation process.

While Indigenous scholars endeavor to situate their rights and independence outside of the colonial power structure, self-determination should not be construed as an inspiration for isolation or separation. Walker and Belanger (2013:198) indicate that Indigenous people view self-determination as a normative partnership with the Canadian state that is guided by mutual respect and recognition for treaty relationships, constitutional arrangements, and collective rights. In this regard, urban Indigenous governance attends to mobilizing local actors, communities and institutions in sectors such as housing, health, education in order to meet the needs, advance the interests, and accommodate the self-determination of urban Indigenous People. In addition, positioning urban self-determination in a way of underpinning Indigenous density and complexity would also permit modern cultural hybridity that harmonizes Indigenous cultural differences (Walker et al., 2013:198). Indeed, more than a political and legal struggle, self-determination in the urban context should manifest through meaningful measures of autonomy that facilitate their continuously renewed spiritual and relational responsibilities in white settler societies.

Above all, the most important characteristic of self-determination one should be aware of is its nature of transformation. As the original occupants of the land, Indigenous people have the inherent right to govern their own affairs through the reformulation of settler state-Indigenous society relations (Walker et al., 2013:1998). Given the current Indigenous-state reconciliation framework still characterized by obscurity and a tendency of undermining and absorbing Indigenous culture to mainstream culture, it is urgent to work out this reformulation to both tackle the tensions between municipalities and Indigenous communities on the one hand and promote Indigenous engagement on the other. Therefore, scholars have begun to conceptualize how settler cities can reformulate their relationships with Indigenous communities in face of the prioritization of individual rights over Indigenous collective rights (Walker & Barcham, 2010). One of the most promising concepts which have been presented and discussed as pathways towards advancing urban Indigenous self-determination is co-production.

Towards Co-production in municipal planning

Coproduction rests on the right of Indigenous self-determination, and thus facilitates municipal-Indigenous urban governance. Specifically, Bouvier et al. (2018) note that coproduction

is concerned with full partnership and shared control between Indigenous and non-Indigenous governance actors at every stage in the process of planning and making policy. However, coproduction is more than cooperation. According to Walker, Moore and Linklater (2012), co-production refers to the policy generation and implementation process in which non-state actors are involved in policy creation rather than only in its implementation. This whole process starts from detecting problems or issues, to setting priorities, implementing programs and services, monitoring to evaluating. However, Walker and his associates note that the application of coproduction does not abdicate the state's responsibility for making public policy; instead, it creates value and shared responsibility that results in a high likelihood of achieving good outcomes.

Co-production is fluid. Walker and Belanger (2013) highlight that it is not necessary to have "an Indigenous affairs policy" as a product of co-production; instead, it can be embedded in any tools like a civic declaration, community accord, sector-specific protocol agreements, a proactive policy framework, or more nuanced Indigenous citizen engagement techniques (209). As such, coproduction should not be restricted to any policy or area. Rather, this concept should be explored in a variety of disciplines, such as municipal governance, public space design, economic development, land-use planning, or culture planning and preservation (Walker and Belanger 2013). In fact, what matters the most is how policy and programs co-produced with Indigenous communities improve their life quality and well-being on their own terms and not on dominant Eurocentric terms.

Coproduction is also considered a promising approach in the field of service delivery (Ouart, 2013). When it comes to the actors of urban Indigenous governance, there is growing attention to the important role of urban Indigenous organizations in maintaining and redefining Indigenous identities in the urban setting (Fridere, 2008). Building on the coproduction literature, Ouart (2013) examines citizen participation in the delivery of services through the specific case of the Friendship Center in Saskatoon. According to Ouart (2013), through co-production practices, knowledge and experience of Indigenous cultures, rather than a disadvantage, prove as essential for the successful design, and delivery of appropriate services. In this way, coproduction can help enable the resurgence of Indigenous culture, knowledge and practices that drive transformative change accommodating the rights to self-determination of urban Indigenous People.

While the concept of co-production has been applied to city planning processes and service delivery discussed above, there is still a lack of clear empirical research on how this concept can be more transferable to examine municipal-Indigenous governance. Therefore, it is important to examine how the concept of co-production can facilitate planning governance interface in a way to fully, and justly, accommodate urban Indigenous self-determination in settler cities. Given the fact that Indigenous identity refers to an enormous diversity of people of varying socio-political and economic interests (Frideres, 2008) as well as the difference in urban Indigenous policies among Canadian municipalities, I aim to answer the research question by investigating planning practice in two cities, which are Toronto and Saskatoon.

3. Methodology

Given the distinctive challenge of building authentic and trusting relationships with Indigenous nations as well as respecting Indigenous values and knowledge, Bradford and Chouinard (2010) point out the importance of a bottom-up process and a more collaborative methodology for implementing programs and policies addressing Indigenous residents. Meanwhile, place-based policy approaches have emerged in response to the ineffectiveness and gridlock in the top-down decision process of national governments (Bradford, 2005). According to Cantin (as cited in Bradford, 2005), place-based approaches are often defined as "collaborative means to address complex social-economic issues through interventions defined at a specific geographic scale". As such, they can capitalize on local knowledge to solve issues as well as facilitate collaboration between different levels of government and civil society; more importantly, it recognizes the crucial role of municipal governments (Bradford, 2005). Therefore, the place-based policy approach would be useful to analyze Municipal-Indigenous relationships as well as the coproduction in policy-making and planning of the local government.

Besides, the collaborative municipal-Indigenous governance frameworks or "interfaces" (Walker, 2008) in Canada's urban municipalities can be used to explore specific processes of Indigenous policy co-production, particularly in the absence of a coherent municipal-provincial-federal framework regarding urban Indigenous policy. In order to flesh out how policy co-production is performed via the Indigenous-municipal interface, I utilize four criteria drawn out from the work of Walker (2008) for my empirical analysis as below:

a. Citizen Participation and Engagement: Municipal-Indigenous relations could be strengthened by "a stronger process for ensuring Aboriginal citizen participation from the scale of the household, to community/ neighbourhood, to city council" (Walker 2008: 27).
b. Governance Interface: Indigenous communities seek "culturally appropriate municipal services and governance arrangements" and "a visible presence in place-making endeavours like urban design and heritage articulation" in a way that could "exercise self-determining autonomy locally in partnership with non-Aboriginal Canadian society" (Walker, 2008:28). Currently, there are two groups that municipalities should pay attention to and regularize their relationship with: (1) Indigenous reserves or rural communities, with governments such as band councils, with proximity to a municipality; (2) urban Indigenous communities that should be engaged in consultation and decision-making on municipal matters related to Indigenous peoples, such as Aboriginal advisory bodies or Friendship Centers (Walker 2008: 29).
c. Indigenous Culture as Municipal Asset: Walker (2008) advocates for a single office within municipal government that is committed to Indigenous aspirations and cultures, including but not limited to urban design, community services, street and park naming, and economic development. In addition, there should be human resource strategies aiming at staff recruitment, training and retention initiatives to attract and promote Indigenous employees (Walker 2008: 31).
d. Economic and Social Development: Municipalities can promote Indigenous culture and history in local heritage, tourism and place-promotion while undertaking economic initiatives related to career guidance, entrepreneurship training and business development for Indigenous residents (Walker 2008: 31).

As my research question is interpretivist in nature, I choose to apply the comparative qualitative case study methodology. According to Crowe, Cresswell, Robertson, Huby, Avery & Sheikh (2011), the case study approach is particularly useful to utilize in order to explain, describe or explore an issue, event, or phenomenon for an in-depth appreciation. Crowe et al. (2011) take a new policy initiative as an example of how this methodology helps to understand and explain causal links and pathways resulting from it. Case studies are suitable in different ways depending on the epistemological standpoint of the researcher, including critical, interpretivist, or positivist

approaches (Crowe et al., 2011). Both the nature of this purpose and the accompanying literature require the use of a qualitative research approach that captures information on more explanatory 'how', 'what' and 'why' questions.

Based on the place-based approach, I choose the two cities of Toronto and Saskatoon to examine the extent of the relationship between municipal governments and their Indigenous communities. These two cities are selected as they have a significant Indigenous identity population and are identified as Urban Indigenous Strategy cities, which were "selected on the basis of expectations about their information content" (Flyvbjerg 2011: 307). In other to undertake the empirical analysis, I have collected information from city websites, TRC calls to actions, key documents regarding Indigenous action plans, agreements, programs and services were gathered from each municipality. The selection and analysis of information are based on the four criteria listed above. Though these pieces of information do not demonstrate comprehensively the Municipal-Indigenous relations in the two cities, they provide background on the presence of Indigenous affair divisions, how they are operated within municipal administration, and attend to Indigenous self-determination rights through their initiatives, services, and relationships with other governments or Indigenous organizations that assist them in carrying out duties.

CHAPTER II: DEFINE THE PROBLEM

1. Settler Colonialism and Treaty Relationship

The relationship between Indigenous people and the Canadian state has long been perceived in light of settler colonialism which is an ongoing land-based process. According to Wolfe (2006), settler colonialism seeks to erase the presence of the original population of the territory to create a new society of invasive settlers. It has been well documented by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars that such land appropriation is often performed by direct and indirect forces including warfare, disease, starvation, and by imposing legal systems. Tragically, this "invasion"- in Wolfe's words is not an event but a structure in nature because the social, political, and economic structures have been all established by the invading people (Lowman & Barker, 2015:25). As such, settler colonialism is not a past event or legacy but has always been reproduced on the mythical premise about the emergence and development of the Canadian state and the denial of its genocide history. The popular narrative in Canada has justified oppression and the society founded upon this oppression, resting on what Alfred (2005:109) called "imperial arrogance"— the belief in the superiority and universality of Euroamerican culture.

Central to Canada's national identity and discourse is the treaty-making which serves to form the mythology of Indigenous surrender of their land and at the same time incorporate Indigenous populations and their lands into the legal and political jurisdiction of the Canadian settler state. Indeed, the notion of these treaties representing land surrender has been instilled not only by the government but also social, cultural, and educational institutions, evolving into a neutral and unbiased point of view (Starblanket, 2020: 19-20). However, many Indigenous scholars (Youngblood Henderson, 2002; Stark, 2010; Hildebrandt, Carter & First Rider, 1996) have underscored that this view of treaties stands in stark contrast with what the Indigenous people perceive, which is a legal and political framework for the coexistence of different groups in a common space. To be specific, writing about Treaty 7, Hildebrandt et al (1996:137) note that the First Nations accepted the treaty holding the belief that they would have full authority over their territory and "could continue to live as they always had" and "share the land with the whites" (Hildebrandt et al., 1996:137). It is of utmost importance to note that in Indigenous philosophies and legal systems, land is sacred as Mother or the source of life and thus can neither be sold nor transferred (Little Bear, as cited in Starblanket (2020:22)). The settler Canadian state, while

privileging the European legal system, has failed to respect and take into account the legal and political perspectives of Indigenous people who are also a party of the treaties.

Until now, the Canadian government has made verbal and some political commitments to decolonize its relationship with Indigenous people. Central to the process of decolonization is to reconsider and restructure the treaty relationship. For instance, Arnot (2009) states that renewed treaty relationships would serve as a framework for Indigenous people to hold a rightful place in roles of leadership within the Canadian state. Meanwhile, in a document entitled Principles - Respecting the Government of Canada's Relationship with Indigenous Peoples (2018:3), the Department of Justice Canada shows a commitment to a renewed relationship with Indigenous Peoples, based on the recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership by stating that "The Government of Canada is committed to achieving reconciliation with Indigenous peoples through a renewed, nation-to-nation, government-to-government, and Inuit-Crown relationship based on recognition of rights, respect, co-operation, and partnership as the foundation for transformative change." It also acknowledges the special constitutional relationship of Indigenous people with the Crown. Another stepping stone in 2017 is the dissolution of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, which is charged with implementing the Indian Act, a colonial law. However, as long as colonization is still considered a past legacy while colonial dispossession and governance persist, a renewed relationship means nothing but a continued effort of Indigenous assimilation and integration in disguise.

2. Indigenous people in the city

Section 35 of the Constitution of Canada refers to Indigenous people by the term Aboriginal Peoples, which include First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples. The Royal Proclamation of 1763, recognizing the land of Indigenous People, is the cornerstone in forming the relationship between First Peoples and the British Crown, and later the Canadian government (Slattery, 1984). Historically, the Canadian governments have deliberately attempted to erase the culture and language of Indigenous People in an effort to assimilate them. The most prominent and disastrous practice is the residential school system that operated between 1831 and 1996 (RCAP, 1996:42). However, these interventions have not succeeded in undermining Indigenous cultural values or their sense of distinctiveness.

After the treaties were made, Indigenous peoples had been kept on the fringes of the then newly evolving Canadian society. They were forced to reside on the reserves until deemed civilized enough to join Euro-Canadian society; however, this proved to be a measure to reinforce Indigenous economic and geographic marginalization (Hunt, 2020:95). Indeed, Peters & Andersen (2013:22) note that the settler government intentionally established Indigenous reserves away from urban areas in a way that reduced contact between settlers and Indigenous peoples as well as ensured the lack of control of their prime lands and the systemic underdevelopment of reserve economies. As such, it is not difficult to observe that Indigenous people experience disproportionate poverty in Canadian society. For instance, a Canadian Press article shows that 81 percent of Indigenous families on reserves had incomes below the Canadian low-income level in 2016 (as cited in Anderson & Ball, 2020:150). Meanwhile, Brittain and Blackstock (2015:12) found that a significant amount of literature has associated the overwhelming rates of First Nations child poverty to "Canada's history of colonial laws that led, and continue to lead, to loss of land, and thus to [a loss of] economic self-sufficiency, loss of language and culture, break up of family and community and a plethora of other negative and enduring effects." In general, the poverty experienced by Indigenous people is not neutral but a direct result of land dispossession, loss of livelihoods, and their forced dependency on the colonial state.

That said, many Indigenous scholars (Hunt (2020); Peters (2012)) have diverted attention from damage-centered or trauma-focused perspectives but focused on alternative approaches that embrace diversified forms of Indigenous existence and modes of Indigenous political, and social life. These approaches are particularly important given the fact that Canadian colonial ideas, practices and policies have continuously perpetuated the incongruence between Indigenous people and the city. However, it is imperative to note that "all Canadian cities are on Indigenous lands" (Simpson, 2014:23) and that "American Indians… have lived in urban areas since before the time of Columbus" (Snipp, 2013:174). Yet, Indigenous communities have been forcefully removed from urban areas under the Indian Act. Quoting this Act, Barman (2007:5-6) points out it regulated that "the residents of any 'Indian reserve which adjoins or is situated wholly or partly within an incorporated town or city having a population of not less than eight thousand' could be removed legally without their consent if it was in 'the interest of the public and of the Indians of the band for whose use the reserve is held." As a result, Indigenous people have been alienated in the urban

setting to the extent that their abilities to govern themselves as a political entity beyond their reserves have been put in question.

In Canada, the term Urban Indigenous Peoples is generally used to describe all Indigenous peoples (status and non-status Indian, Métis and Inuit) who live in urban centers. While "Indian" is a legal term referring to those people the government recognizes as having Indian status under the *Indian Act*, "non-status Indians" are those who lost their status, and thus do not have the same rights under law as status Indians (Warry, 2007:9). In the past, Indians were not considered full citizens and the Indian Act set out rules on how they could become citizens and relinquish their statuses, such as obtaining a university education or marriage to non-Indian men (Heritz, 2018). Due to a dearth of jobs stemming from a poor economy and a lack of social services such as education or health, many Indigenous people have moved to cities seeking better opportunities. This migration is not new, and a great number of Indigenous people have long lived or been born in the city and considered it to be their "home." That said, it is important for them to keep a close connection to the Indigenous community where they were born or where their parents or grandparents lived. As such, urban Indigenous people can still manage to preserve their tradition and culture, just as what is asserted in the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples' report - "Crossing the city limits does not transform Aboriginal people into non-Aboriginal people; they go on being the particular kind of person they have always been – Cree, Dene, Mohawk, Haida" (as cited in Andersen (2013)). That is to say, support for the preservation and redefinition of Indigenous cultures as well the establishment of Indigenous presence will effectively respond to the emerging self-identification trend in the cities.

To echo the above notion, Andersen (2013:47) states that urban Aboriginal is "a distinctive and equally legitimate form of Aboriginal identity" with twelve elements. Of no particular importance order in shaping the distinctiveness of urban Aboriginality, these elements are (1) economic marginalization; (2) a growing professional/middle class; (3) cultural diversity; (4) legal diversity; (5) status blindness; (6) urban Aboriginal institutions; (7) distinctiveness of urban Aboriginal policy ethos; (8) the character of informal networks; (9) attachment to non-urban communities; (10) struggles over the political representation of urban Aboriginals; (11) racism/social exclusion; (12) and place(s) of Aboriginal women in urban Aboriginal social relations (Andersen, 2013: 51-63). Apparently, while urban Aboriginality is not homogenous and

varies from community to community, it is not exportable to non-Indigenous people. Indeed, these elements have helped comprehensively conceptualize the urban Indigenous experience in Canada, providing a helpful tool for urban authorities to build their Indigenous policies.

Today, the Indigenous population has been continuing to grow in urban areas. According to the 2016 census, 867,415 Indigenous People lived in a city of more than 30,000 people, accounting for over half of the total Indigenous population. Cities having the largest Indigenous populations are Winnipeg (92,810), Edmonton (76,205), Vancouver (61,460), and Toronto (46,315) (Statistic Canada, 2016). However, the Canadian government has historically been hesitant to create policies specifically addressing urban Indigenous People due to disagreements over the unclear and controversial question of legislative authority, resulting in negligence for urban Indigenous People (Hanselmann, 2001: 4). Meanwhile, Belanger (2013) notes that when Indigenous people leave their reserve, it is not only interpreted as their decision to abandon their identity and culture, it was also seen to absolve the government of legal responsibility and funding arrangements for them. As such, urban Indigenous migrants have been likely to suffer from a lack of resources needed either to ease their integration into urban life or to maintain their permanency. That said, in the face of adversity, urban Indigenous population people have drawn on their own creativity to build organizations to meet their needs, playing a critical part in urban Indigenous community development. More importantly, these service-delivery institutions have formed what Peters (as cited in Andersen, 2013) calls "institutional life", contributing significantly to the production of urban Aboriginal collective identity and particularly providing a mechanism for Indigenous self-determination in the urban setting.

3. Urban Indigenous governance

A milestone in the pursuit of self-determination rights of urban Indigenous people happened in April of 2016, when the Supreme Court of Canada in the case Daniels v. Canada recognized the rights of non-status Indians and Métis to be a federal responsibility, thus allowing these groups to have access to services and funding programs. This, in turn, makes way for them to become fairly well-established urban Indigenous communities that can operate their own institutions and organizations since the first migrations to cities at the end of World War II (Newhouse, 2003). However, Tomiak (2010) notes that these communities are not grounded on a

geographical reality but rather a vibrant and dynamic formation of social relationships, networks, and shared activities centering on Indigenous agencies. Running as social service agencies for Indigenous populations, these organizations, most notably Friendship Centers, assume significant roles in shaping urban Indigenous communities by generating a sense of belonging, providing a place for meeting and gathering, and developing a visible Indigenous presence in the city.

Besides, Indigenous organizations are found to implement meaningful strategies that address barriers to urban Indigenous people's well-being on their own terms. In particular, when urban agencies are seen conflicting with Indigenous cultural values and sometimes posing a threat to positive cultural identities, Indigenous organizations earn Indigenous populations' trust thanks to the way they operate in accordance with traditional Indigenous worldview, perceiving individual's problems as "symptoms of deeper problems" that are rooted in "racism, powerlessness and cultural breakdown." (Newhouse, 2003: 249). Furthermore, governments at all levels, to some extent, have also created conditions and provided resources for the development of Indigenous organizations and institutions that sometimes challenge settler norms. In brief, Indigenous organizations have been acknowledged as legitimate agencies not only to meet the needs of urban Indigenous populations but also to increase the capacity of urban Indigenous communities to create spaces and pursue strategies beyond the confines of the settler framework.

In addition to service delivery, Indigenous organizations also play significant roles in cultural and community development through the network of friendship centers, culture and education centers, artists co-operatives, and other development organizations. In the face of silent but ongoing assimilation force to the cultural mainstream, community development and cultural preservation are instrumental in building and investing in effective and sustainable Indigenous communities, government and services. Indeed, while viewing Indigenous people as homogenous in terms of needs, concerns, or objectives, the government also perceives urban Indigenous organizations as a point of contact in the process of assimilating Indigenous populations into mainstream society (Ouart, 2013). It is evident that culture, as the accumulated teachings of ancestors, the foundation of traditions, customs, values, language, worldviews, and connections to the land, is the essence of Indigenous identity. Therefore, by maintaining cultural continuity under intergenerational effects of colonization, urban Indigenous organizations have fostered community development and created a sense of self-determination beyond the reserves. Undoubtedly,

Indigenous cultures have manifested themselves in settler cities through the development of culturally appropriate institutions that address Indigenous needs in terms of housing, health, jobs, education to arts and culture.

The most important part of urban Indigenous governance is perhaps the political institutions used to advance their own interests in the city, which are Indigenous councils of local Indigenous organizations and formal advisory bodies to municipal councils (Newhouse, 2003). Individuals participating in these bodies will act as learned and informed representatives of Indigenous communities to deal with mainstream agencies in various issues. Take the Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg as an example, its website reads "The Aboriginal Council of Winnipeg is a community based, membership driven, Indigenous organization which serves as a political and advocacy voice that represents the interest of the Urban Indigenous community of Winnipeg." While functioning to reinforce Indigenous self-determination, these institutions work on the basis of group rights and jurisdiction derived from original occupancy, treaty relationship, and constitutional arrangements made between the Canadian state and Indigenous peoples.

So, it can be seen that urban Indigenous governance comprises the "institutions, services and political arrangements dedicated to meeting and representing the needs and interests of the urban Aboriginal population" (Graham, as cited in Tomiak (2010)). However, Tomiak (2010) notes that settler urban governance practices have not facilitated a meaningful degree of decision-making power, autonomy, and sufficient resources for the activities of urban Indigenous organizations. Indeed, there has been a fiscal responsibility wrangling between federal and provincial governments when it comes to Indigenous issues. As Allec (2005:1) observes, "the long-standing conflict between the provincial and federal governments has negatively impacted First Nations peoples and has resulted in the patchwork of fragmented services, problems with coordinating programs, under-funding, inconsistencies, service gaps, and lack of integration". In addition, provincial governments are likely to elude from providing Indigenous-specific services and refer Indigenous citizens to available mainstream services instead (Tomiak, 2010). Meanwhile, it is pivotal to reshape the relationships between municipal, provincial and federal governments with the Indigenous governments in a way that guarantees the rights and well-being of urban Indigenous citizens.

In response to this tricky situation, Indigenous scholars have agreed that accommodating self-determination and fostering the relationship built on mutual recognition and respect is the key to reconciliation and strengthened relations between Indigenous nations and the settler state (Green (2020); RCAP, vol.2 (1996:4); Walker & Belanger (2013)). In terms of urban Indigenous communities, they have been quite neglected as a distinct policy concern group by local governments. As Tomiak (2010) points out, Canada's urban governments are furthest away from Indigenous populations in terms of rights but closest in terms of meeting the needs of their Indigenous residents. Spotting this role paradox, there has been a growing interest in addressing municipal-Indigenous urban policy-making and planning (Belanger & Walker, 2013; Nelles & Alcantara, 2014; Peters, 2012; Tomiak, 2010; Walker, 2008). Meanwhile, many metropolitan centers, particularly Prairie cities such as Edmonton or Calgary, have developed ambitious policy frameworks and initiatives to work with Indigenous communities (Walker et al., 2013). Indeed, municipal catering to Indigenous communities' aspirations and needs not only affects the quality of future urban development in social, economic and cultural sectors (Walker, 2008) but also offers unique attributes to the nation-wide reconciliation journey (Tomiak, 2010). In the spirit of recognizing and respecting Indigenous self-determination and continuing group rights, several civic administrations have proceeded the practice of planning and policy-making on the basis of co-production, in which Indigenous communities can exercise their self-determinations rights in partnership with the local governments. The next chapter will go into detail about how the two cities Toronto and Saskatoon are navigating their urban Indigenous policies and initiatives based on the concept of co-production.

CHAPTER III: CASE STUDIES

1. City of Toronto

The city of Toronto is located on the traditional territory of different nations including the Mississaugas of the Credit, the Anishnabeg, the Chippewa, the Haudenosaunee, and the Wendat peoples and is now home to many diverse First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples. It is also covered by Treaty 13 with the Mississaugas of the Credit (City of Toronto, n.d.). Today, the city has the fourth largest Indigenous population in Canada, which is 46315 (Statistics Canada, 2016). However, this number is much lower than the estimate from agencies serving the community, which is around 70000 (City of Toronto, n.d.). Besides, similar to other Canadian cities, the Indigenous population in Toronto is increasing, with urban Indigenous peoples comprising the fastest growing segment of society (Statistic Canada, 2016). Compared with other urban Indigenous communities, Indigenous Torontonians are found most likely to express a strong sense of their Indigenous identity in the city (Environics Institute, 2011). Indeed, despite being more likely to feel like a part of a non-Indigenous community, Indigenous Torontonians maintain strong Indigenous cultural links thanks to a variety of cultural activities widely available in the city. In general, Toronto is their home, even first-generation residents. While they demonstrate a commitment to the land and share a history with their families and communities living on reserves, their daily realities, the pattern of life and experiences are undoubtedly urban.

In 2008, the City of Toronto established an Aboriginal Affairs Committee (AAC) comprised of up to 28 service provider organizations and one member of the City Council. Meeting four times a year and reporting through the Executive Committee to City Council, the Aboriginal Affairs Committee's mandate is (1) to provide advice to City Council on the elimination of barriers faced by Indigenous people and to liaise with external bodies on barriers to participation in public life and to the achievement of the social, cultural, economic, and spiritual well-being of Indigenous people; (2) to address specific issues faced by the Aboriginal community, develop options for council's consideration, and make recommendations (City Council, 2008). With the direct involvement of Indigenous leaders in its operation, this committee provides an important avenue for Toronto's Indigenous people to pursue self-determination rights. For instance, the Toronto City Council voted for a monument on Nathan Philips Square because an Indigenous member of the Indigenous Affairs Committee was "asking for updates and saying, "I want it to be reported back

at the next meeting what they've done."" (Anderson & Flynn, 2020). Indeed, the AAC has to some extent helped to navigate Toronto's strategies and programs in a more inclusive and equitable manner for Indigenous communities.

It can be said that the model of the AAC is relatively progressive and addresses a great number of life aspects of Indigenous communities. In fact, the committee works with various city departments regarding urban Indigenous issues. For instance, it works with the Parks Forestry and Recreation department in naming city trails and acknowledging Indigenous influence on the growth of Toronto (Heritz, 2016). Furthermore, Mae Maracle, the President of Native Child and Family Services of Toronto (as cited in Heritz (2012)), notes that while other Canadian cities were consulted by Toronto's AAC, the Toronto advisory body is much different because its statements of commitment are unique in the way that they are more binding than other cities' protocols. That is to say, the AAC has somewhat fleshed out how the concept of co-production between Indigenous communities and settler cities would come in reality.

Significant evidence of the City of Toronto's efforts and commitment in building relationships with Indigenous communities and advancing Indigenous reconciliation and self-determination rights is the establishment of the Indigenous Affairs office at city hall with a staff of five in 2017. While existing within the office of city manager Peter Wallace and reporting directly to him, the unity also works with other city departments and Indigenous groups, and individuals. As such, it can facilitate and reflect the Indigenous community's aspirations. Commenting on the office's formation, Councilor Kristyn Wong-Tam says it has the potential to be "transformative," by bringing Indigenous voices into the city bureaucracy so that policies can be better informed, while Councilor James Pasternack shows concerns for its funding source (Rieti, 2017). Indeed, funding has always been a persistent challenge for the operation of not only Indigenous-oriented units of local governments but also Indigenous organizations and governing agencies, undermining reconciliation efforts and rendering the state's commitment to Indigenous self-determination superficial. That said, as Wesley and Lauren Kimura, of the city's Indigenous Affairs Office said "Nowhere in Canada are there as many direct Indigenous-led, Indigenous-delivered services for Indigenous peoples." (Kopun, 2020), it is undeniable that the City of Toronto has demonstrated certain commitments to engage Indigenous communities in a holistic manner.

It should be noted that the City of Toronto has made a number of measures that ensure Indigenous peoples are included in the process of policy-planning and Indigenous capacity is being developed (Commitments to Indigenous Peoples, n.d.). Take the housing issue as an example. In 2018, the Shelter, Support and Housing Administration (SSHA) co-created the *Meeting in the Middle Engagement Strategy and Action Plan (Meeting in the Middle)* with the Toronto Aboriginal Support Service Council (TASSC) and the Indigenous Community Advisory Board (CAB) in working out solutions more meaningfully address Indigenous homelessness in Toronto. All of the protocols and practices of the plan are outlined in a way that is inclusive, holistic and promotes Indigenous sovereignty and well-being (Shelter, Support and Housing Administration, 2019). While current measures are not exhausted with various existing barriers or concerns, an inclusive and holistic manner will serve as a good entry point for developing a meaningful and engaging relationship with Indigenous communities.

In addition, as a direct result of consultations with Indigenous communities, the City of Toronto introduced a statement of commitment, acknowledging that many Indigenous people "living in Toronto are affected by historical and contemporary injustices which continue to have profound impacts on most, if not all, aspects of life", recognizing the contributions of Indigenous people "to the success and vitality of the city", and providing a "strategic platform for pro-active intergovernmental relations" on urban Indigenous issues (cited in the report on Statement of Commitment to Aboriginal Communities in Toronto (2010)). Particularly, the report emphasizes that these commitments are built on "listening, learning, sharing, promoting, establishing partnerships and allocating resources" aimed at developing a meaningful relationship with Indigenous people in Toronto. Among the seven commitments that cover employment, economic development, housing, health, and education, the commitment number 4 states clearly that "the City also commits to engaging Aboriginal communities in the City's decision-making process, to removing barriers to civic participation and to increasing the representation and role of Aboriginal people on municipal boards and committees" (Statement of Commitment to Aboriginal Communities in Toronto, 2010). In brief, the City of Toronto has successfully created a formal process in place that can regularize the working relationship with its Indigenous communities for better addressing their needs and aspirations.

One important aspect to look at a city's reconciliation efforts is how it responds to the TRC's Calls to Action. Endorsing the 94 Calls to Action in 2014, the City of Toronto developed concrete actions within the role of municipal governments to fully implement these calls. These measures included the adoption of cultural competency training for all the city staff as well as its local residents, a ten-year capital project to incorporate Indigenous place-making in Toronto parks and public realms, and a roadmap and report card for installing plaques to commemorate Indigenous places (Flynn, 2021). For example, the city partners with Indigenous groups to manifest truth and reconciliation in Allan Gardens through activities such as events, ceremonies, healing spaces, gardens, and water features. Particularly, the park also embodies the knowledge co-production in horticulture by embracing an inclusive concept that encourages dialogue between Victorian botanical principles and Indigenous horticultural practices (Canadian Institute of Planners, 2017). It can be observed that some Calls to Action are mirrored in the city's Statement of Commitment, showcasing the determination and sustainability in the way the city government addresses the TRC report and the discourse of reconciliation in general.

As cultural preservation plays a crucial role in pursuing self-determination and reinforcing Indigeneity for urban Indigenous people, it is imperative for local governments to facilitate this right of their Indigenous residents. The City of Toronto adopts and implements the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) as the framework for reconciliation. Therein lies Article 11 which states that Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs protects cultural traditions and customs. The City acknowledges this right through the work of Heritage Preservation and other divisions doing environmental assessments that require consultations with Indigenous peoples of the area as part of City staff's legal duty to consult (City of Toronto, n.d.). It is worth noting that Toronto City Council was one of the first governments — local, provincial, or federal — to adopt UNDRIP (Andersen and Flynn, 2020). Moreover, as part of the reconciliation process, the City has circulated the Indigenous history of Toronto and adopted an Aboriginal Education Strategy, which combines formal and informal learning approaches, regarding what information staff needs to know about Indigenous peoples in Toronto. This gives rise to the rollout of Cultural Competency training which is in the process of developing currently. That is to say, the current approach of the city towards the Indigenous community will reinforce the distinct place of these communities in

the urban context rather than viewing them merely as victims in need of help. Such an approach will make positive social changes for sustainable Indigenous community development in Toronto.

The City of Toronto also has several measures aiming for the economic and social development of Indigenous communities. First, the City of Toronto commits to implementing employment practices that ensure that employment opportunities are accessible to Indigenous people and increases the number of Aboriginal employees at all occupational levels (City of Toronto, n.d.). In response to Action number 92 which ensures equitable access to jobs and education as well as long-term sustainable benefits from economic development projects for Indigenous people, Toronto works with its local Indigenous community to develop the Indigenous Centre for Innovation and Entrepreneurship (ICIE). As the first Indigenous business incubator of its kind in Ontario, this center is designed to support the growth, expansion and scale-up of Indigenous businesses in Toronto, by providing space, business programming, advisory services, mentorship supports, shared co-workspace, community event space, and connections to business networks. After years of consultations, the City has committed 22,000 square feet of commercial space over three floors at 200 Dundas Street East in Toronto to serve as a culturally and technologically rich space for Indigenous entrepreneurs. This project is expected to support around 420 Indigenous businesses and create 500 new jobs for Indigenous peoples (Canada, 2019). ICIE is a concrete example of the city's efforts in building economic and social catalysts for Indigenous peoples. In brief, the City of Toronto has made important strides in building relationships with Indigenous communities that is crucial in facilitating Indigenous self-determination rights.

2. City of Saskatoon

As the largest city in Saskatchewan, the city of Saskatoon is located on the North Saskatchewan River within Treaty 6 Territory and the Homeland of the Métis. The land has been resided upon for around 11,000 years by local people, while European settlement of Saskatoon did not begin until the 1880s (City of Saskatoon, n.d.). According to Statistics Canada (2017), there are around 27310 Indigenous people in Saskatoon. While this number is not large compared with other urban centers in Canada such as Edmonton or Vancouver, Saskatoon has one of the highest Indigenous populations per capita in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2017). Indigenous residents of Saskatoon are mainly First Nations and Métis people with roughly the same percentages. The city is anticipated to become the most Indigenous Canadian city by 2031 (Heritz, 2018). Saskatoon is

home to three urban First Nations reserves—Muskeg Lake Cree (the first urban reserve in Canada), One Arrow, and Yellow Quill (Canadian Institute of Planners, 2015). There are also three other First Nations with their land in or adjacent to the city, which are Red Pheasant Cree, Whitecap Dakota and Thunderchild (Map of First Nations in Saskatchewan, n.d.). In general, Saskatoon is clearly an important Canadian city for Indigenous peoples.

Despite being one of the most Indigenous cities in Canada, Indigenous people in Saskatoon do not actually feel welcomed in their home. According to the Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study (Environics Institute, 2011), Indigenous Saskatoonians are the least likely of those in Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study (UAPS) cities to say that they are accepted by non- Indigenous residents, and a larger minority than anywhere else think race relations are getting worse. The study also shows that the rate of non-Indigenous Saskatoonians who believe the presence of Indigenous People is negative is higher than the average rate of Canada. Indeed, Atkinson, Berdahl, McGrane & White (2012) found widespread hostility towards government programs aiming to support Indigenous peoples in Saskatoon. That said, similar to Indigenous Torontonians, Indigenous People in Saskatoon have pride in their Indigenous heritage and know their family trees well. They also have stronger concerns over retaining their Indigenous identity than any other Indigenous people in UAPS cities (Environics Institute, 2011). All in all, while Indigenous people may face a high degree of racism, they still hold an important connection to Saskatoon as their home without and maintain a relationship with their community of origin.

When it comes to how the city addresses the needs and rights of local Indigenous communities, it is worth referring to Saskatoon's Strategic Plan 2013-2023, which serves as the basis for all policy and program, implementation, and funding out of City Hall. This document reflects the city's commitment to harmonizing cultural endeavors, strengthening cultural development, and reinforcing a sense of community. As such, it also provides a framework for Saskatoon's major planning initiatives in partnership with Indigenous communities. In addition, being at the forefront in promoting reconciliation, the City of Saskatoon has a great number of initiatives that are making strides toward the TRC's Calls to Action. As such, the city is an excellent exemplary case to examine best practices in co-produced programs and policies between local governments and Indigenous communities.

When it comes to local government's efforts and commitment to Indigenous engagement, the City of Saskatoon has shown certain dedication to cultivating it. Take the Saskatoon Speaks the largest community dialogue for visioning directions in its history as an example. Indigenous professionals, political figures, and community leaders were invited to participate in these consultation events for providing perspectives about the City's strengths, weaknesses, and future directions. However, Indigenous participation was lower than the city's expectation; thus, two additional consultation gatherings were organized specifically targeting Indigenous communities that might be claimed to symbolize a dedication to achieving inclusive participation from Saskatoon's Indigenous residents (Fawcett et al., 2015). In addition, the City also devised the strategy of recruiting some Indigenous leaders as 'project champions' to circulate around the broader Indigenous communities and encourage their participation (Fawcett et al., 2015). It also shows the City's goodwill in fostering collaboration between the City and Indigenous leaders. In fact, "Strengthen relations with local Aboriginal organizations" is also mentioned as a strategy in the strategic goal "Quality of Life" in Saskatoon's Strategic Plan 2012-2022 (City of Saskatoon, n.d.). That is to say, there have been positive signs for authentic Indigenous engagement and inclusion, including communication, consultation, and opportunities for Indigenous involvement.

While the City of Toronto establishes the Indigenous Affairs office at the city hall demonstrating its commitment to building relationships with Indigenous communities and advancing Indigenous reconciliation and self-determination, the City of Saskatoon establishes the Indigenous Technical Advisory Group (ITAG) with the same purpose. The establishment of this group is the response to TRC Call to Action no. 92 and is based on Article 19 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. This new structure engenders the meaningful participation of members of First Nations and Métis communities in the design of the City's initiatives to help ensure that the unique interests and perspectives of Indigenous peoples are acknowledged, affirmed, and implemented (City of Saskatoon, n.d.). In order to do so, the group's members are recruited on the basis of their relevant experience and specialized expertise.

One of the first projects this advisory group works on is the City of Saskatoon's "Green Strategy", aiming to develop an integrated approach to planning and maintaining a sustainable, biodiverse city with a focus on natural areas and other green and open spaces (City of Saskatoon, 2020). Given the important connection to the nature of Indigenous people, the participation of ITAG in this critical strategy may pave the way for promoting Indigenous voices and stories as well as

providing opportunities for connections to lands and waters based on Indigenous knowledge and values.

In addition to Indigenous engagement, the City of Saskatoon also works on making places for Indigenous visible presence. A significant step is the Treaty 6 and Métis flags flown at City Hall on a permanent basis showcasing Indigenous contribution to Saskatoon's development. Besides, the City of Saskatoon worked together with local Elders, Harry Lafond and Senator Nora Cummings, to feature Treaty 6 Territory and Homeland of the Métis medals on bike racks along the historical 21st Street in honor of the culture and history of local Indigenous people (City of Saskatoon, n.d.). In response to TRC Call to Action no. 79, the city also reviews naming policies, aiming to increase the number of streets and public facilities with indigenous namesakes in consultation with local Elderlies and Indigenous organizations and entities (City of Saskatoon, 2020). For instance, Chief Darcy Bear Park was named in recognition of Chief Bear's accomplishments and the city's longstanding relationship with Whitecap Dakota First Nation. In terms of art, the city has provided both financial and organizational support to develop Indigenous arts to ensure that public art in Saskatoon recognizes Indigenous peoples' history and contributions (City of Saskatoon, 2020). All of these measures constitute a positive move as part of a larger recognition of indigenous history and culture in the city of Saskatoon.

Another aspect of the governance interface suggested by Walker (2008) is how the municipality regularizes its relationship with local Indigenous organizations and institutions. According to Fawcett et al. (2015), the City of Saskatoon acknowledges the representative role of Indigenous leaders and institutions within their urban communities, and that they also possess particular knowledge about those communities beyond the scope of the city hall. As such, there has been important cooperation between the city and Saskatoon Tribal Council, Gabriel Dumont Institute, Central Urban Métis Federation Inc. and other Indigenous groups in various initiatives to promote dialogue on reconciliation and Indigenous inclusion, such as Urban Indigenous Gathering, Kitsakinaw, Wicihitowin Conference, and to meet the needs and demands of Indigenous residents in other aspects of life (City of Saskatoon, 2020). One significant collaboration between the City of Saskatoon, and Saskatoon Tribal Council (STC) to note is the downtown safety pilot project to address homelessness and safety issues downtown, in which the latter is the lead agency. Working with community agencies like the Saskatoon Housing Authority,

Prairie Harm Reduction and the Saskatoon Food Bank and Learning Centre, STC Chief Mark Arcand emphasizes that he hopes to have a sustainable solution by putting people in long-term housing with mental health and addiction checks to come (Shield, 2020). Indeed, later in September 2020, the city announced that the Downtown Safety Response Plan would comprise two phases – a comprehensive community-based case management strategy, and a long-term transitional supportive housing model (City of Saskatoon, 2020). This partnership has played an excellent example of how an Indigenous-based approach can be effective in meeting the needs of Indigenous residents who are hurting. In that way, there would be a strong motivation for the city of Saskatoon in specific and other urban centers in general to integrate Indigenous perspectives to build more holistic approaches by collaborating with Indigenous organizations and institutions.

In order to better integrate Indigenous perspectives, Walker (2008) also suggests the view of "Indigenous culture as municipal asset" that the City of Saskatoon has manifested through different practices. The City's 2013-2023 Strategic Plan (City of Saskatoon, 2013:20) states that its long-term strategy is to "offer an inclusive workplace that embraces diverse backgrounds". In reality, the percentage of Indigenous staff of Saskatoon's Workforce was 8.5% in 2014 and 8.6% in 2015, far behind the 2015 Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission goal of 14% (Heritz, 2018). In response to this situation, the city has worked with Indigenous community partners as well as non-Indigenous employers, employment, education and training institutions, business associations to develop the Indigenous Engagement Employer Handbook, aiming to provide guidance and practical options for employers to improve their Indigenous workforce recruitment and retention outcomes. Furthermore, in response to the TRC Call to Action no. 57 in regards of providing education related to Indigenous history and culture to local government staff, the City of Saskatoon comprised ayisiyiniwak: A Communications Guide as an educational resource for City employees to enhance their understanding of Indigenous culture and practices in 2017. Given the pretty unfavorable view of Indigenous residents among Saskatoonians, these measures can help to expand, in Walker's words (Walker, 2008:30), "the local imaginary" and the "depth of civic identity" when it comes to the integration of Indigenous culture and history in the urban life.

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

The previous chapter explores some initiatives undertaken by the two cities of Toronto and Saskatoon showcasing their commitments to the TRC Calls to Action as a way to contribute to the nationwide reconciliation process as well as to improve the relationship between the government and local Indigenous communities at the local level. Given the fact that reconciliation entailing the dismantling and reorganization of the settler power framework (Andersen, 2013) in a way that facilitates the meaningful integration of Indigenous perspectives in shaping such institutions, this journey is still at the very start. Considering there is no formal link between Indigenous people and municipal governments as well as the limited power of the latter, most cities demonstrate their commitment to Indigenous reconciliation by responding to TRC Calls to Action as well as building a relationship with local Indigenous communities. However, advancing Indigenous self-determination requires more Indigenous participation in political systems and policy processes at the local level of government to achieve policy outcomes that address effectively urban Aboriginal issues on their own terms. Against this context, this chapter is going to review and discuss the limits of the work of the cities of Saskatoon and Toronto in facilitating the self-determination of Indigenous communities in the urban context that I base on the concepts of municipal-Indigenous "interfacing" (Walker, 2008) and "co-production" (Belanger and Walker 2009, Walker et al 2011) mentioned in the literature review.

When examining the case of the City of Toronto, it can be seen that Indigenous peoples here are building their community through collaboration with the city hall and through Indigenous organizations. One significant piece of evidence for the city's commitment to facilitate Indigenous self-determination is the establishment of the Aboriginal Advisory Committee and the Statement of Commitment to Aboriginal Communities in Toronto. Besides, when it comes to advancing Indigenous self-determination in the policy realm, it is imperative to not construe it as merely the accommodation of Indigenous people in mainstream society but rather the reinforcement of Aboriginal authority in decisions regarding their well-being in their own interpretations. As such, Indigenous people can maintain cultural and social identities that are separate from the mainstream society and culture, which are crucial to advancing their own self-determination rights. The City of Toronto has showcased this praxis by accommodating the operation of important Indigenous organizations that have a strong cultural base as their foundation, such as Aboriginal Legal

Services of Toronto (ALST), Anishnawbe Health Toronto (AHT) and Native Child and Family Services of Toronto (NCFST). At this point, the City of Toronto has showed a good example of including Indigenous principles in programs and services addressing to the urban realities of the local Indigenous peoples.

While there has been a number of measures and initiatives implemented to nurture the relationship between the City of Toronto and its Indigenous residents, there are still constraints and challenges that Indigenous people are faced with to sustain their self-determination. The first and most frequently mentioned is the level and stability of funding for Indigenous services that impede Indigenous organizations from designing and implementing services and programs responding to the needs and priorities of their communities. According to Frances Sanderson, executive director of Nishnawbe Homes (Kopun, 2020), there is a lack of long-term commitment as well as insufficient resources and the autonomy to deliver the programs and services in a culturally appropriate manner, not to mention that qualifying requirements are time-consuming and rigid. Indeed, it can be seen that funding for Indigenous organizations is not always reliable and to some extent difficult to access.

Another challenge is related to issues of legal status and jurisdiction that hinder Indigenous people's access to culturally specific services. According to Andersen et al. (2020), while Indigenous communities in Toronto have been recovering and practicing their cultural traditions, they have also found officially approved ways to hold ceremonies in the city by facing tremendous bureaucratic challenges that are almost impossible to meet. It is not unlikely for Indigenous people to find the use of their vital ceremonial sites inconvenient or inappropriate according to the rules or regulations of the city. For example, when they lit ceremonial fires on the beaches of Lake Ontario and elsewhere across the city, or planted medicines and food, they were challenged by city workers (Andersen et al., 2020). Indigenous people perceive these kinds of activities as a way to strengthen their relationship with the land whereas the local government's policies related to lands often contradict such understanding of Indigenous communities, which Andersen et al. (2020) call a "profound schism" from the very beginning. As such, municipal authorities have often been found standing aside, unsure of how to handle these appeals of Indigenous communities and rendering them uncertain.

Regarding the City of Saskatoon, there are significantly visible efforts of collaboration with local Indigenous communities. First, it should be acknowledged that the city has the potential in creating transformative planning in which local experience and knowledge can be listened to and absorbed to shape ongoing politics. In addition to various dialogues with the residents including Indigenous communities, Saskatoon has developed a number of practical and effective initiatives and programs in multiple aspects and sectors in the priority areas that Walker (2008) identifies. In Saskatoon, the most significant representative body for First Nations people is the Saskatoon Tribal Council which has stepped into different important projects with the city of Saskatoon in improving the quality of life of Indigenous people such as the downtown safety pilot project. Recently, the Council has constituted a historic achievement by signing an agreement to take control over child welfare in its seven communities (Vescera, 2021). While this is the fruits of hard work at the federal and provincial levels, it can hint at more successful and meaningful programs and models for the recognition of their self-determination at the municipal level. In addition, Saskatoon is regarded as a leader among Canadian cities for working on urban reserve service agreements and cooperating with several local First Nations (Heritz, 2018). It can be seen that certain institutional commitments to Indigenous communities can convey goodwill in fostering connectivity with the city and a sense of belonging among urban Indigenous residents.

Notwithstanding significant partnership, this form of partnership does not fully reflect the Indigenous self-determination, let alone co-production. Examining the City of Saskatoon's planning process leading to its Strategic Plan 2013-2023, Fawcett et al. (2015) note that it falls far short of the two principal dimensions of recognition underlying good forms of collaboration between the municipality and Indigenous communities, namely, the "territorially based recognition of Indigenous places" and "the recognition of Indigenous political authority". Throughout consultation meetings, Indigenous representatives are viewed merely a stakeholder among a diverse Saskatoon public, indicating the city's shallow recognition of Indigenous place and authority within their traditional and treaty territories. Indeed, simply visiting the city's website, one can see that Indigenous initiatives and matters are put under the section of Cultural Diversity which comprises policies and programs in terms of race relations and diversity and inclusion. In brief, the city has failed in re-situating urban Indigenous communities from a position as equal as other diverse resident groups to a more central position that acknowledges and incorporates their self-determining autonomy.

The above problem reflects another challenge for Indigenous self-determination which is the lack of representation at the municipal level. Indeed, when reviewing the life of Indigenous people in Canadian urban centers, Morse (2010:2) observes a "long history of Aboriginal peoples seeking to fill a critical void in the provision of important services that have been neglected by federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments". While the participation of elected Indigenous city councillors is instrumental in encouraging participation and engagement with Indigenous citizens in civic processes at the municipal level, there is only one current Councillor of the City of Saskatoon, Zach Jeffries, identifying as Indigenous. In addition, when looking at the role of the nascent Indigenous Technical Advisory Group, one can observe that its main role is only advising and reviewing the development of policies (City of Saskatoon, n.d.). It is because members of this groups are recruited based on their experience, skills and knowledge of Indigenous people rather than an elected voice representing Indigenous rights and needs. Considering this is the only division dedicated to Indigenous affairs in the City Hall, it appears that there is a lack of a mechanism for Indigenous representation and voice to participate in policy planning as what co-production entails. In the meantime, Indigenous people are still awaiting fundamental changes, including improved social programs, resource revenue sharing, and land rights, among other agenda items. In brief, the city still falls short of a framework for integrating Indigenous perspectives and aspirations into planning practices for a meaningful degree of Indigenous representation and participation in municipal governance.

In addition, considering different legal statuses and characteristics among Indigenous communities, it is imperative to have such a governance mechanism like an Indigenous advisory council to embed indigeneity in the culture and operations of the City Hall as well as to actively collaborate with the city. As such, there will be space for the representatives and leaders of various Indigenous organizations and governments serving Indigenous communities to call for the attention of the city to their issues and make recommendations. Besides, while the City of Saskatoon has implemented collaborative programming partnerships with Indigenous communities, governments and organizations, they are more on a specific project-to-project basis which may cause contradicting interests among communities and be hard to sustainably continue permanently. Therefore, such a governance mechanism will help to nurture a more authentic institutional representation of all Indigenous communities. Additionally, this mechanism will serve as a foundation for coproduction to be embedded in the municipal planning process.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

As Coulthard (2007) argues, under recognition models, genocidal practices of exclusion and assimilation have been replaced with a more conciliatory set of discourses and practices. However, the relationships between the Canada state and Indigenous societies remain colonial at its core. This research, therefore, aims to contribute to laying a practical groundwork for collaborative planning between Indigenous and mainstream traditions in light of the coproduction concept, which is significant in supplanting colonial relationships with new and transformative relationships based on negotiation, consent, trust, consensus, accountability, reciprocity, and resurgence of Indigenous culture, knowledge and practices. In order to do so, the research chooses to analyze planning initiatives in the two cities Saskatoon and Toronto. Using the method of case study analysis, this research aims to discover how the two cities facilitate Indigenous self-determination in the specific political contexts of these two cities.

It can be seen that Toronto and Saskatoon have made significant progress in building relations with Indigenous communities with more recent efforts in implementing reconciliation initiatives to address the TRC Calls to Action, undertaking collaborative projects with Indigenous stakeholders in different aspects and changing physical spaces to be more inclusive of Indigenous peoples. Between these two cities, the City of Toronto has demonstrated a stronger commitment to the concept of co-production by increasingly including Indigenous perspectives in its governance model besides building relationships with Indigenous communities. In fact, the City of Toronto has surpassed provincial requirements by adopting UNDRIP, which has not yet been approved by the Province of Ontario. The City of Toronto's adoption of UNDRIP, which is seen as a best practice by numerous Indigenous scholars and activists, demonstrates its commitment to build respectful reciprocal relationships with Indigenous communities. Meanwhile, the City of Saskatoon is still in the state of examining the possibility to adopt and implement this critical framework (Shield, 2021). In brief, both cities have shown distinct engagement of Indigenous stakeholders in their planning process that may serve as foundations for a renewed relationship with Indigenous peoples in the urban center.

However, in order to fully apply the concept of co-production in the planning process and decolonize urban governance, there is still a long way to go for urban municipalities. Given a lack of trust in the city government among Indigenous communities due to a disregard of Indigenous

citizens in the past, there should be an institutionalized mechanism to advance mutual understanding and shared responsibility between the city and Indigenous stakeholders. Considering the nation-to-nation relationship between Indigenous people and Canada, the diversity of Indigenous governance configurations as well as the local geopolitical realities, such a mechanism should be guided by multilayered, interconnected and context-specific procedures that are created and controlled by Indigenous "knowers" in partnership with the municipal governments (Fawcett et al., 2015). Simply put, rather than consulting and accommodating, the city governments should be obliged to inform and partner with Indigenous stakeholders from the first state of the policy production process in light of a deeper commitment to reciprocal, respectful relationships. Altogether, thanks to its transformative and reconciliatory potential, the concept of coproduction would be a promising framework for other Canadian municipalities to contribute to the holistic process of reconciliation with Indigenous nations.

REFERENCES

Alfred, T. (2005). *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Allec, R. (2005). *First Nations health and wellness in Manitoba. Overview of gaps in service and issues associated with jurisdiction*. Winnipeg: Inter-Governmental Committee on First Nations Health.

Andersen, C., and Denis, C. (2003). Urban Natives and the nation: Before and after the Royal Commission on Indigenous Peoples. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 40 (4): 373-390.

Andersen, C. (2013). Urban Aboriginality as a Distinct Identity, in Twelve Parts. In E. Peters & C. Andersen (Eds.), *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation* (p. 46-68). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Andersen, C. (2013). Urban Indigenous planning: Towards a transformative statistical praxis. In Walker, R., Natcher, D., & Jojola, T. (Eds.). (2013). *Reclaiming indigenous planning* (Vol. 70). McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP.

Anderson & Ball (2020). Foundations: First Nation and Métis Families. In Dickason, O. P., & Long, D. A. (5th eds.) *Visions of the heart: Canadian Indigenous issues* (p.142-164). Don Mills, Ont: OUP Canada.

Anderson, D., & Flynn, A. (2020). Rethinking" Duty": The City of Toronto, a Stretch of the Humber River, and Indigenous-Municipal Relationships. *Alberta Law Review*, 58(1), 107-132.

Arnot, D. (2009). We are all Treaty People. In Leeson, H. A. (Ed.). *Saskatchewan Politics: Crowding the Centre* (Vol. 21), (p. 223-237). University of Regina Press.

Atkinson, M., Berdahl, L. McGrane, D. and White, S. (2012*). Attitudes Towards Aboriginal Issues in Saskatchewan: A Research Brief*. Saskatoon. Retrieved from https://www.schoolofpublicpolicy.sk.ca/documents/research/archived-publications/government-

reports/2012_Attitudes%20towards%20Aboriginal%20Issues%20in%20Saskatchewan.pdf on Aug 7 2021.

Barman, J. (2007). Erasing indigenous indigeneity in Vancouver. *BC Studies*, (155), 3-30.

Barry, J. & Agyeman, J. (2020) On belonging and becoming in the settler-colonial city: Co-produced futurities, placemaking, and urban planning in the United States, *Journal of Race, Ethnicity and the City*, 1(1-2), 22-41.

Bartmes, N., & Shukla, S. (2020). Re-envisioning land-based pedagogies as a transformative third space: perspectives from university academics, students, and Indigenous knowledge holders from Manitoba, Canada. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 14(3), 146–161.

Belanger, Y. (2013) Breaching Reserve Boundaries. In Andersen, C., & Peters, E. J. *Indigenous in the city: contemporary identities and cultural innovation* (p.69-87). UBC Press.

Bouvier, N., & Walker, R. (2018). Indigenous planning and municipal governance: Lessons from the transformative frontier. *Canadian Public Administration*, 61(1), 130–134.

Brittain, M. & C. Blackstock (2015). *First Nations Child Poverty*. Ottawa: First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada.

Canada (2020). *Self-government*. Retrieved from https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1100100032275/1529354547314 on 8 Apr 2021.

Canada (2019). Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario. *One-of-a-kind Indigenous business incubator rising in Toronto*. Retrieved from https://www.feddevontario.gc.ca/eic/site/723.nsf/eng/02523.html?OpenDocument on 28 Jul 2021.

Canada. Library of Parliament. Legal and Social Affairs Division. Parliamentary Information and Research Service. *The Distribution of Legislative Power: An Overview* by Isabelle Brideau and Laurence Brosseau. Publication No 2019-35-E. Retrieved from https://lop.parl.ca/staticfiles/PublicWebsite/Home/ResearchPublications/BackgroundPapers/PDF/2019-35-e.pdf

Canada. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Report. Volume 1, *Looking Forward, Looking Back*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1996.

Canada. Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Report. Volume 2, *Restructuring the Relationship*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1996.

Canadian Institute of Planners (2015) *First Nations and Métis*. 2015 Conference Basics. Retrieved from https://www.cip-icu.ca/Special-Pages/CIP-Conference/Conference-Basics/First-Nations-and-Metis# on 7 Aug 2021.

Canadian Institute of Planners (2017). *A Vision Document for Allan Gardens*. Retrieved from https://www.cip-icu.ca/Files/APE-2018-Projects/FOAG-Refresh.aspx on 19 Aug 2021.

Charlie, L. (2020). Piecing Together Modern Treaty Politics in the Yukon. In Dickason, O. P., & Long, D. A. (5th eds.) *Visions of the heart: Canadian Indigenous issues* (p.83-93). Don Mills, Ont: OUP Canada.

City of Saskatoon (n.d.). *History*. Retrieved from https://www.saskatoon.ca/community-culture-heritage/saskatoon-history-archives/history on 31 Jul 2021.

City of Saskatoon (n.d.) *Indigenous Technical Advisory Group*. Retrieved from https://www.saskatoon.ca/community-culture-heritage/cultural-diversity/indigenous-initiatives/indigenous-technical-advisory-group on 6 Aug 2021.

City of Saskatoon (2020). *City of Saskatoon's Response to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action and Responsibilities - January 2020 Update*. Summary of Calls to Action. Retrieved from https://pub-saskatoon.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=105643 on 7 Aug 2021.

City of Saskatoon (2020). *New Saskatoon partnership formed to address downtown safety and homelessness*. Retrieved from https://www.saskatoon.ca/news-releases/new-saskatoon-partnership-formed-address-downtown-safety-and-homelessness on 9 Aug 2021.

City of Saskatoon (2013) *Strategic Plan 2013-2023*. Retrieved from https://www.saskatoon.ca/sites/default/files/documents/transportation-utilities/transportation/active-transportation/city_of_saskatoon_strategic_plan_2013-2023.pdf on 25 Jul 2021.

City of Toronto (n.d.) *Indigenous people of Toronto*. Retrieved from https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/accessibility-human-rights/indigenous-affairs-office/torontos-indigenous-peoples/ on 24 Jul 2021.

City of Toronto (n.d.) *Commitments to Indigenous Peoples*. Retrieved from https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/accessibility-human-rights/indigenous-affairs-office/commitments-to-indigenous-peoples/ on 25 Jul 2021.

City Council of Toronto (2008). Item Ex 16.14, "Terms of Reference – Aboriginal Affairs Committee". Retrieved from www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2008/ex/reports/2008-01-08-ex16-cc-dit14.pdf on 25 Jul 2021.

Cornell, S., & Jorgensen, M. (2019). "What are the Limits of Social Inclusion? Indigenous Peoples and Indigenous Governance in Canada and the United States". *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 49(2), 283–300.

Corntassel, J. (2007). Partnership in action? Indigenous political mobilization and co-optation during the first UN Indigenous Decade (1995–2004). *Human Rights Quarterly*, 29(1), 137-166.

Corntassel, J. (2012). Re-envisioning resurgence: Indigenous pathways to decolonization and sustainable self-determination. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 86-101.

Coulthard, G. S. (2007). Subjects of empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'politics of recognition' in Canada. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6(4), 437-460.

Courchene, T. (2007) Global Futures for Canada's Global Cities, *Institute for Research on Public Policy: Policy Matters*, 8(2), 3-36.

Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC medical research methodology*, 11, 100.

Dorries, H. (2017). Planning as Property: Uncovering the Hidden Racial Logic of a Municipal Nuisance By-law. *Journal of Law and Social Policy*, 27(5): 72-93.

Edmonds, P. (2010). Unpacking Settler Colonialism's Urban Strategies: Indigenous Peoples in Victoria, British Columbia, and the Transition to a Settler-Colonial City. *Urban History Review*, 38(2), 4-20.

Environics Institute. (2010). Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study: Toronto report. Retrieved from https://www.uaps.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/UAPS-Toronto-report.pdf on 24 Jul 2021.

Fawcett, R. B., Walker, R., & Greene, J. (2015). Indigenizing city planning processes in Saskatoon, Canada. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 24(2), 158-175.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Flynn, A. (2021) With Great(er) Power Comes Great(er) Responsibility: Indigenous Rights and Municipal Autonomy. *Journal of Law and Social Policy*, 34(1), 111-127.

Frideres, J. (2008). Indigenous Identity in The Canadian Context. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 28(2), 313-342.

Graham, K. (1999). Urban Indigenous governance in Canada: Paradigms and prospects. In Hylton, J. (Ed.) *Indigenous Self-Government in Canada* (p. 377-391). Saskatoon: Purich Publishing.

Green, J. (2020). Enacting Reconciliation. In Dickason, O. P., & Long, D. A. (5th eds.) *Visions of the heart: Canadian Indigenous issues* (p.237-250). Don Mills, Ont: OUP Canada.

Hanselmann, C. (2001). *Urban Indigenous People in Western Canada*. Calgary, AB: Canada West Foundation.

Heritz, J. (2012). Urban Aboriginal self-determination in Toronto. In Newhouse, D., FitzMaurice, K., McGuire-Adams, T., & Jetté, D. *Well-being in the urban Aboriginal community: Fostering biimaadiziwin, a national research conference on urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 43-54). Thompson Educational.

Heritz, J. (2016). Municipal-Aboriginal advisory committees in four Canadian cities: 1999–2014. *Canadian Public Administration*, 59(1), 134-152.

Heritz, J. (2018). Municipal-Indigenous relations in Saskatchewan: Getting started in Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert. *Canadian Public Administration*, 61(4), 616-640.

Hildebrandt, W., Carter, S., & First Rider, D. (1996). *The True Spirit and Original Intent of Treaty 7*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Horak, M. (2012). Conclusion: Understanding multilevel governance in Canada's cities. In Horak, M. & Young, R. *Sites of Governance: Multilevel Governance and Policy Making in Canada's Big Cities*. Montreal: McGill-Queens Press.

Hunt, D. (2020). "The Place Where the Hearts Gather": Against Damage-Centred Narratives of Urban Indigeneity. In Dickason, O. P., & Long, D. A. (5th eds.) *Visions of the heart: Canadian Indigenous issues* (p.94-105). Don Mills, Ont: OUP Canada.

Jojola, T. (2000). Indigenous Planning and Community Development. *Traditional Dwellings and Settlement Review*, 12(1), 1-15.

Jojola, T. (2013). Indigenous Planning: Towards a seven generations model. In Walker, Natcher, & Jojola (Eds.) *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (p.457-472). Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

Kopun, F. (2020, Feb 21). Indigenous report given to city: Staff say more funding, space needed for Toronto to meet recommendations. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved from https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/indigenous-report-given-city/docview/2359264315/se-2?accountid=14789 on 19 Aug 2021.

Kymlicka, W. (1998) *Finding Our Way: Rethinking Ethnocultural Relations in Canada*. Oxford University Press, Toronto

Leo, C. (2006). Deep Federalism: Respecting Community Difference in National Policy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 39(3), 481-506.

Matunga, H. (2013). Theorizing Indigenous Planning. In Walker, Natcher, & Jojola (Eds.) *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 3-32). Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

Nejad, S., Walker, R., Macdougall, B., Belanger, Y., & Newhouse, D. (2019). "This is an Indigenous city; why don't we see it?" Indigenous urbanism and spatial production in Winnipeg. *The Canadian Geographer*, 63(3), 413-424.

Nelles, J., & Alcantara, C. (2014). Explaining the Emergence of Indigenous–Local Intergovernmental Relations in Settler Societies: A Theoretical Framework. *Urban Affairs Review*, 50(5), 599–622.

Newhouse, D. (2003). The Invisible Infrastructure: Urban Aboriginal Institutions and Organizations. In D. Newhouse & E. Peters (Eds.), *Not Strangers in These Parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (p. 243-254). Ottawa: Policy Research Initiative.

Norris, M., Clatworthy, S. & Peters, E. (2013). The Urbanization of Indigenous Populations in Canada. In Andersen, C., & Peters, E. J. *Indigenous in the city: contemporary identities and cultural innovation* (pp.29-45). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Office of the Treaty Commissioner. Map of First Nations in Saskatchewan. Retrieved from http://www.otc.ca/ckfinder/userfiles/files/fnl_1100100020617_eng.pdf on 16 Sep 2021.

Ouart, P. (2013) Laying the Groundwork for Co-Production. In Andersen, C., & Peters, E. J. *Indigenous in the city: contemporary identities and cultural innovation* (p.132-150). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Peters, E. (2005). Indigeneity and marginalisation: Planning for and with urban Aboriginal communities in Canada. *Progress in Planning*, 63(4), 327–404.

Peters, E. (2011). Emerging Themes in Academic Research in Urban Indigenous Identities in Canada, 1996-2010. *Indigenous Policy Studies*, 1(1), 78-105.

Peters, E. (2012). *Urban Indigenous policy making in Canadian municipalities*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Peters, E. J & Andersen, C., (2013) *Indigenous in the city: contemporary identities and cultural innovation*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Porter, L. (2013). Coexistence in Cities: The challenge of indigenous urban planning in the twenty-first century. In Walker, Natcher, & Jojola (Eds.) *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 283-310). Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

Porter, L. & Barry, J. (2016) *Planning for Coexistence?: Recognizing indigenous rights through land-use planning in Canada and Australia*. New York: Routledge.

Porter, L. & Yiftachel, O. (2019) Urbanizing settler-colonial studies: introduction to the special issue, *Settler Colonial Studies*, 9:2, 177-186.

Proulx, C. (2006). Indigenous identification in North American cities. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 26 (2): 405-438.

Qadeer, M. (1997) Pluralistic planning for multicultural Cities: the Canadian practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(4), 481–494.

Sancton, A. (2011). *Canadian Local Government: An Urban Perspective*. 2nd ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Simpson, A. (2017) The ruse of consent and the anatomy of 'refusal': Cases from indigenous North America and Australia. *Postcolonial Studies*, 20(1), 18–33.

Simpson, L. (2014) Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence and Rebellious Transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(3), 1-25.

Shelter, Support & Housing Administration Toronto (2019). Meeting in The Middle: Protocols and Practices for Meaningful Engagement with Indigenous Partners and Communities. Retrieved from https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/8674-SSHA-Protocols-and-Practices-for-Indigenous-Engagement_Sept-9-2019.pdf on 25 Jul 2021.

Shield, D. (2020, Sep 19). Saskatoon Tribal Council to be lead agency for downtown safety pilot project. *CBC News*. Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatoon/tribal-council-lead-agency-for-downtown-safety-project-1.5726493 on 9 Aug 2021.

Shield, D. (2021, Jul 20). Saskatoon to look into implementing UN Indigenous rights declaration. *CBC News*. Retrieved from (https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatoon/city-to-look-into-implementing-un-indigenous-rights-declaration-1.6109696 on 19 Aug 2021.

Slattery, B. (1984). The Hidden Constitution: Aboriginal Rights in Canada. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 32(2), 361-391.

Smith, A., & Bruyneel, K. (2011). The third space of sovereignty: The postcolonial politics of U.S.-indigenous relations. *Perspectives on Politics*, 9(1), 183-185.

Snipp, M. C. (2013) American Indians and Alaska Natives in Urban Environments. In Andersen, C., & Peters, E. J. *Indigenous in the city: contemporary identities and cultural innovation* (p.173-192). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Stanger-Ross, J. (2008) "Municipal Colonialism in Vancouver: City. *Canadian Historical Review*, 89(4), 543–80.

Starblanket, G. (2020) Crises of Relationship. In Dickason, O. P., & Long, D. A. (5th eds.) *Visions of the heart: Canadian Indigenous issues* (p.13-33). Don Mills, Ont: OUP Canada.

Stark, H. (2010). Respect, Responsibility, and Renewal: The Foundations of Anishinaabe Treaty Making with the United States and Canada. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 34(2), 145-164.

Statistics Canada (2016). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: Key Results from the 2016 Census*. Retrieved online from https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/171025/dq171025a-eng.htm

Statistics Canada (2017). *Focus on Geography Series, 2016 Census.* Retrieved online from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-cma-eng.cfm?LANG=Eng&GK=CMA&GC=535&TOPIC=9

Statistics Canada (2017). *Saskatoon, CY [Census subdivision], Saskatchewan and Division No. 11*. Retrieved from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=4711066&Geo2=CD&Code2=4711&Data=Count&SearchText=Saskatoon&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=Aboriginal%20peoples&TABID=1 on 31 Jul 2021.

Tomiak, J. (2010). Indigenous governance in Winnipeg and Ottawa: Making space for self-determination. *Aboriginal Policy Research Consortium International* (APRCi). 65.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada—TRCC (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to action*. Retrieved from http://trc.ca/assets/pdf/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Veracini, L. (2011). Introducing settler colonial studies. *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1(1), 1–12.

Vescera (Aug 5, 2021). Saskatoon Tribal Council inks deal to take control of child services. *Saskatoon StarPhoenix*. Retrieved from https://thestarphoenix.com/news/local-news/saskatoon-tribal-council-inks-deal-to-take-control-of-child-services on 17 Aug 2021.

Walker, R. (2003) Engaging the urban Aboriginal population in low-cost housing initiatives: lessons from Winnipeg. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 12(1), 99–118.

Walker, R. (2008). Improving the Interface between Urban Municipalities and Indigenous communities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 17(1), 20-36.

Walker, R. & Barcham, M. (2010). Indigenous-Inclusive Citizenship: the city and social housing in Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(2), 314-331.

Walker, R. & Belanger, Y. (2013). Indigenousity and Planning in Canada's Large Prairie Cities. In Walker, Natcher, & Jojola (Eds.) *Reclaiming Indigenous Planning* (pp. 193-216). Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

Walker, R. & Moore, J. & Linklater, M. (2012). More than stakeholders, voices, and tables: Towards co-production of urban Indigenous policy in Manitoba. In Peter, E. *Urban Indigenous policy making in Canadian municipalities* (p.160-201). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Wall, K. (2016). Gathering place: Urban indigeneity and the production of space in Edmonton, Canada. *Journal of Urban Cultural Studies*, 3(3), 301-325.

Warry, W. (2008). *Ending denial: understanding Aboriginal issues*. University of Toronto Press.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387–409.

Young, R. (2012) Conclusion. In Peters, E. J. *Urban Indigenous policy making in Canadian municipalities*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Youngblood Henderson, J. (2002) Sui Generis and Treaty Citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 6(4), 415-440.

VITA AUCTORIS

NAME	ANH LAM
PLACE OF BIRTH	Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
YEAR OF BIRTH	1988
EDUCATION	Le Hong Phong Highschool, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam 2003 – 2006
	University of Economics, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam 2006 - 2010, B.Sc
	University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario 2019 – 2021, M.A