

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE  
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES  
7<sup>TH</sup> COUNCIL, 54<sup>TH</sup> SESSION

TABLED DOCUMENT NO. 7-54

TABLED ON JANUARY 14, 1975

TD 7-54

Tabled on Jan 14, 1975

A PAPER ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF

THE DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Prepared for the Legislative  
Council of the Northwest  
Territories.

10 JANUARY 1975

12 December 1975.

SUMMARY

PAPER ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The paper on the Philosophy of the Department of Local Government is presented in five sections. Sections 1, 2 and 3 deal primarily with the background to the Philosophy Paper, and the means by which it was prepared. Section 4 sets out the philosophy of the Department, and Section 5 relates the philosophy of the Department to various issues and concerns regarding Local Government voiced by those communities to which departmental representatives travelled during the writing of the paper. This summary deals with the paper section by section, highlighting the main points dealt with in each section of the paper.

Section 1 p.p. 6-12

Introduction

This Section deals with the motion by the Territorial Council, January 25, 1974, requesting the preparation of a philosophy paper by the Department of Local Government. In interpreting the motion of the Council, the Department has prepared the paper based on research and using material gained from three main areas:

1. Communities in the Northwest Territories

19 communities were visited by Local Government staff members involved in writing the philosophy paper. In some instances public meetings were held, and in other instances Council meetings were attended. Local people were questioned about their views regarding the philosophy and operations of the Department of Local Government.

2. Interest Groups

The I.T.C., the Association of Municipalities, the Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories, and the Metis Association of the Northwest Territories were all consulted regarding the preparation of the Philosophy Paper and their views gained either by written submission or by personal consultation.

3. Other Resource People

These include academics, civil servants, and various other professional and resource people with a particular interest or expertise in the North. A complete list of these people is found in Appendix 1 of the Philosophy Paper.

Section 2 - p.p. 13-17

Structure and Functions of the Department

This Section of the paper briefly mentions the legislative basis for the Government of the Northwest Territories and then goes on to give a brief description of the functions of the various divisions of the Department of Local Government. The description of the Department as given in the paper is now out of date, as it shows the Department as it existed prior to the re-organization of the Territorial Government which took place in April 1975.

Section 3 - p.p. 18-44

Consultations Held in Preparing the Paper

In this Section the paper sets out the issues raised by the 19 communities, the interest groups, and the various individuals included in the research for the paper and these are shown under three main headings:

1. Development Support Provided by the Department

Sub-issues raised under this heading include such items as: Political Education, Conferences, Workshops, Training for Municipal Employees, and Control of Development.

Most of the issues seem to relate to two concerns: the communities want more education and training in local government, and more funds.

2. Municipal-Territorial Relations

Sub-issues under this heading include: Government Indifference and Wastage, Local Control over Funds Spent in Communities, Authority Over Social Policies and Programs, Territorial Council, and the Territorial Government's Lack of Accountability to the People.

3. Native Political Development

Sub-issues raised under this heading include: Conflict Between Settlement and Band Councils, and the lack of native representation on many municipal councils.

In relation to the larger municipalities issues dealt with in this Section include: Financing of Local Government and Land Settlement Questions.

Section 4 - p.p. 45-54

Philosophy

This Section spells out the philosophy of Department of Local Government. "Local government" is defined by this Department to mean the process by which group decisions are made at the local level. The section begins with the point that municipal local government in Canada has evolved through British and Canadian tradition into forms which we presently recognize today. The Paper states that this type of municipal government, as found in Southern Canada, has been established in order to serve the needs and interests of the Euro-Canadian urban population. In so doing it has functioned quite well. Local government, however, has not evolved in the Northwest Territories in the same way that it has in Southern Canada because previously the native peoples had no need of such forms, in the earlier history. The forms of municipal government which we know in the North have thus been transported here by Canadians from the South. The paper suggests that if these forms and procedures of local government are suitable to the communities of the North, then they will remain. If they are not suitable to northern peoples, however, the Department of Local Government maintains that it should assist them to modify the forms of local government to ones which will serve their needs better, as it suggests that people normally evolve political processes appropriate to their needs.

The paper then points out that the larger municipalities of the N.W.T. have been unable to provide for the equitable involvement of native people in their local government process. In spite of the fact that two-thirds of the N.W.T. is populated by native peoples, the report notes that even with consciously planned efforts in the development of municipal government it appears that many of the native people do not feel they can be involved in the municipal government process.

Development Process

The report presents the development process as being an educational emphasis of the Department to provide native people with a realistic opportunity for political involvement, through educating them to see that they can play a major role in governing themselves. This education involves more than the mechanics of government; it also involves developing the ideas of good citizenship. Good citizenship is seen as developing an awareness of Canadian political institutions and processes and then becoming involved in participating in these processes.

## Canadian Sovereignty over Indian and Inuit Peoples

The paper maintains that the relationship of the native peoples to the Government of Canada is colonial in some respects because of the fact that most native peoples are still unaware of their rights and duties as Canadian citizens, and thus they cannot be assumed to have freely consented to the rule of the Canadian Government. The Canadian concept of dominion over people involves their willing acceptance, understanding, and participation in the Canadian political process, and the Department of Local Government suggests that this is not so with the majority of the native people of the North. They do not understand the process, therefore the Paper suggests it cannot be presumed that they have agreed to it.

### Political Development in the North

Quoting from the Carrothers Commission, the paper then goes on to state that political development in the North should involve political self-determination; that is, if the native peoples in the North find the particular forms of local government which have been brought from the South to be unacceptable to them, then they should be allowed to evolve a type of political process which is unique to the North and which meets their particular needs. This kind of self-determination leads to self-government, and the eventual form of that government which evolves in the North may be very unlike the traditional forms which have evolved elsewhere in Canada.

### Section 5

This last section considers the questions and problems raised by the communities with respect to Local Government in the context of the philosophy of the Department put forward in Section 4. Under the section entitled "Native Political Involvement" three sub-issues are considered:

#### 1) Band Councils in Relationship to Settlement Councils

The paper seems to state that if the Band Councils, as the more traditional form of local government body, is more appropriate to the needs of the people than is the settlement council, then the Department should be prepared to make the necessary changes to recognize the Band Council as the legitimate local government body.

- 2) Perception of Settlement Councils as being racially exclusive.
- 3) Native non-involvement in larger municipalities.

These two issues are seen as being in conflict with Department philosophy.

The Appendices to the Philosophy Paper lists in detail the research done to support the conclusions made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ABSTRACT . . . . .	1
SECTION I - INTRODUCTION	
Resolution of Territorial Council . . . . .	6
Interpretation of the task. . . . .	6
Preparation of the paper . . . . .	9
SECTION II - STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT . . . . .	13
SECTION III - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS - THE ISSUES RAISED	
Development Support . . . . .	18
Municipal-Territorial Relations . . . . .	23
Native Political Involvement . . . . .	32
SECTION IV - PHILOSOPHY . . . . .	45
SECTION V - THE ISSUES RELATED TO THE PHILOSOPHY . . .	55
APPENDICES . . . . .	63

ABSTRACT - Paper on the Philosophy of the  
Department of Local Government

The philosophy of the Department is presented by this paper in two ways:

- (a) Section IV links a series of propositions which taken together represent the Philosophy of the Department.
- (b) Section V reconciles the Department's philosophy with the issues raised in the communities thereby providing a more concrete examination of the various propositions.

SECTION I

The section begins with the motion of the Territorial Council requesting this paper.

The motion is then interpreted by the Department to request a summary and explanation of present Departmental philosophy -- involvement by the communities is noted to be of particular importance in the preparation of the paper. A possible interpretation of Council's motion requiring the formulation of a new philosophy is rejected. The final item in this section (Methodology) discusses the hows, whos, whys and whens of the preparation of the paper. It notes three areas of research:

- 1) The Communities: nineteen communities were consulted; the process varied between public and open Council Meetings or both. The intent in consulting the communities was to provide the opportunity and encourage open discussion and criticism of Departmental philosophy and operations.
- 2) Interest Groups: the Inuit Taperisat of Canada, the Association of Municipalities, the Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories and the Metis Association of the Northwest Territories. The interest groups were chosen on the basis of their particularly political orientation and consultation was by written submission, interviews or both.



- 3) Other Resource People: academics, civil servants and various professionals chosen on a basis of their particular expertise. The process of consultation was by interview and a collection of assorted research documentation.

SECTION II This section discusses Canadian and Territorial Legislation relating to the Department and further notes and summarizes the functions of the various divisions. Included among these divisions are: Municipal Affairs, Town Planning and Lands, Recreation, Employment, Emergency Measures, Library Services, and Research and Development.

SECTION III The issues raised in the community consultation are discussed under three headings: Development support by the Department; Municipal-Territorial relations and; Native political involvement. Sub-issues under the first main heading include the need for political education, conferences, workshops, training for municipal employees and control of development. Sub-issues raised within the second main issue include; bureaucratic indifference and wastage, control over the funds spent in communities, authority over social policies and programs, a feeling that the Territorial Council is a body without any real power, and the Territorial Government's lack of representativeness and accountability. Sub-issues raised under the heading of native political involvement are considered separately in relation to the smaller communities and to the larger municipalities -- they include: conflict between Settlement and Band Councils, and the assumption of ethnic exclusivity by many Settlement Councils. In relation to the larger municipalities reasons are offered for the absence of significant native participation. Two other issues dealt with in this section include the financing of local government and questions arising from the pending land settlement.

SECTION IV This section begins with a definition of terms: philosophy - is the sum of the political and moral ideas and assumptions upon which the Department is based; local government - the term is considered as being broader in scope than is the Department's conception of it as being municipal government.

The point is made that the municipal form of

local government has evolved through British and Canadian practice, it is then noted that this evolutionary process is the norm but has not been the case in the N.W.T. Accepting this the Department assumes that if the forms and procedures of municipal government are suitable to the communities of the North, then this form of local government will remain. If not, then modified forms of it will emerge and the Department is prepared to make proper accommodation to recognize the legitimacy of these forms.

The concept of municipal government is dealt with further by noting that the same municipal forms of government are being developed in the North as have been established in southern Canada. While these forms are identical the processes of developing them are quite different. A more evolutionary process in the south compared to the more centrally planned development in the Territories. A concern in the development of Local government here is that in spite of this more consciously planned approach there are significant indications that as in the south, the larger municipalities of the N.W.T. have been unable to provide for the equitable involvement of native people. The consequences of a continuation of this process are raised and the paper notes that this situation is as at odds with the philosophy of the Department as it is with the declared principals of political development shared by the Territorial and Federal Governments.

The paper next considers the concept of local government expressed by the Carruthers Report. Drawing heavily from the report it emphasizes that the philosophical orientation of this Department is that the development of local government has an educational emphasis toward the development of citizenship rather than the narrower view of exclusively providing instruction in the management of municipal government.

What follows are a series of reasonings offered in support of the philosophic view that this first and pre-eminent obligation of the Department is to provide the necessary support that will insure major native participation at all levels of political development in the North.

The fundamental constitutional relationship between the aboriginal peoples and the Government of Canada is linked to the process of political education and involvement as follows: Canada's claim to sovereignty in the North is comprised of two things; claim to possession of the land, and claim to dominion over its people. The first claim was established by a unilateral declaration of ownership coupled with the intention to enforce the claim if contested. More recently this claim has come under negotiation with the indigenous population. The paper notes that dominion over a people, in the Canadian democratic tradition, can only be legitimately established through the freely given consent of those governed. And as this consent is determined by the knowing participation in the political processes the paper urges political education as a Departmental priority and further emphasizes that until this concept can properly be established the constitutional status of indigenous people will continue to be significantly different from that of other Canadian citizens.

The following point continues the above discussion in examining the relationships of original and non-original peoples of the North with the Government of Canada. It concludes the former relationship is colonial in nature and the latter is not.

Again drawing from the Carruther's Report the paper offers support to the Department's philosophic view with particular reference to the requirement of a much broader base of political knowledge and experience before provincial type status can be considered.

This section concludes making reference to Dr. L. Hamelin's remarks concerning government from the top, meeting government coming from the base. The paper defines these "governments" as the Territorial Government on the one hand and the growing political involvement of the Territorial population on the other. It then argues that the terms on which these "governments" will meet and the political processes and structures which will result can only be matters of speculation. What is taken as certain is that this union will be a function of the self-determining expression of the people of the North and the paper again emphasizes the necessity of the Department's role in facilitating this expression.

SECTION V

This final section considers the issues raised by the communities in light of the Department's philosophy. The first issue, summarized as the inadequate provision of developmental support in the forms of workshops, conferences and training programs for municipal employees, clearly indicates an operational deficiency of the Department. It does not however pose a conflict with Departmental philosophy, rather it is in support of it.

The next issue deals with native political involvement and the sub-issues are considered as follows:

- (a) Band Councils in relationship to Settlement Councils -- as is noted in the philosophy section. "If forms of local government emerge which are more appropriate to the needs of the communities, the Department is prepared to make the necessary accommodations in recognition of these forms".
- (b) Perception of Settlement Councils as being racially exclusive -- the Department acknowledges its responsibility to insist against the formalization of ethnic exclusivity in the development of local government; while at the same time recognizing the necessary pre-eminence of the principle of self-determination for the original people of the North.
- (c) Native uninvolvement in the largest municipalities -- this is in conflict with Departmental philosophy.

The third issue headed Municipal-Territorial raises community concern over government unresponsiveness, bureaucratic wastage and indifference etc. These issues are taken to be more in the order of complaints and in themselves do not pose a question to Departmental philosophy. But taken together they do represent a significant increase in political interest and participation. It is then noted that the manner in which the "government from the top" chooses to respond to this growing political interest will likely determine the quality of future political life in the Northwest Territories.

## SECTION I - INTRODUCTION

### RESOLUTION OF TERRITORIAL COUNCIL

This paper takes as its beginning the following discussions and motion which occurred on the 25th of January during the 51st sitting of the Territorial Council:

#### "MOTION TO PREPARE PHILOSOPHICAL POLICY PAPER" \*)

DR. HAMELIN: Thank you so much. I want to make a motion in effect to ask the Department of Local Government with the Administration and with peoples of the settlements to prepare a kind of Philosophical Paper on the Policy of that Department.

.....

DR. HAMELIN: In my mind, it should be fundamental that the people of the settlements have an input in the preparation of the paper. It is not only a paper written by the people above, as I explained this morning, but by both sections of the Government; by people on the top and people at the bases. So I think that the contribution from the bases is essential in my motion.

### INTERPRETATION OF THE TASK

We have interpreted the above motion, "To prepare a kind of philosophical paper on the policy of that Department", as requesting a full summary and explanation of the ideas, assumptions and values which have and do form the base of this Department's efforts to develop local government.

---

\*) Council of the Northwest Territories Debates, 51st Session, pp. 336-338, 25th January 1974.

"In co-operation with the people in the settlements," is understood to mean that to the greatest extent possible residents of the communities across the Northwest Territories should be provided with the opportunity and encouraged to make their views known on the philosophy of the Department, and whether they think it is appropriate to their needs; and further that they should be encouraged to offer criticism of and alternatives to any aspect of current Departmental operations.

It should be noted that an alternative interpretation to the Council motion might be that the Department of Local Government should prepare, with the fullest possible involvement of the citizens of the Northwest Territories, a complete and new philosophy on which to base itself. While this task may well and properly be taken up in the future, it is clear from discussions preliminary to the motion -- as is indicated below -- that this was not Council's present intent:

MR. CREERY: .... We have been very much an operating Department, reacting to problems as we see them, .... having broad outlines set before us, mostly by the Carruther's Commission, that has delineated our immediate objective.

DR. HAMELIN: "I wonder if you cannot become a little bit more specific about the real philosophy .... Have you a special model that you could have designed years ago, or now is your staff prepared to be this "think force"?"

MR. CREERY: .... as to the formation of a philosophical base and its clear expression, we have not done that properly ....

DR. HAMELIN: Any way, I am not too impressed when you confess this philosophy has not already been set up, because I think the Carruthers Commission had a good idea for that but they have not given all the philosophy to the Local Government.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER PARKER: .... the development of local government starting at the bottom has not been without a plan, there has always been a plan. The fault perhaps has been, it has not been as well recorded or enunciated as perhaps it should have been".\*

---

\* Council of the Northwest Territories Debates  
51st Session pps. 330-331

PREPARATION OF THE PAPER

Given this interpretation of the task the Research and Development Division of the Department was given responsibility for the project.

The first step was to identify the major resource areas from which data would come: the communities, expert resource people, and special interest groups, as well as papers, documents, and records pertinent to local government in the Northwest Territories. \*) The communities and special interest groups were picked as major resource areas because of Dr. Hamlin's injunction that "a contribution from the base is essential in my motion". We decided to gather information from expert resource people as a preliminary measure, first to assure ourselves that the operations of the Department to date were not based on outmoded or inappropriate principles and second, to familiarize ourselves with current research and attitudes on community development and northern development in southern Canada. While no specific reference to data gathered from this group is made in the body of the paper, apart from footnotes referring to the Appendix where a report of their consultation is contained, some valuable direction was gained from them in the articulation of the Department's philosophical position.

Since the communities were the key source of information, the Regional offices of the Department were briefed and asked to organize methods of seeking the ideas and opinions of the settlements upon local government. Responsibility for involving the interest groups and discussions with resource people was left

\*) See Appendix I for list of all consultants.



with the Research and Development Division at Headquarters.

By the end of April, 1974, all settlements had been contacted by Regional office staff. Interest groups thought to be able to make a valuable contribution were approached by Headquarters staff. An extensive series of interviews, panel discussions and workshops were undertaken with various scholars, researchers and other consultants on northern affairs; and with senior civil servants engaged upon northern activities or in the development of local government in the Provinces. A wide range of valuable ideas, criticisms, and opinions was secured.

During May and June, while we were reviewing the information received to that point, it became evident that very little active participation had so far been generated among the people in the settlements. Reports of input from the settlements, municipalities, and interest groups was sparse. Accordingly, a decision was made to assign the Research and Development Division full-time work on the project from September, stimulating the input of information from the communities and preparing the paper in draft form.

It was decided to hold meetings starting in September in what was felt to be a representative cross-section of Territorial communities, both settlements and larger municipalities. This cross-section was made up by the Division in consultation with Regional personnel. Naturally, it would have been far better to meet with all communities, but owing to constraints of time and funds, this was felt to be impossible. Headquarters personnel,

with the help of Regional staff, would act as social animators. In smaller communities Settlement Councils were asked to sponsor these meetings, and it was left to them to determine how the meeting should be organized - whether as a full scale public meeting, or a meeting only with the Council, or a combination of both. In the large municipalities, however, the meetings were sponsored by the Department as public meetings, after initially contacting the Council and inviting their participation.

Meetings were encouraged to be as open-ended and frank as possible; questions were devised to encourage wide ranging comments, opinions, and ideas concerning the peoples' experience of local government and to elicit a picture of the way in which it was seen by each group of participants. A similar process was followed in meetings with the interest groups. No formal research instrument was used at the meetings and no formal presentation made. Instead, it was emphasized that the paper had not yet been written, and that the comments of each community would be faithfully reflected. As a result, meetings tended to focus upon the issues most important to the individual community, and not to revolve around issues presented to the community. The issues therefore varied from place to place.

It should be made clear at this point that this paper is not offered as a purely and orthodox academic presentation. It is, rather, an account of the results of a citizen participation project in association with the Department and in consultation with individuals and organizations with a strong interest in the Northwest Territories.

Between September and November 15th visits were made to sixteen settlements. A tour of five larger municipalities was completed by the end of November. Meetings with interest groups were finished by the end of the first week in December.

Analysis of data collected took place on a continuing basis throughout the collection period. By December, the format of the paper was decided upon and first drafts completed.

The paper, as it is presented, follows almost exactly the way the total project evolved: first the research, secondly, the articulation of our philosophy, and third, the reconciliation, or examination, of our philosophy in the light of issues raised by the communities and interest groups. It should be re-stated at this point that we conceived our task as the articulation of the ideas and values which have underlain the Department's efforts to develop local government rather than the construction of a whole new philosophy on which to base future direction. This is not to say that valuable direction for the future was not gained, but that the paper ultimately represents what has been and is conditioning our operation to date, as checked out in the field.

SECTION II - STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT

Prior to the main body of this paper, contained in the succeeding sections, we felt it appropriate to include a brief description of the Department's enabling legislation, and its operational structure.

The legislative basis for the Northwest Territories Government can be found in the N.W.T. Act. This act defines the physical boundaries of the Northwest Territories (Sec. 2); and establishes the Government (Sec.'s 3-24). The Government is clearly stated to be a creature of the Federal Government, headed by a Chief Executive Officer, the Commissioner, who is charged with "administering the Government of the Territories under instructions given from time to time by the Governor in Council or the Minister (of Indian and Northern Affairs)".

That part of the N.W.T. Act that relates directly to the Department's mandate is Section 13, paragraph (c), which enables the Commissioner in Council to make Ordinances in relation to "municipal institutions in the Territories, including local administrative districts, school districts". Principal among such Ordinances is the Municipal Ordinance, which describes the legal structure of incorporated municipalities, and provides for their establishment and organization.

The Department of Local Government was specifically

established as that part of the Northwest Territories Government charged with initiating and facilitating the process of political development in the N.W.T. through the vehicle of local municipal governing bodies, provincial-like status only being considered after a strong third level of government is established.

The operational structure of the Department is illustrated, it consists of seven divisions reporting to the Director: Municipal Affairs, Town Planning and Lands, Recreation, Employment, Emergency Measures, Library Services, and Research and Development. A brief description of the functions of each is given below.

#### MUNICIPAL DIVISION

Supervises and inspects the operation of municipal government, provides assessment rolls based on equalized assessment for organized municipalities, prepares assessment and taxation rolls for unorganized areas, manages and controls funds for municipal, capital projects, Operations and Maintenance, Debentures, Loans and Grants; ensures that water and sanitation services are provided and operated; and that imaginative municipal growth and changing conditions.

#### TOWN PLANNING AND LANDS

This division develops policies and programs designed to meet the needs for community and regional planning related to physical development and land use. Areas of responsibility include: research into urban planning ideas appropriate to the

northern environment, building site selection and approval to enable municipalities and settlements to exercise local control of growth and development; the creation of overall development plans in conjunction with the community to guide the future growth of the urban area and to assign social and economic priorities; the designing of new subdivisions, identifying of areas for renewal and redevelopment, and other land use developments entailing the conducting of site surveys, analyzing of community trends, and plan formulation. The lands program area involves policy initiation and research into land disposal systems; and the management and administration of Commissioner's and designated Crown Lands in a manner consistent with local and public interest.

#### RECREATION

The purpose of this Division is to provide professional guidance upon recreational programs and facilities to communities and voluntary organizations. This is carried out through an extensive funding program assisting in the cost of constructing facilities and as grants for the operation of programs. Leadership and training programs are offered also. The Division acts as advisor to the N.W.T. Youth Council and the Interdepartmental Committee on Youth.

#### EMPLOYMENT

The programs of this Division are intended to improve the employment prospects of all N.W.T. citizens but are most

relevant to the Native population whose experience of and opportunities for wage employment are very limited. These programs include selection of trainees, job placement, liaison with Canada Manpower Centres, counselling, training-on-the-job contracts with private employers, special middle management training programs for the public service and job relocation. In addition the Division also works through Settlement Councils to help them provide a local employment service in several communities. A community work program is also available to help local residents in some communities by providing employment through the transfer of social assistance funds. The Division provides support services to the Inter-Departmental Committee on Employment of Northern Residents and the Federal-Territorial Manpower Needs Committee.

#### EMERGENCY MEASURES

This Division provides an organizer who works out of Headquarters to assist all municipalities and settlements to establish committees which can cope with emergencies, e.g. floods, epidemics, environmental pollution, should they occur.

#### LIBRARY SERVICES

The development of Library Services in communities through programs of funding: the Library Building/Furnishings Grant; direct mail borrowing and volunteer distribution of small collections of books; and professional training and consultation to local librarians.

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

This Division is primarily responsible for the overall political development of settlements in the Northwest Territories. This responsibility is discharged through the formation and development of Settlement Councils. Settlement Managers (Executive Department) act as Local Government Development Officers, supported by trained Development Officers at the Regional level, and Specialist staff at Headquarters. The Headquarters staff are responsible for three areas directly conducive to political development: Training, including the education of Councillors, Settlement Secretaries and staff; related research; and community development. A fourth area, finance, compiles and monitors the financial and administrative needs of the Department as a whole.

In addition to its primary responsibility, the Division ensures that the operation of all programs of the Department are developmental in nature and are oriented to the Departmental objectives (see Section V, Philosophy, below).



SECTION III - SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS -  
THE ISSUES RAISED

In this section, we propose to summarize the data gathered from the communities and the interest groups. Reference will be made to issues raised by expert consultants where appropriate. \*) This summary is given both for the purpose of indicating what appears to be the main issues, or concerns among the people and to illustrate the philosophical position of the Department. In the phrase used in the discussion preceding Dr. Hamelin's motion in Council it will serve as an indication of the direction the "government from the bottom" is taking.

The mass of data acquired appears to us to identify three central issues: (1) Developmental support by the Department; (2) Municipal-Territorial relations; (3) Native political involvement (or exclusion). All quotes in this section are taken from reports on consultations with communities and interest groups, Appendices I and II respectively.

(1) Developmental Support

The first issue, developmental support by the Department, breaks down into four sub-issues: Political education, conferences, and workshops, training for municipal employees, and control of development. All solutions offered by the communities raising the issue implied the giving of more help by the Department in personnel and finances. A clearer definition of the Department's role within the Territorial Government was also thought to be necessary.

---

\*) See Appendices II, III, and IV for full reports.

The necessity for a program of education about local government was specifically mentioned in eight communities, and implied in virtually all the rest. It seemed to rest on two arguments: first, that people in the communities were either apathetic, uninvolved or actively hostile towards the local Council because they (the former) were ignorant of what precisely local government was all about, or were under a misapprehension as to its nature. In Tuktoyaktuk, for example:

People in the community do not know very much about what the Council is supposed to be. It is very difficult to make them understand that the Council represents them and it is there to govern the settlement. They think you are putting yourself forward if you speak out. When we became a Hamlet all help from the Government was cut off, and this made it even harder. What is needed now is a program about Councils and Government. If a person from the settlement was hired and trained as a development specialist, he could go around the community talking them aware of what is Council's role.

and in Pond Inlet:

People are still not fully aware of what a Council should do or be. There needs to be a continuing program of adult education.

In Cambridge Bay, with forty people present, the first question to be asked after the general introduction was, "What is Local Government?" In inuvik the point that very few people knew about local government was much emphasized. The meeting felt that both the very poor attendance, and the feeling on the part of those who were present that they could not respond well to the Department's invitation to participate were attributable to the fact that they knew very little about the Department. They suggested programs

of political education through schools and C.B.C. programs as well as a full-scale adult education program.

Requests for a continuation and expansion of the current program of inter-settlement conferences and local settlement workshops were explicitly stated by six communities as being of the highest priority. In Fort Resolution, in response to the question, "What kind of training is most important to the Council?" the answer was, "Settlement Council Conferences and individual settlement workshops". In Eskimo Point, it was stated:

Settlement Council Conferences are very important because they allow us to find out what other Councils are doing and they should be held more regularly.

Much the same statements were made in Tuktoyaktuk, Cambridge Bay, and Fort Providence. Evidently, this has been one of the more successful methods of training for Councillors.

The subject of training for Municipal and Settlement Council employees came up most strongly in Inuvik, but was also raised in Fort Resolution and Eskimo Point in connection with the Settlement Secretary position.

From Eskimo Point:

The Settlement Secretary is very important to the Council and the Department of Local Government should have better training for them and they should be paid more.

In Inuvik, the point was emphasized in relation to staff shortage and lack of funds. They asked the Department to

undertake a program of direct instruction for the training of various employees which would involve them in the work of the Department for short periods. Training positions should be funded over a two-to-four year period.

On the last point, or sub-issue, the control of development, the communities often expressed a measure of reproof because the actual process of development had been neither initiated nor continued in consultation with them; this created a feeling of helplessness and frustration in the face of continual "pushing" by Government and private industry. Those participants directly involved in local government appeared universally to regard development as a good thing, but that there was so much to learn, so little time to absorb the pressures they were feeling, that they were often tempted to withdraw from contact with Government programs or to ask the Department to, "intercede", for them - to hold the pressures at bay - until they felt better prepared.

The following quotes give a sense of this feeling:

**Fort Good Hope:**

When Settlement Councils were initiated, the people were not asked how Local Government should be developed. Therefore, the responsibilities of a Settlement Council are not those responsibilities the people see as being important; they are only important to the Government. Also, we already had the Chief and Band Council structure - no attention was paid to it when Settlement Councils were started and it became less and less effective. The idea of developing municipalities is only serving the interests of the Government..... In any case, the people were pre-judged as to their ability to handle Local Government before the program was started; they were not consulted then and are not being consulted now.

Fort McPherson:

The internal political development of the community is progressing to the satisfaction of the Council and they discourage any attempt on the part of people or agencies outside the community to intervene in any way ....

Fort Resolution:

The Department should have had this meeting five years ago, there would have been more people out then.

Frobisher Bay:

(If we were to start over again) we would just talk to the local people and follow what they wanted us to do; we would ignore instructions from Yellowknife.

Pond Inlet:

The Government goes too fast in making laws .... But if the Government is to keep pushing us, we must have a Council .... We are living more and more in the white man's way and it is hard to learn quickly enough.

In six communities "more help" from the Department was specifically requested; in Fort Resolution "more people to work in the settlements"; in Broughton Island, "more support from Frobisher Bay (to the Council)"; in Frobisher Bay itself, "We do not seem to have much to do with the Department any more .... The Government should have an agency for Councils to function through to other Departments and agencies"; and in Inuvik, "We need the Department's assistance in rectifying the problem of mixed-up priorities in the Territorial Government .... Has the Department considered assuming an ombudsman role?"

In summation, it would appear that the Councils are requesting increased development support from the Department, particularly in the area of education and training, first because of pressure from their own people - from "below" - this pressure taking the form either of indifference or hostility to their (the Council's) efforts; and secondly because of pressure from "above" - from the proliferation of Government programs and generally increased economic activity in the Northwest Territories. This development support is also apparently necessary to "buy time" for local government to develop at its own pace. Briefly, the communities now seem to understand the scope of what they are taking on when they form Local Governments and feel the need for time and training to get to a point where they can keep control of local development.

(2) Municipal-Territorial Relations

The second general issue, relating to the operating relationship existing between the Territorial Government and the communities, has five sub-issues:

- bureaucratic indifference and wastage;
- control over the funds spent in communities;
- authority over the social policy and program;
- a feeling that the Territorial Council is a token body without any real power; and
- the Territorial Government's lack of representativeness or accountability.

The problem of an unresponsive bureaucracy was directly mentioned in twelve communities. Councils were angry at the lack of attention paid to them by various Government Departments, (Ft. Resolution: "Q - Has the Government attitude toward the Council improved? A - No. Most Departments do not pay proper attention to the Council. The general attitude is getting worse, that is, less responsive."), at the lack of consultation on impending policy and legislation, and at the apparent lack of any result on the rare occasions when they were consulted:

Frobisher Bay:

Everything the Council says is forgotten, even when Government officials are present; it is not absorbed, it disappears. Even when notes and minutes were taken down, nothing seemed to go to the Executive.

In Igloolik:

We greatly disapprove of Game Regulations being made up by personnel in Yellowknife without the Inuit taking part.

In Fort Franklin:

If we do not tell people directly what we want, we never get it; this paper will probably not get through to those who can make decisions.

They were also concerned about the fact that they had almost no advance or thorough information about Government activities that affected them, and many were cynical about what they considered an obvious wasting of funds.

From Eskimo Point:

We feel it is important that we know about government and companies coming on the land. The Federal Government promised that they would contact us before there was anything done on the land. We have found evidence of exploration and activities of the fisheries people and the Council has not heard anything about it from the Federal Government. We do not want to argue with the Government, we just want to know what they are doing.

In Igloodik:

... the Government is always complaining about being short of money, but they seem to spend a lot just moving staff around.

In Pond Inlet:

A lot of funds are wasted on charters and wasteful travel and such things.

On the matter of the control of funds spent in communities (raised in 12 communities), there was a general view that the local Council should have more control. The first among other points raised was that the Government's spending priorities appears "mixed up":

In Fort Good Hope:

When money is spent, it is usually for the wrong things - it is spent for what Government people think is important, not what the settlements think is important.

In Tuktoyaktuk:

The Hamlet should be allowed to set its own priorities in budgetting, based on what the people think is important.

In Inuvik:

The priorities of Government seem to be mixed up - if basic standards of living are considered a



priority .... Fiscal policies are created by civil servants who usually have very little experience and are transient anyway.

The implication is that local people have a much better knowledge of the local situation, and, after the general distribution of monies by the Government of the Northwest Territories, should have much more say in the spending of those funds that are allocated to their community - ostensibly to serve them. In some settlements, the solution was seen as lying in a bigger grant of uncommitted funds, presumably so that the Council could undertake what the Government seemed unable to:

In Wrigley:

We should have more money that we can spend to help the settlement in ways that we see are important.

In Repulse Bay:

The Council should have access to more funds that are not committed to specific activities in order to meet community needs as they arise. They could create their own programs to deal with local issues.

In other communities the budget was compared to welfare, not only in the way it is given out, but in the resulting apathy and lack of willingness to participate on the part of citizens:

In Tuktoyaktuk:

Right now the Hamlet gets a budget every year from the Government; this is like getting welfare. We cannot do anything with the budget except spend it on things which we are told we can spend it on ... The Territorial Government is in a similar position with respect to the Federal Government: unless it can get some economic independence it will always be a puppet government.

In Hay River:

Municipal budgets are like welfare - and produce the same kind of apathy.

This feeling of frustration was summed up in a statement made in Inuvik:

In the control of programs, the real problem is economic control, which rests with the Territorial Government. We have no political recourse to that Government. That is the real problem. There is no way for us to change general fiscal priorities even if, say, an arrangement was made between the Federal and Territorial Governments to give Federal grants-in-lieu funds to the Territorial Government to pay.

Related to the sub-issue of the control of funds is a criticism arising from meetings in the larger municipalities; that of a significant lack of funds to perform the services that are under the authority of the Council:

In Yellowknife:

When Local Government began in the North, their definitions were confused. Rather than giving responsible government they gave responsibilities... The main problem is that we don't have the tools to do the job -- we don't have enough money ... The Native-White thing is not the real problem. The real problem is a lack of money ... we are just not communicating ...

In Hay River:

Under-representation only becomes a problem when it results in an unequal distribution of benefits. When there is a lack of funds to develop all areas equally there is bound to be an unequal distribution. We have enough problems trying to service our own outlying areas, let alone the reserve. When it comes down to it, those who can afford to pay will get the services. It is impossible to finance an area with no economic base.

The question of Councils having authority over the

social programs affecting community life (welfare, game, housing, education, policing) came up in thirteen communities, usually in response to a question aimed at eliciting a response on what each community thought the scope of Council's authority should be. All communities thought they should have some control in these areas, although some were content to wait for it, not feeling ready to undertake it at present. Some thought that the separate organizations now set up to advise in these areas (Education, Health and Welfare Advisory Boards, Co-ops, Hunters and Trappers Associations) should continue to look after these areas; others thought that committees of Council should look after them, but with the Council ultimately in control. The prevailing feeling can be summed up in the following from Inuvik:

With regard to more authority in the social aspects of the community, the way it is now (advisory boards) no power is given along with responsibility, so there is no interest. If we were to be given the authority (as with the Yellowknife school board, even though the funding is 90% government) we are not sure right now what we would like to take on, but there should be a program of developing municipal authority in those areas.

Again, the major grounds for claiming more authority was that of better knowledge of local conditions. An example was quoted by Igloodik:

Another area: the R.C.M.P. They do what the Government wants, but do not take action until a law has been broken. Two years ago the settlement wanted their own policeman, but we were turned down by the Commissioner, who

said we could perhaps have it when we were a Hamlet. We would prefer our own police because they would be able to prevent crimes, and the community would know what to do to help.

An issue relating specifically to the larger municipalities concerned the physical presence of Government within their communities. They argued that a large population of civil servants made for a highly transient population, and thus decreased participation; Government staff housing programs made for a narrow tax base of property-owners, supplemented by large grants-in-lieu of taxes, thus concentrating municipal finances in Government hands; and, particularly in Inuvik, gross inequalities of standards of living in the municipality resulted which had the effect of fragmenting the population. The solution most often mentioned was to institute a policy encouraging home ownership among civil servants, both to establish realities to the community, and to broaden the tax base.

Finally, an issue which arose in practically all communities, either by implication or directly, and which can be summed up in the following quotations:

In Fort Good Hope:

The main obstacle to Local Government is the Territorial Government itself; it does not hold itself accountable to the people. The people have no control or influence over the Government, they receive very little information about its activities.

In Inuvik:

There seems to be an upper limit to the exercise of encouraging local government. It becomes futile if the higher government is not represen-

tative. We would be happier even if definite times were set to stages of political development in the N.W.T. and were announced. There should be a definite plan of development of the N.W.T. in this regard.

And in Yellowknife:

There is no communication between different levels of Government .... one group is elected and responsible to the people, and the other is not.

This concern certainly formed the core of the criticism from the larger municipalities, and was discussed at some length. In the hamlets and settlements reaction to the Territorial Government ranged from outright hostility, to frustration, to puzzlement. A few settlements spoke about the non-responsibility of the Territorial Government with concern; most were questioning its responsiveness, or lack of it, and the apparent irrationality of Government programs. By extension, of course, all issues relating to control ultimately question the non-representative nature of the Territorial Government, and we have concluded that more and more settlements will come to pose this question more forcefully as they develop politically.

Related to this issue are a number of criticisms of Territorial Council, which, in some settlements were generated when the purpose of the meeting was introduced. Presented below are quotes expressing these criticisms:

In Fort Good Hope:

Why is the Department of Local Government collecting this information? This should be done by the Territorial Councillors themselves.

In Fort Franklin:

This is the first time that we have become aware of the fact that there is a representative for this area on Territorial Council.

In Tuktoyaktuk:

The Territorial Council is particularly meaningless --- the communities have no contact with it, and all it seems to do is what the Government tells it to do.

In Hay River:

Even the Territorial Council cannot change the Government; meetings have been held again and again but nothing has been done -- why should it be different this time?

In Rae/Edzo:

All meetings (of Territorial Council) talk about where and how much money is to be spent, they never talk about how the Indians will do it or even how much money one Indian will get. When we are deciding to make a Councillor (Territorial) candidates come around - at election time, never afterwards. They think we do not understand anything, that we are just dumb Indians -- everyone here tonight feels this way. Once elected, the people never get a chance to speak, and after they are elected they forget about the people.

In Inuvik:

The Territorial Council is really only effective if the Government wants to implement what they recommend. It is like the development of a Settlement Council; there seems to be a fear of allowing people to make mistakes. The feeling of power is given, but not the actual power. This is a built in frustration.

Obviously, there is some serious questioning as to the effectiveness of Territorial Council as it is presently constituted, and as to its projected development as an embryo legislature. There is a developing awareness that locally-elected authorities should be relating to a territorially-elected authority.

(3) Native Political Involvement

The third general issue raised concerns the participation (or exclusion) of the native peoples of the N.W.T. in political structures, and more specifically, those pertaining to local government. What immediately became clear on reviewing the data on this issue was that a distinction has to be drawn between the smaller settlements and the larger municipalities. Generally speaking, on virtually all Settlement and Hamlet Councils there is a large native majority-six or seven out of eight seats: In larger municipalities, Hay River, Yellowknife, and Inuvik, there is little or no native representation. Frobisher Bay can be said to represent a half-way point. Sub-issues are therefore related first to those raised in smaller settlements, and second, to those raised in larger municipalities.

Settlements

Councils in the smaller settlements do reflect the ethnic make-up of the population, that is, about 90% native. \*) Notwithstanding the criticisms expressed earlier,

---

\*) For Distribution of Territorial population see Appendix IV.

there is a high degree of acceptance of the Council by the native people as the body that can speak to varying degrees for their interests. It was said that since Councils were established local people have had more information, have participated more in decision making, and have felt at least a certain measure of control over their own affairs pass into their hands. For example, the Council in Igloolik stated:

Before there was a settlement, people lived apart and had no need of a Council. Now a Council is very important. When people first came together everything was done through the Settlement Manager. The Inuit were very "low class" and could not say anything. Now anything to be done has to be approved by Council and the people know what is going on.

However, at this point a further distinction has to be made between predominantly Indian and predominantly Inuit settlements. In the Indian settlements there exists an alternative local political structure, pre-dating the Settlement Council by a considerable length of time. This is the Chief and Band Council. As there are now, in effect, two local political structures, there is potential conflict that in some settlements have already occurred in determining what will be the nature of the relationship between them; which will take priority; whether each can deal with separate areas of jurisdiction; whether, in fact, a choice of political vehicles has to be made by the native people. Theoretically, of course, it can be said that each has a very well defined area of jurisdiction. In actual fact,



though, in a settlement that is 90 or 95% Indian, and who construe their interests to a large extent by ethnicity, there is considerable overlap. \* Local solutions range from suspicious reaction against Settlement Councils to what Settlement Councils think to be an agreeable accommodation. What seems to be the most articulate position, however, is that outlined in the following quotes.

In Fort Franklin:

Q. Should the Council have any direct control over other program areas?

A. The Band Council should be given more authority in these areas; they look after the people; the Hamlet Council looks after the administration of the town. Moreover, the Band Council has been in existence a long time. The Hamlet Council is "under" the Band Council and responsible for a limited set of responsibilities only.

In Rae-Edzo (Chief Arrowmaker):

Band Councils should be over town (settlement) Councils. The Band Council does more than the Town Council, but you only hear about the Town Council. Band Councils were here before Town Councils; why should the Town Councils be over (accorded more recognition and status) Band Councils? Town Councils being started only recently just create trouble .... We do not have any quarrel with having a Town Council, but before they do anything, they should ask the Chief first and get his permission .... the reason why we ask for control is because the Band Councils have been neglected .... As long as the Town Council doesn't change the rules of anything on their own, before they let the Chief know.

In predominantly Inuit settlements there is no alternative local political structure. What seems to have occurred is that there is now an assumption by Inuit people that Settlement Councils are for the Inuit, can gain a political voice at the local level. \*\*

\* For further discussion of this point see Appendix IV pp. 2-3.

\*\* This point is also mentioned in Appendix IV, pp. 3-4

In Pond Inlet:

We can run our own things. We have a Council which are Inuit and they know how the Inuit live. A Settlement Manager -- the Kadlunaat - they don't know a thing about how the Inuit live.

In Broughton Island:

Q. Do you think the Settlement Council should have both Inuit and non-Inuit people on it?

A. Yes. A white person can help explain things to us.

In Pangnirtung:

Q. Do you think that both Inuit and non-Inuit should be on the Hamlet Council?

A. The non-Inuit are free to run for Council but they won't get elected.

In Cambridge Bay, where there is a large white population, responses showed an impulse to protect the Inuit status of the Council:

The idea of a Settlement Council is good, but it should be in the Eskimo language and the minutes should be in Eskimo. Only Eskimo people should be on the Council .... There should be more P.U.D.A. (Project on the Use of the Development Approach) sessions here to explain to the Eskimo people what local government is and to explain to the whites to leave the Council alone.

This assumption that Settlement Councils are for the Inuit is encouraged and acted upon by the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. \*) Following is a quote from the report on the meeting with them in Ottawa:

There is considerable cross-representation between I.T.C. Directors and local I.T.C. representatives and members of Settlement Councils. In very many settlements I.T.C. normally communicated with the people through the Settlement Council ... In many (some?) instances Settlement Councils saw I.T.C. as their collective spokesman, that is to say,

---

\*) See Appendix III

as the voice of official local opinion on given matters.

### Municipalities

The picture of native political involvement in the larger municipalities is entirely different. It is full of conflict and misunderstanding and appears to be that of exclusion. In every larger municipality the claim was made that, as it stands, the local government structure, the Council, allows for everyone's participation, no matter what their background. Constitutionally, this is true. However, it is evident from their lack of participation, again acknowledged in every municipality, that somehow the structure alone, is inadequate for native inclusion. Reasons for this situation were discussed in all municipalities, and, although the perspective is different, depending on who is talking, a native or a white, the following were given as principal factors conditioning native political exclusion:

1. The procedures, form and "red tape" involved in municipal government are too complex for native people, at their present stage of development, to grasp.

Hay River:

... complicated procedures and red tape discourages native participation (in local government).

C.O.P.E. (Committee on Original People's Entitlement):

A municipal government is the white man's way of running things (implication - we cannot get involved).

2. There is a lack of interest on the part of the native people -- or a lack of knowledge and facility.

Inuvik:

The Council here has two native members ... There would be more members if not for a lack of interest; the last Federal election proves they can dominate the election of representatives if they want to.

C.O.P.E.:

So many of our people are just like -- "sleeping" -- if a meeting is boring, you go to sleep. You do not realize that it is important if you do not know why it is being held ... Most of us do not have any knowledge of the white man's system. People with that knowledge are stepping in and taking over.

3. There are actually two distinct groups up here, and where there is a majority (Yellowknife) the majority should rule. Certain communities are like white cities transported north.

Hay River:

If there are distinctly separate groups with distinctly separate interests then they will form distinct kinds of communities and should have correspondingly distinct forms of local government.

Metis Association and Indian Brotherhood:

Local conditions should determine the form of local government adopted - different communities will ask for different things ... We think that in some places the Band Council should run the community. We would not allow whites on the Band Council because they are transient, they are Southern oriented, so they shouldn't have a voice.

4. As more white Southerners come into the N.W.T. natives are surrounded by a new society.

Hay River:

Decreasing native participation is inevitable

with increasing urbanization, particularly in communities with a white oriented economic base. These communities grow with a majority of white people in them; the percentage of educated, sophisticated people grows; they naturally rise to leadership positions. Why should the native people bother to get involved?

Metis Association and Indian Brotherhood:

More people are coming in from the South, and more will come with all this economic activity. They have brought in their own systems, and the native people do not know anything about them. The native people are forced out.

5. Developments are moving so quickly in the N.W.T. now that the native people cannot begin to keep up.

Hay River:

Where there is enough time allowed for unforced development, then one can expect native participation. This is not the case in Hay River. Perhaps the native people should have to fight for representation.

C.O.P.E.:

Our awareness is growing, but it always seems that as soon as we think we have mastered something, the rules are changed. Developments up here are moving so quickly they are out-stripping our ability to learn, even if we are more aware.

6. Senior Government policies have encouraged segregation.

Hay River:

Senior Government programs and attitudes have forced a segregated society up here by always treating white and native differently.

Inuvik:

The Government created barriers, actually two communities, when they built Inuvik by extending utilidor service to one part of the town only.

C.O.P.E.:

How can you have development when people do not feel strong and confident? Everything the white man brings in seems to undermine us: welfare, the native people were not asked if they wanted it. The next thing was houses - no one asked for homes, just some help with the freight rates. When something goes wrong in the houses, we have to ask the white man to fix it - in this way we are made dependent.

Solutions that were offered, principally by the native people themselves, stressed education, and "protection" in the local government program in the form of, say, residency restrictions of five-ten years on voting. The thrust behind the idea of protection seemed to be for time to allow a lot of catching up, through increased education and training. \*

Metis Association and Indian Brotherhood:

In the past, if you didn't vote for the Hudson's Bay Manager, he would give you no credit - the same with the owner of the general store (Fort Resolution). People still think this is the case. Council has asked someone to come in and explain election procedure, not just in a meeting, but going door-to-door. Local Government should step up its educational programs ... It all comes back to education; if you don't know about something, you can't do anything about it. Local Government should increase their education and training programs to reach all people.

C.O.P.E.:

There should be some protection for native people in Local Government. We need this because we really do not know how to work the system. We have only accomplished one millionth of what we have to do. This protection should give us some time so that people can learn .... It is because we do not have this protection that we form native groups and associations in order to get involved. But people then accuse us of being racists.

---

\* For further discussion, see Appendix IV, pp. 7

There are two issues which will clearly have an important bearing on the future forms and structures of both Local and Territorial Government but which we do not deal with at any length in this paper. They are native land claims; and the relationship between local self-government and local taxation.

Our purpose in briefly discussing these three issues at this point is to accord recognition to the fact that certainly, they are very important issues and that they do raise significant questions of philosophy but that, unlike, say, such issues as the establishment of municipalities or even the eventual acquisition of provincial status, they are issues which raise policy questions of form and structure about which appropriate governments have not made decisions.

It is not the Department's purpose in this paper to propose solutions for particular problems but to identify the processes by means of which problems might be solved and to explain the philosophy upon which these processes are based.

In 1966 when the Carruther's Committee considered the matter of Local Government finances it made the following comment:

"The question of taxation need not necessarily arise; to the contrary, settlements doubtless will continue to require access to a fund comparable to the community development fund. The council could have both a decision making and an advisory function; and the scope of its jurisdiction could be subject to extension by administrative act within the Department of Local Government in cooperation with other departments having responsibility in the community". \*

This paper does not deal directly with the issue of the financing of Local Government: who should pay for the services rendered to a municipality?

There are obvious philosophical considerations involved in the question "who should pay?", but we do not deal with them specifically.

Although the philosophical notions we espouse in this paper have clear implications as to the financial role of the State in the development and conduct of Local Government we have concluded that the terms of reference we have been given do not call for that long examination of the economic and political value system of the State which would be required to answer the



question "what is fiscal responsibility in local government?"

The Department is actually engaged upon a long term study of the financing of local government in consultation with the Boreal Institute of the University of Alberta and within the next few months we expect to produce a detailed policy report based on the study.

However, there is one idea implicit in this paper which we feel should be made explicit. It is that local self-government is good -- that political self-determination is good both for the State and the local community, whether the cost of municipal services is met from local resources or from state resources. While this proposition rejects that definition of "fiscal responsibility" which holds that political controls properly being only in the hands of those governments who levy taxes we emphasize that it does not reject the idea of local taxation. It is the purpose of our long term Departmental Study to propose what are sound political and economic principles for the financing of local government in the N.W.T.

A further political issue not dealt with in the body of this paper is that generated by a potential land claim settlement on behalf of the aboriginal peoples. During the course of our inquiry, this issue arose in all of the meetings with interest groups, and was discussed extensively with a number of expert resource people. As it has been raised to us, the issue naturally stimulates a re-formulation in terms of the nature of a future society in the N.W.T. - will it be integrated, or segregated?.

The substance of what was said on this issue by the three native interest groups amounts to the imposition of an absolute condition bearing upon all that they said - essentially, that despite any points that might be raised given the prevailing political circumstances in the N.W.T., a land settlement would change those circumstances to such an extent that any discussion of local government was fundamentally irrelevant until after it had occurred. Therefore, although they were willing to speak to present issues, what they said now would become beside the point when a land settlement was made.

The same point was made by senior Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Officials - that a municipally oriented program of local government development would be radically altered, either by a land settlement or by an increasing invocation of the Indian Act, effectively the creation of reserves, in the N.W.T. local government would then take the shape of Band structures, as is developing in the Provinces, and the present program of the N.W.T. Government would, perforce, be obsolete.

The emphasis of the present program of developing local government in the N.W.T., while remaining as flexible as circumstances permit, is towards the development of an integrated society, as evidenced by the non-exclusive nature of our principal development vehicle, the Settlement Council. If a substantial land settlement occurs, there is a possibility that racial segregation may follow: if "reserves" are created in the N.W.T., there is no doubt of it. Leaving aside the question of "reserves"

for the moment, two questions immediately arise. The first is whether the native people will in fact choose segregation, given the land settlement, and the second is, if they do, in what form will they segregate? We could speculate as to the answers to these questions almost indefinitely, any answers being dependent on the nature of the settlement, when it takes place, and what political forces are at play at the time. Our contention, however, in this brief examination of the issue is that there little point in trying to take into account, in our present statement of philosophy, what might or might not happen as a result of the projected land settlement. Land Settlements will certainly take place and will undoubtedly have a profound effect upon local government in the N.W.T. But until we know better what those Settlements will provide and what effects ensue it is fruitless to try and encompass such major political events, at this time.

In the matter of developing local political structures, our philosophy emphasizes a high degree of flexibility and accommodation to local circumstances. Our primary objective in this as in other issues, is to prepare the people of the N.W.T. to make conscious, informed decisions when the time comes. As such, our major efforts are directed towards the process of developing a self-sustaining and growing, political awareness. Any attempt to predict the eventual shape of the N.W.T.'s political future would be, at best, a hypothetical exercise and on our part, and is inappropriate within the context of this paper.

#### SECTION IV - PHILOSOPHY

As described in Section II the Department of Local Government has divisions as distantly related as Employment, Recreation, Emergency Measures, and Municipal Affairs. When we discuss the Philosophy of the Department, we are dealing with the political and moral ideas which underly all of the divisions and determine the attitudes and methods by which they apply themselves to the development of Local Government.

The term "Local Government" means the process by which group decisions are made at the local level, whether that level be a hunting or fishing camp, a settlement, or any of the more complex forms of municipality. Local government can and in the Northwest Territories, does take a number of different forms: there are the various kinds of Municipal Councils, there are Chiefs and Band Councils and there have been other forms of leadership and local decision making when groups of people lived closer to the land. There is also the form of local government that has a representative of central government (e.g. a Settlement Manager) mainly responsible for decisions at the local level.

When this Department talks of the development of local government it means the development of the municipal form of local government. More specifically, this Department is responsible for assisting communities to develop Settlement Councils and in the process rendering the function of the Settlement Manager unnecessary. As communities are able and demonstrate the willing-

ness, they are assisted in moving to Hamlet status and to the higher levels of incorporation.

The municipal form of local government has by and large, been adopted from southern Canada. It has been assumed that this is a good way for a community to govern itself for two main reasons. First, that it is in keeping with the Canadian democratic tradition in that it permits every person over a certain age to vote and stand for office regardless of sex, religion or race; and secondly, because it permits development of suitable processes and procedures necessary to the provision of public services and to the conduct of fair and equitable dealing between citizen and society.

Municipal governments played a significant role in the development of British practice and institutions and has since - with evolved modifications - become an integral part of Canadian political development. It is now accepted generally in Canada as the legitimate and most effective means of local government.

The indigenous Indian and Inuit people of the Northwest Territories do not have the municipal form of local government as part of their political traditions. They do not, simply because there was previously no need for such a form in the earlier periods of their history. But as they began to live more permanently in settlements, the need has developed and the Government has determined the methods proven elsewhere in Canada would be more appropriate to meet this new need. The Department of Local Government has therefore introduced and developed municipal government structures and processes throughout the Territories.

The Department recognizes that people normally evolve political processes and institutions which are appropriate to their needs. Further the department recognizes that the basic assumption has and is being made that the municipal form of government is the most suitable form for the communities within the Territories. We now make the assumption that if the forms and procedures of municipal government are able to provide for the interests and fulfil the needs of the community that this form of local government will be accepted and become legitimate. If, however, circumstances are such that this assumption proves ultimately illfounded, then more suitable forms of local government will emerge and the Department holds itself prepared to make such accommodations as will recognize the legitimacy of these alternative forms. \*

While the North has adopted the identical structures as southern municipal government, the processes by which local government is being established in the North varies considerably from those which occurred in the South. The development of municipal government in southern Canada has taken a more evolutionary, a less centrally planned course that is the case in the N.W.T. And in the provinces municipal government was established by and in order to serve the needs and interests the Euro-Canadian population. As a means of local representation and administration of this population it has functioned quite well. It has not however functioned as effectively on behalf of native people; rather, municipal government has demonstrated a singular deficiency in providing for the involvement and safeguarding of

---

\* For discussion of a point in this context, see Appendix IV, pp. 5-6

native interests. In actuality it has played a significant role in the political exclusion and community isolation of many of the original peoples of Canada.

In spite of our more consciously planned efforts in the development of the municipal government in the Northwest Territories, this same process appears to be at work in the major municipalities.

In a part of Canada two thirds populated by native peoples, a continuation of this process raises depressing prospects. It is surely as unacceptable to all the people of the North as it is at odds with the philosophy of this Department and the declared principles of political development shared by the Territorial and Federal Governments.

Noting the required difference in approach and in recognition of the ethnic and political realities of the Northwest Territories, the Carruthers Commission discusses the development of municipal government in the following terms:

"We consider that a continuing and intensified program for the development of local government, in which all residents can be offered the opportunity of a meaningful role which they can understand, is crucial to the economic, social and political development of the North. In a sparsely populated country where the population is polarized into many small communities between which communication is not easy. In terms of education, too, local government (including, where feasible, a local school authority) has an important role to play in the North at this time. It is a means by which people can perceive a relationship between problems and their solutions; and for people who have been obliged to rely on welfare and other unearned income - who view "government" as "people who look after others", and to whom "if" means "when" - participation in local government may be a most significant

means to responsible citizenship. Experience in public affairs at the local level provides a means to a greater interest in broader public issues and offices at the Territorial and Federal levels. \*)

In keeping with the spirit of the above reference to development of local government the Department assumes then that as a first priority the development of municipal government must be seen as a means by which the original people of the Northwest Territories may come to play a major role in all levels of government. In practice, this confirms the emphasis on the obligation to the communities for political and social education toward a working awareness of their particular interests rather than exclusively providing administrative instruction as the communities move through the levels of incorporation.

This educational emphasis of the Department is intended to provide indigenous people with a realistic opportunity of public involvement on the basis of their citizenship; the alternative, as has become the situation in southern Canada, is extra-parliamentary political expression on the basis of race. \*

It is the commonly held and accepted view that the Northwest Territories has a colonial-type relationship with the Government of Canada. It is not our intention to discuss this view in any detail but as political development, including the development of local government, must take as a beginning point the reality of Federal-Territorial relationships, it is appropriate to review the matter briefly and to consider whatever implications there are for this Department.

---

\*) Report of the Advisory Commission on the Development of Government in the Northwest Territories, Vol. I, pp. 189-190.

\* For further discussion of this point, see Appendix IV, pp. 4-5



Canada's claim to the land and water lying within the boundaries of the N.W.T. was not clarified until 1925. This claim was challenged as late as the 1930's and it has only been since World War II that there has been international recognition and confirmation of Canadian sovereignty to what is now the Northwest Territories.

There are two aspects to the Government of Canada's assertion of sovereignty in the North. The first is claim to possession of the land; the second is claim to dominion over its people.

Possession of the land was initially established by a unilateral declaration of ownership made with the intent and implied ability to enforce the claim if contested. Latterly possession of the land is being re-established by a negotiated settlement with the original inhabitants of the North.

Dominion over a people, in the democratic tradition, can only be legitimately accomplished through the freely expressed consent of the people governed. In Canadian political practice, consent to be governed is expressed through the knowing participation in the established electoral processes. The indigenous population of the North is by and large unaware of the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship, and there is only a beginning understanding of Canadian political institutions and processes. The Department considers the development of the political and social awareness that will provide for this knowing participation to be imperative and includes this as its priority in the development of municipal government.

The assertion of Dominion raises the most fundamental political question of an individual's relationship with the state. In the Northwest Territories there are essentially two forms this relationship takes. The first, exists between the Government of Canada and those people who are not original to the Northwest Territories, and the second is that which exists between the Government of Canada and the native people of the Territories.

The difference in these relationships hinge on the terms colonial. The individuals who have come North from southern Canada have done so voluntarily and as a consequence have sacrificed some very valuable political rights enjoyed by other Canadians. They are deprived of these rights because of the colonial relationship which exists between the Government of Canada and the Northwest Territories. But they are not themselves colonized: they have come north in pursuit of their individual or institutional interests; they are of the prevalent (Canadian) culture. The rule of Canadian parliament and its legal and administrative extensions in the Northwest Territories are understood by them and largely accepted as being legitimate.

The relationship between the Government of Canada and the aboriginal peoples is qualitatively different and is much more fully colonial in nature. The indigenous peoples are in the position of having their laws, their languages and their procedures of public life superimposed by those of another culture. As was mentioned, the indigenous people are in the main, unaware of their rights and duties of Canadian citizens and cannot be assumed to have recognized the legitimacy of the rule of Canadian Government.

The Department of Local Government assumes that we as a Nation are committed to the free and informed exercise of the right of self-determination within the Canadian political context by the aboriginal peoples of the North. And the Department further assumes that providing support to the self-determining initiatives of native peoples is the proper priority in the development of municipal government.

An element which underlies and gives further urgency to the equitable development of local government is the eventual prospect of provincial-type status for the Northwest Territories. In considering alternative directions to the future constitutional development of the North, the Carruther's Report offers two postulates which they hold to be essential and which offer the Department of Local Government some philosophical guidance:

"Every Citizen of Canada has a claim to participate in the institutions of responsible Government under the Canadian Constitution; it is a goal of political development of the Northwest Territories that the optimum number of Canadian citizens resident in the Territories should, at an optimum speed, participate in Government as fully as Canadian citizens resident in the Provinces."

"The Eskimo and Indians, as indigenous minorities should be free to maintain their cultural and ethnic identities, subject to fundamental human rights as recognized by the Canadian Constitution."

The Department recognizes that these two postulates taken seriously and taken together and applied with conviction will produce a form of political development unlike any that has previously taken place in Canada. The singular distinction being that native people will be significantly involved in the evolution of Territorial political processes and in the eventual

reformulation of constitutional relationships with the Government of Canada. The Department of Local Government holds the assurance of this involvement to be the operational expression of its principal philosophic tenet.

"Even if the Commissioner goes often and visits the settlements, it is not enough to bring, as he said, the government to the people, the government is something you believe, you have faith in. You are building another thing at the base, and I do not know how these two governments could be on a single column: the one that tries to go down from the top and the one who tries to build up from the base. I am not sure if you are not having two governments, in fact. And I do not know where they will meet; there is a very philosophical question in building a government. I think we are very right to start from the base. But I am not sure you will meet the government coming from the top". \*)

Dr. Louis-Edouard Hamelin

As Dr. Hamelin remarks, there are two forms of government in the Northwest Territories. The first, is the Government of the Northwest Territories as the administrative extension the Government of Canada. And second, there is the "government from the base" which is only the beginning of political involvement of all citizens of the Northwest Territories in local and Territorial Government. The Department while being a part of the "government from the top" has as its task the development of local government which is the development of the government from the base.

---

\*) Debates of the Council of the Northwest Territories  
51st Session, p. 331, January 1974.

There can be no question that this "government from the base" will eventually meet the "government from the top". On what terms, and what political processes and structures will result can only be a matter of speculation. What is accepted is being certain and is taken as the corner stone of the philosophy of the Department is that the union of these two governments will be a function of the political expression of the people of the Northwest Territories. And the Department further asserts its first responsibility to be the development and support of this political expression in a manner which attempts to reconcile Territorial political development with Canadian political principles.

## SECTION V

In Section III, three central issues were identified as being of fundamental concern to the communities and the interest groups in the development of local government. We now propose to consider these issues in the light of the philosophical position discussed in Section IV. We shall hope to give point to that philosophy by demonstrating how the issues raised by the communities support our philosophical position, and how we are responding to concerns they expressed.

The first issue identified, developmental support, relates directly to what has been stated to be the Department's broader educational role in preparing people to engage effectively in all levels of government and in the resolution of all political questions which affect them. The fact that an expansion of the Department's operations within this role was called for so consistently and at such length offers full support for the Department's broader educational emphasis in the development of local government.

The sub-issue that we have called the control of development has particular point in this context. We regard it, in the light of our philosophy, as a measure of success that the general level of political awareness has risen to the extent that this has become a point of issue. It indicates that the communities have become aware of the nature of the wider political and social environment, and have gained some appreciation of their present political circumstances. In any educational enterprise, this birth of self-understanding is a source of motivation and

direction for the learner. The control of development in one's own community is a key criterion in the measurement of political self-determination. What is most significant, however, in communities seeking to control their own development is that they appear to see it, in part, as a means to obtain increased support in the form financial and personnel resources for political development and education.

In recognition of the fact that the provision of political educational support to the communities is a fundamental objective, and one central to the Department's philosophical position, a special Development Program Paper was produced early in 1974 outlining the proposed operation of the Department in this area and seeking the resources necessary to carry it out. This program has received approval in principle from the Executive Committee and ways and means of funding it are presently being studied.

Briefly, the program analyses the Department's developmental operation in three parts: goals and objectives, a program overview, and costs. The goals are consistent with the philosophy stated in this paper. Objectives are expressed in terms of the development of Councils as both political and administrative bodies. An analysis of the process of development through to hamlet status follows, completed by a description of a model council. The development model used by the Department is then outlined, and staff responsibilities and relationships examined. Finally, costs based on current figures are given.

One of the specific sub-issues arising from the field data and discussed in Section III relates directly to one of the proposals in the Development Program; this proposal is for an appropriation for inter-settlement conferences and intra-settlement workshops. No political education program on Local Government has yet been devised, as all effort to this date has been directed at establishing training for those people most directly concerned with the program of local government development, namely Councilors, Settlement Secretaries, and Government staff. Once these training needs are met, attention can be turned to an education program for the general public. For both to be carried on simultaneously would call for much larger funds than are currently available. It is interesting to note that development support was not requested by the larger municipalities. In Yellowknife, it was specifically rejected. This is because the Department has never been involved with them in political development; municipalities have been regarded by themselves and the Government as "developed". However, the municipalities did call for programs of public education. \*

The only specific program of training for Municipal or Settlement Council employees, or potential employees, is the Settlement Secretary program. It is safe to predict that the need for more and better training programs for local government employees will grow steadily more pressing as political development gathers pace.

---

\* For further discussion of this point, see Appendix IV pp.6-7



The next major issue raised in the communities was that of native political involvement. With the few notable exceptions, we have observed (see Section III) that in the smaller communities there is a significant degree of involvement by Indian, Inuit and Metis people in the development of local government.

This involvement has two major effects: first, it makes possible the transfer of control of certain activities from the "government from the top" to the local communities. At first such transfers are confined to the operation or management of Government-initiated programs such as road maintenance, water delivery, and similar services. As Councils develop the skills and express the willingness, greater degrees of program and financial control are transferred to them.

The second, and in the long term the most crucial effect of this involvement is that it assists people to learn about the operating processes of local and central forms of government. This educational function is most important when it is considered that the Department of Local Government is the only Department within the Government of the Northwest Territories that in any way is charged with providing opportunities of political education to the adult native population of the North. As it is used here, the term "Political Education" does not simply mean that people are instructed in how to manage municipal government. It is much broader and helps people to develop a

sense of their political interests and to develop political awareness and skills that can be of use in working with other political forces such as the Territorial Council and Government, Band Councils, the Federal Government, Economic and Industrial Institutions.

We have remarked earlier in this paper, that it is important to Canada as a whole that the original peoples of the Northwest Territories are able freely and knowledgeably to develop and express their political will. That in the Canadian democratic tradition Government is only legitimately established when the people governed give their consent. And as this consent is determined through participation in the electoral processes, it is important that the aboriginal peoples quickly come to understand and participate in these processes. It must be noted that until such time as the terms of this consent can be properly and knowingly negotiated the status of the native people of the Northwest Territories will continue to be that of a colonized people; and the dominion of the Government of Canada over them will continue to be based on principals other than those expressed in the Canadian Constitution.

In way of a minor digression we note further that it is possible and it may even be pragmatically advisable to assume legitimately established Dominion in the North. This however will not always be so. The question of Constitutional legitimacy will surely be raised here as it is being raised in French Canada and as it is being ever more strongly raised by native people across the South. And beyond the borders of Canada contemporary

history offers us far more dramatic examples of the effects of improperly assumed Dominion.

It was noted as a sub-issue of native political involvement in local government that some settlements raised the question as to whether municipal government should take the form of a Band Council or whether the present jurisdictional relationship between Settlement and Band Councils ought to be modified. The question of whether some Settlement Councils ought to formally be considered as Inuit Councils was also raised and in some communities this racial exclusivity was simply assumed. The Department of Local Government while it advocates racially integrated structures of municipal government, at the same time recognizes its pre-eminent obligation to assist citizens of the Northwest Territories in their development toward political self-determination; hence, the Department retains a sufficient flexibility to make whatever structural or jurisdictional changes which, within the spirit of Canadian politics, might be required to provide for the implementation of this most basic principal.

In the major municipalities within the Northwest Territories significant native involvement does not exist. In its absence:

The obligation of this Department and of the Territorial Government to provide a means of political education for native people is compromised:

Political control and development is out of native hands and their right to be self-determining is compromised:

Native people are obliged to secure political expression through ethnically exclusive interest groups.

This lack of native involvement in the larger municipalities is entirely at odds with the philosophy of the Department of Local Government.

The issue identified in Section III under the heading "Municipal-Territorial Relations" is broken down into the five sub-issues: - bureaucratic indifference and wastage; control over funds spent in communities; authority over social policy and program; the view that the Territorial Council is a body without any real power; and the Territorial Government's lack of representativeness and accountability. Many of the very pertinent points made by the communities in connection with these issues will be helpful in future Departmental planning; they are not however dealt with here principally because they relate more to Departmental operations than they do to the Departmental philosophy.

We have said earlier that the development programs of the Department of Local Government have been (and still are) restricted to communities below the level of Village. While the philosophy of the Department is equally applicable to the larger municipalities, we are here considering the sub-issues listed above mainly in connection with the Department's principal activity of developing local government in the small communities.

Most of these sub-issues are more in the order of complaints and criticisms which are not at all peculiar to the N.W.T. Bureaucratic indifference, unresponsiveness, the wasting

of government money are the sorts of complaints that are heard from municipal governments in most parts of Canada. And perhaps that is the most significant factor about their occurrence in the N.W.T.

The Department of Local Government's mandate to develop local government follows from the recommendations of the Carruther's Report. It has now been in operation for seven years and has clearly met with some success in that there does exist a vastly increased number of people (as compared with 1967) involved in local government. But we emphasize in this paper that municipal government is also a vehicle of political education which enables people to understand and participate in other levels of government. Gradually therefore, more and more territorial citizens are coming to evaluate the "higher" levels of government by the same standards and principles as they have learned to apply to the local forms of government. The above noted sub-issues raised in the communities indicate the growing awareness of, and interest in, the broader political scene and are, in our judgment, indicators that the philosophical approach to the development of local government has been appropriate.

Further, the revising of these sub-issues is the beginning tangible expression of the "government from the base" beginning to question "government from the top". The manner in which this "government from the top" chooses to recognize and respond to this growing political interest and involvement will likely determine the quality of the future political life in the Northwest Territories.

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX I - List of Consultants
- APPENDIX II - Reports of Consultations with Communities
- APPENDIX III - Reports of Consultations with Interest Groups
- APPENDIX IV - Reports of Consultations with Expert Resource People.
- APPENDIX V - Population Distribution with the N.W.T.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Report of the Carruther's Commission on the Development of Government in the N.W.T.
- Barber, L.I., Indian Land Claims and Rights, Speech for Symposium on Amerindians - The Royal Society of Canada, October 1974.
- Bond, J. J., A Plan for Human Resource Development within the N.W.T. - A Political Approach, Report prepared for the Carruther's Commission, July 1966.
- Hamelin, Louis-Edmond, Manifestations Amerindiennes de Caractère Politique dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest.
- Rea, K. J., The Political Economy of Northern Development, May 1974.
- Rea, K. J., The Political Economy of the Canadian North, University of Toronto Press, 1968, Toronto.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF CONSULTANTS

COMMUNITIES:

Fort Good Hope	Urinley
Fort Resolution	Eskimo Point
Fort Providence	Repulse Bay
Fort McPherson	Panqirtung
Fort Franklin	Broughton Island
Tuktoyaktuk	Pond Inlet
Cambridge Bay	Iglonlik
Coppermine*	
Frobisher Bay	
Hay River (Village and Band)	
Yellowknife	
Inuvik	
Rae-Edzo	

INTEREST GROUPS:

Inuit Tapirisat of Canada  
Committee for Original People's Entitlement  
Metis and Non-Status Native Association and  
Indian Brotherhood of the N.W.T.  
Association of Municipalities

Mr. R. Kennedy,  
Territorial and Social  
Research Division,  
Centennial Tower,  
400 Laurier Avenue, West,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1A 0H4

Mr. J. Hendricks,  
Territorial and Social  
Research Division,  
400 Laurier Avenue, West,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1A 0H4

Mr. H. Carter,  
Deputy Minister,  
Department of Northern Affairs,  
Government of Manitoba,  
WINNIPEG, Manitoba.

Mr. R. McBride,  
Minister of Northern Affairs,  
Government of Manitoba,  
WINNIPEG, Manitoba.

Mr. K. de la Bair,  
Arctic Institute of North  
America Pine and Peel,  
MONTREAL, P.Q.

Ms. J. Sarrasan,  
Arctic Institute of North  
America,  
Pine and Peel,  
MONTREAL, P.Q.

Dr. Pauline Jewett,  
Department of Political Science,  
Carleton University,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.

Mr. D. Orlikow, M.P.,  
House of Commons,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.

Mr. Hugh Brody, M.A.,  
Pond Inlet, N.W.T.

Mr. John MacKenzie,  
Extension Department,  
Government of Manitoba,  
WINNIPEG, Manitoba.

Mr. Mike Brosseau,  
Department of Indian and Northern  
Affairs,  
Centennial Tower,  
400 Laurier Avenue, West,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1A 0H4

Professor Korocil,  
Department of Geography,  
Simon Fraser University,  
VANCOUVER, B.C.

Mr. B. Belovic,  
Science Advisor,  
Science Council of Canada,  
Kent - Albert Building,  
150 Kent Street,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1P 5P4

Mr. R. F. Battle,  
Assistant Deputy Minister  
Department of Indian & Northern  
Affairs,  
Centennial Tower,  
400 Laurier Avenue, West,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1A 0H4

Mr. D. A. Davidson,  
Director, Territorial & Social  
Development Branch,  
Department of Indian & Northern  
Affairs,  
400 Laurier Avenue, West,  
Ottawa, Ontario.

Mr. B. L. Kennedy,  
Chief, Territorial Affairs  
Division,  
Territorial & Social Development  
Branch,  
Centennial Tower,  
400 Laurier Avenue, West  
OTTAWA, Ontario.

Mr. A. J. Kerr,  
Chief, Social Research Division,  
Territorial & Social Development  
Branch,

Mr. J. J. Bond,  
Department of Regional Economic  
Expansion,  
Sir Guy Carleton Building,  
161 Laurier Avenue, West,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.



Professor K. J. Rea,  
c/o Department of Political  
Economy,  
Sidney Smith Hall,  
University of Toronto,  
St. George Campus,  
TORONTO, Ontario.

Professor F. Vallee,  
Department of Anthropology &  
Sociology,  
Carleton University,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1A 5B6

Professor B. Cox,  
Department of Anthropology  
& Sociology,  
Carleton University,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1A 5B6

Professor K. Francis,  
Department of Geography,  
Scarborough College,  
University of Toronto,  
SCARBOROUGH, Ontario

Professor D. Smith,  
Department of Anthropology &  
Sociology,  
Carleton University,  
OTTAWA, Ontario.  
K1A 5B6

REPORT - FORT GOOD HOPE SESSION

DATE:           SEPTEMBER 18th, 1974.

Tentative arrangements were made with Mr. G. Barnaby prior to the session for its organization. This resulted in a preliminary meeting the afternoon of September 18th with the Settlement/Band Council where the purpose of the session and the paper were explained more fully. Councillors and members of the community present expressed considerable concern and indignation that such large questions were being put at such short notice. This indignation was tempered with a good deal of skepticism regarding the effect of any paper in changing Government policy. However, an agreement was reached to have a community meeting that night to discuss the questions raised by the paper. Approximately 40 - 50 people turned up. After a short preamble, the following discussion took place.

- A. The main obstacle to local government is the Territorial Government itself: it does not hold itself accountable to the people. The people have no control or influence over the Government, they receive very little information about its activities. When money is spent, it is usually for the wrong things - it is spent for what Government people think is important, not what the settlement think is important.

Q. Have you any comments on the way in which Settlement Councils were developed, or the idea of having Councils?

A. When Settlement Councils were initiated, the people were not asked how local government should be developed. Therefore, the responsibilities of a Settlement Council are not those responsibilities the people see as being important; they are only important to the Government. Also we already had the Chief and Band Council structure - no attention was paid to it when Settlement Councils were started and it became less and less effective. The idea of developing municipalities is only serving the interest of the Government.

Q. Would you prefer to see a Band Council instead of a Settlement Council?

A. It really does not matter what the structure is called; those people that are the leaders will still lead. What is important is whether it has the power to get things the people want. At the moment, most government programs and activities do not appear to make sense; if we were just given the money that would be spent here anyway, we could do things much better.

Why is the Department of Local Government collecting this information? This should be done by the Territorial Councillors themselves, rather than have someone else do their dirty work. The kind of questions you are asking do not make sense; the Government is not going to change even when all the settlements tell it what they want, or it will just make up a policy that is the same for all the N.W.T. without recognizing local differences.

Q. Is there any way the Government could help communities more effectively?

A. Whenever we ask for something, it takes the Government a long, long time to respond. People that are closer to the communities should be allowed to make decisions without having to ask other people. The big problem is that the Government is not responsible to the people; they have no say over the pace of development. In any case, the people were pre-judged as to their ability to handle local government before the development program started; they were not consulted then and are not really being consulted now.

## REPORT - FORT MCPHERSON SESSION

Date: September 23, 1974

The Settlement Council, having been informed by telephone of the Departments' desire to meet with them over the paper, discussed it prior to the arrival of the staff and recommended that the staff conduct a door to door survey of opinion in the settlement. After arrival in the settlement attempts were made to communicate to the Council and Settlement Secretary that a door to door survey was inappropriate for the purpose of gathering a collective set of opinions and recommendations on the settlement with regard to the "philosophy" of the Department, and that staff preferred to work through the Council as representatives of the community. However, the Council expressed a lack of any substantial interest in the purpose or outcome of the paper beyond stating two points which appear below.

1. The Settlement Council is accorded only token authority as to control of the actual quality of life in the community and thus does not fit into any concept of "local government" that the community understands.
2. The internal political development of the community is progressing to the satisfaction of the Council and they discourage any attempts on the part of people or agencies outside the settlement to intervene in any way. The paper is seen as contributing to such an intervention and the Council wish to disassociate themselves from it.

REPORT - FORT RESOLUTION SESSION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 23rd, 1974.

The Settlement Council was first contacted by letter explaining the intent of our wanting to meet with them.

Some effort was made to organize public meetings, but it was clear that the level of Council and community interest in a discussion of local government was not high.

- Q. Do you agree with the basic idea of local government; if not, what could be done differently.
- A. The basic idea of a Settlement Council is all right.
- A. The responsibilities of a Settlement Council should be stated, at times there is conflict with the Band Council.
- A. Local Government should co-operate more with the Indian Brotherhood, particularly in training field workers.
- A. Local government should have more people to work with in the settlements.
- A. The Department should have had this meeting five years ago, there would have been more people out to the meeting then.
- A. The Settlement Secretary's job should be less administrative and more explaining political matters to people.
- A. The Settlement Council should have an office separate from that of the Settlement Manager.

Q. What kind of training is most important to the Council.

A. Settlement Council conferences and individual Council workshops.

Q. Has the Government attitude toward the Council improved.

A. Most Departments do not pay proper attention to the Council.  
The general attitude is getting worse, that is, less responsive.

REPORT - FORT PROVIDENCE SESSION

DATE: SEPTEMBER 25th, 1974.

The subject of the meeting had been introduced to the Council by letter some weeks prior to the meeting date and the Chief and Band Councillors had specifically been asked to attend.

The meeting began with an explanation of our purpose in requesting the meeting.

- Q. If settlement government was to be started again in Fort Providence, are there things that should be done differently? Is a Settlement Council a good way to begin or should it be another way.
- A. It was felt that Rae/Edzo has a better method of running things, that is, the Chief and Band Council showing a much higher degree of influence.
- A. It was strongly emphasized that local government workshops should both precede and immediately follow Settlement Council elections.
- A. As it is now, people are not interested in local government; people do not understand all of the things involved:  
(It should be noted that at the time of this meeting only 2 of 8 Councillors remained active, the others having very recently



resigned. The pronounced feeling was that the Council did not know enough about local government, hence were unable to represent the community properly).

The balance of this meeting took the form of a Local Government workshop.

## REPORT - FORT FRANKLIN SESSION

Date: September 26, 1974

Prior to the session, the Hamlet Council agreed to meet with staff on the paper, and consider a community meeting if they felt it was appropriate after gaining an understanding of what was to be examined. Consideration of the paper was placed on the agenda of a regular Council meeting and some time was spent discussing the paper with the staff present. The following points were made after a short introduction.

A: This is the first time that we have become aware of the fact that there is a representative for this area on Territorial Council. He has never visited us, so he could not know about our community. If this paper is being written for Territorial Council, the Council member should be here so we can tell him what we think. Also, if we do not tell people directly what we want, we never get it; this paper will probably not get through to those who can make decisions.

It is very difficult to comment on local government when we have very little idea of how it fits into the total picture of government in the N.W.T. For example, we have no idea how funds are generated, or why certain amounts of money are allotted for particular activities.

Q: What do you think the powers of Council should be?

A: Many people are coming into this area as tourists. They stay at nearby lodges on Great Bear Lake. The Territorial Government allows these activities to go on without consulting the local people. We should have control over the (resource-harvesting) area around the Settlement as well as deciding what people can come to the community. Fish are becoming more and more scarce in the lake.

Q: Should the Council have any direct control over other program areas?

A: The Band Council should be given more authority in these areas; they look after people; the Hamlet Council looks after the administration of the town. Moreover, the Band Council has been in existence for a long time. The Hamlet Council is "under" the Band Council and responsible for a limited set of responsibilities only. We should have direct control over social development funds - the community knows how to spend them in such a way as to benefit people in need. With regard to all the money that the Hamlet Council is being given each year - will we have to pay this back? (Answer in terms of parity with the rest of the country and ownership of land).

With regard to all the money that the Hamlet Council is being given each year - will we have to pay this back? (Answer in terms of parity with the rest of the country and ownership of land).

## REPORT - TUKTOYAKTUK SESSION

Date: October 1-2, 1974

At a Hamlet Council meeting September 23rd, the community's input to the philosophy paper was discussed, and the recommendation made that staff meet with Councillors individually and that a special Council meeting be considered during these consultations. Visits were made to Councillors and the following points made. Subsequently, the Chairman felt that his calling a meeting was undesirable.

Q: In having a Council better than having an administrator?

A: In some ways, having an administrator was better because we were able to get help from the Government easier. Also the running of the Community was more efficient, because he could tell the employees to be at work on time and did not have to worry about creating enemies in the community. He also knew more about Government and was able to talk to them. But having a Council is good because we know more now about how to run our community.

Q: How could having a Council be made better?

A: People in the community do not know very much about what the Council is supposed to be. It is very difficult to make them understand that the Council represents them and it is there to govern the settlement. They think you are putting yourself forward if you speak out. When we became a Hamlet all help from the Government was cut off, and this made it even harder. What is needed now is a program which would teach people about Councils and Government. If a person from the settlement was hired and trained as a development specialist, he could go around the community talking to people and making them aware of what is Council's role. He should be able to speak and write Eskimo. This is vital if the Council is to keep going.

Also, there should be more times where Councils from this settlement and others can get together and talk about what each one is doing. In this way they can learn from each other.

Q: Is there any way in which the Government can help Councils in a better way than it has before?

A: Yes. The Council is now responsible for municipal services (water, sewage, garbage, roads, etc.). These services have always been provided through the Government, and the people do not take much interest in how they are done, so long as they are done. People therefore do not take much interest in the Council. What is important to the community are things like hunting, trapping, and earning, but the Council cannot help them very much in these activities. If, from the beginning, the people had been involved in setting up a Council that had some control over these areas, the Council would be stronger today. The Council should now be allowed to say what is important and what should happen in areas that the people think are important, instead of always asking the Government to do things and never getting any replies.

Q: What do you think should happen with local government in the future?

A: Unless local communities can gain some economic independence from the Government, things will get worse - people will become indifferent. Right now the Hamlet gets a budget every year from the Government; this is like getting welfare. We cannot do anything with the budget except spend it on things which we are told we can spend it on. The Hamlet should be allowed to set its own priorities in budgeting, based on what the people think is important. The Territorial Government is in a similar position with respect to the Federal Government: unless it can get some economic independence it will always be a puppet government. The Territorial Council is particularly meaningless - the communities have no contact with it, and all it seems to do is what the Government tells it to.

REPORT - CAMBRIDGE BAY SESSION

DATE:           OCTOBER 10th, 1974.

The public meeting was organized by the Settlement Council and was well advertised as a discussion and workshop on local government.

It was explained, in terms relating to the request of the Territorial Council, that our purpose in being there was to record what the people of Cambridge Bay felt about local government.

Q. (From the floor) What is local government?

A. (This question appeared to concern a significant number of those present and some length of time was spent dealing with it)..

Q. Do you think there should be an elected Settlement Council or are there other ways of running the community.

A. No response.

Several other questions were asked without any response.

There was and seemed to be an original difference of opinion as to the purpose of the meeting and it was agreed that the Government staff would visit individual homes the following morning and make themselves available at the Settlement Office during that same afternoon.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES

- Q. Do you think the idea of a Settlement Council is a good one or are there other ways of doing things?
- A. The idea of a Settlement Council is good, but it should be in the Eskimo language and the minutes should be in Eskimo. Only eskimo people should be on the Council.
- A. Hamlet status should be easier to get. It is important that we have control over more things in the Settlement. That would probably bring more involvement from the people.
- A. The idea of a Settlement Council is good, but there should be greater Eskimo participation and there should be more help from the Department of Local Government.
- A. It is very important that the Settlement Councillors are able to learn about local government. There should be more Settlement Council conferences and workshops.
- A. There should be more P.U.D.A. (Project in the Use of the Development Approach) sessions here. To explain to all Eskimo people what local government is and to explain to the whites to leave the Council alone.
- Q. Are there things that the Settlement Council feels they should have more control over?
- A. Yes. More direct control over money and municipal services would be better. Council should have control over other things like welfare and game, but maybe not for a while yet.

REPORT - WRIGLEY SESSION

Date: October 10, 1974

Arrangements were made by telephone through the Settlement Secretary to hold a public meeting sponsored by the Council. The meeting took place in the afternoon with about 20 - 30 people present. The main thread of the ensuing dialogue is as follows:

- Q: Do you think having a Council is good for the Settlement?
- A: Yes, when there was no Council, Government people used to come to the settlement and make promises, for example, to provide housing. These promises were almost always broken. Since the Council was set up it is better - we have more control.
- Q: How do you think the Council could be improved?
- A: We should have more money that we can spend to help the Settlement in ways that we see are important. Also, there should be a program of educating people in the settlement about Councils and local government.
- Q: What areas of authority do you think the Council should have?
- A: We should be able to help people in the settlement. If we had some money for assisting people to go out hunting and fishing this would be good for Council.
- Q: What about municipal services?
- A: They are important, but not as important as community interests.
- Q: Do you think the Band Council should be integrated with the Settlement Council?
- A: No. they look after different things.
- Q: If it were possible to start again, would you start up a Council in the same way?



A: We prefer to follow what the Government did; we do not know enough about it to comment on changing what has happened.

Q: Are there any other comments?

A: Yes, in a few years, when we know more, we would like to have some rental houses and have a housing program administered by Council.

## REPORT - ESKIMO POINT SESSION

DATE:           OCTOBER 16th, 1974.

The Settlement Council advised against a public meeting as there was currently an epidemic of Hepatitis in the settlement and they felt that they were quite able to represent the views of the community.

Q. Is the idea of a Settlement Council a good one or are there better ways to run the community?

A. The idea of a Settlement Council is good but there are some improvements that could be made.

- the Department of Local Government should provide more help to the Council.
- Settlement Council conferences are very important because they allow us to find out what other councils are doing and they should be held more regularly.
- the Settlement Secretary is very important to the council and the Department of Local Government should have better training for them and they should be paid more.
- the Department of Local Government should provide the settlement with proper machinery to do its municipal services.

Q. Are there other things in the settlement that the Council feels they should have more control over.

A. Yes. Policing, education, welfare, and more control over the settlement monies, particularly site development. These are

things that the Council would like to have control over but not right away; when the Council has more experience.

- A. The Settlement Council has authority outside the settlement as well as within. It is important that we know what the Government and companies are doing on the land. The Federal Government promised that they would contact us before there was anything done on the land. We have found evidence of exploration and activities of the fisheries people and the Council has not heard anything about it from the Federal Government. We do not want to argue with the Government, we just want to know what they are doing.
- Q. Have the relations between the people and different departments of the Territorial Government changed since the Council has been active?
- A. Yes. The departments pay some attention to the Council but it should be much more. A big problem is that private industry is making arrangements with the Territorial Government without contacting the Settlement Council.
- Q. Are there things that the Department of Local Government should be doing differently?
- A. Yes, we would like to see Local Government people here more often to explain different things to us. We would also like to have workshops.

## REPORT - REPULSE BAY SESSION

Date: October 21-22, 1974

Council was approached by letter, requesting their participation. On October 15 they agreed to hold a special meeting October 21, and to open the issues to the public at a meeting scheduled for the following night. The October 21st meeting was concerned with arrangements for the public meeting, once Council had learned the scope of the questions to be put. It was decided to form small groups, with one Councillor in each group, for consideration of a list of specific questions to be drawn up by staff. Following are the points made in response to these questions.

Q: Is having a Council better than having an administrator only (Settlement Manager)? If so, why?

A: Since there has been a Council, the people have had more information about decisions made that directly affect the settlement. They also feel that they have been able to participate in those decisions, to some extent. The Council is also useful in helping the Settlement Manager.

Q: If you could go back to the time before there was a Council, would you start up a Council, or would you have different type of organization? How would it be different?

A: The Council as it is presently organized is suitable.

Q: Do you think the Council looks after the right kind of things? (Municipal Services, Roads, Airstrip, Fire Protection) should it have control over more things? (like the school, welfare, co-op)

A: There are presently a number of separate organizations that look after other matters in the settlement, no change is recommended. However, the Council should have authority to demand information in resource-exploitation activities in the area and some degree of control over those activities that interfere with established traditional pursuits. Also, the Council should be able to set the prices on locally-sold country food. (If Game regulations regarding selling char without a Commercial license).

Q: Should the budget for Council be given out in a different way?

A: The Council should have access to more funds that are not committed to specific activities in order to meet Community needs as they arise. They could create their own programs to deal with local issues.

Q: Any other comments about local government - what is good about it, what is bad about it, how it can be changed to be better?

- A:
- a) There should be a program of public education on Council matters instituted in the settlement. Part of this could be having funds to hire someone to make minutes of all organizational meetings and distribute them.
  - b) More public meetings should be held, in important matters, referenda should be held.
  - c) The Government should provide information and consult with the settlement on pending legislation and policies affecting the settlement.
  - d) Projects that are instituted in the settlement should provide maximum opportunity for local labour by hiring an outside foreman specialist only.

## REPORT - PANGNIRTUNG SESSION

DATE: OCTOBER 30th, 1974.

The Hamlet Council met and decided that an open meeting of Council would be the best way to proceed.

Q. If Pangnirtung were to be beginning over again as a settlement, are there things this Council would do differently in developing local government.

A. The first thing we would do would be to hire someone who could keep the books and be in charge of the office; and apply for hamlet status.

Q. Why?

A. As a settlement Council we had no control. Nothing was done. We would make decisions and the Government would not do anything. We weren't sure that the Settlement Manager was doing what we asked. As a hamlet, we have control over a lot more things within the community, and Government departments are much quicker in responding to us.

Q. Do you think it would be a good idea to gradually transfer hamlet responsibilities to a Settlement Council.

A. No. They should be granted hamlet status.

Q. Are there other things such as education that the Council feels it should have control over.

A. If the Council had direct control over these things, we would have no time to deal with them. There should be committees of the Councils to deal with them.

- Q. Do you think that both Inuit and non-Inuit should be on the Hamlet Council?
- A. The non-Inuit are free to run for Council but they won't get elected.
- Q. Do you think that the development of government from a settlement to a hamlet to a village is the best way to do things?
- A. Yes, it seems to work all right.
- Q. Are there some things that the Department of Local Government should be doing differently, for instance: the way all hamlets monies are distributed or the rules and regulations which govern hamlet business?
- A. The Department of Local Government gives us less and less money each year to run the hamlet. They will have to increase the money or we will not be able to run the services.

REPORT - BROUGHTON ISLAND SESSION

DATE:           OCTOBER 31st, 1974.

The Settlement Council had discussed the subject prior to the arrival of the Local Government staff and they had determined that a public meeting would be the best way to proceed.

- Q. Do you think the Settlement Council is a good way to run the settlement? Are there better ways, or are there things that should be done differently?
- A. The Settlement Council is a good way of doing things. Things are better since there has been a Settlement Council.
- Q. Are there some ways that the Department of Local Government could be of more support to the Council.
- A. Settlement Council conferences are important and they should be held regularly. (The meeting also requested Settlement Council workshops).
- Q. Is the attitude of Government toward the Council improving?
- A. The different departments of Government do not listen enough to the Settlement Council. (The general consensus was that they should exercise some direct influence over the various Government departments within the settlement).
- C. Do you think the idea of a Settlement Secretary to help explain things to the Council and to write the Council's letters is the best way to do things.



- A. It is a good idea that someone is there to help the Council but he should have training and when the Council is just beginning the Council needs more support from Frobisher Bay.
- Q. Do you think the Council should have more control over settlement finances?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Do you think the Settlement Council should have both Inuit and non-Inuit people on it?
- A. Yes. A white person can help explain things to us.

REPORT - POND INLET SESSION

Date: October 31, 1974

The Chairman of Council - supported by 7 of the 8 Councillors - presided at a public meeting. The Settlement Secretary and Asst. Secretary were the Interpreters. Attendance fluctuated between 50 and 90 during a three-hour session.

After clarification of the purpose of the meeting the discussion took place on four general questions, with 26 speakers (all Inuit) contributing - some several times.

Introduction - Comments during clarification process:

1. "What are you (Department of Local Government staff) doing? What is your job?"  
(further explanation given)
2. "Are there to be new laws about Local Government?"  
(meaning of a "Philosophy Paper" further clarified)
3. "Why do the Inuit never go South to ask such questions of the Southern people? The reason the Inuit cannot give good comments is because white people come asking questions."

General Question 1. *Is having a Council better than having an Administrator (Settlement Manager)? If so, why?*

Comments in Answer (verbatim as interpreted).

- 1st Speaker "I do not know whether a Settlement Manager is better or Council is better for we have no experience of Council being in control alone. I think we cannot run affairs alone; we need a Settlement Manager."
- 2nd Speaker "We should definitely have a Council to protect the people."
- 3rd Speaker "The Government goes too fast in making the laws; there should be more talk first with the Inuit people who are involved."

- 4th Speaker "The people ran themselves before the White Man came; they were their own boss; the people have something to say about this." (=through Council people may again become their own boss).
- 1st Speaker "We are glad to have a Council which can help to solve problems; but if the relation between the Council and the Government changes that will affect the people. We do not want too many changes that affect the people."
- 5th Speaker "We can run our own things. We have a Council which are Inuit and they know how the Inuit live. A Settlement Manager - the Kadlunaat - they don't know a thing about how the Inuit live."
- 6th Speaker "We want a Council in the Settlement. We don't always agree with Council because they don't have enough power and don't try to get more power. They are like the people in the south, always having to go up to the next level before they can do something - what is that word... hierarchy."
- 7th Speaker "We like a Council better than an Administrator."
- General Question 2. *If you could go back to the time before there was a Council, would you start up a Council or have a different kind of organization?*

Comments in Answer

- 8th Speaker "I have three questions about this:  
1. People are not free to get animals to eat anymore.  
2. Liquor was not drunk before: the Government is responsible for this.  
3. We have all come into the Settlement and there are not enough houses. What are the answers to these questions?"
- 9th Speaker "We need(ed) a Council when we came to live in a Settlement which keeps growing."
- 4th Speaker "There used to be no Council (in the old days) only a leader; there was only one rule - 'be good to the people'. If we don't have a Council we should go back to what we were before. But if the Government is to keep pushing us we must have a Council."

10th Speaker "People are still not fully aware of what a Council should do or be. There needs to be a continuing programme of Adult Education."

General Question 3. *Do you think Council looks after the right kinds of things (e.g. Municipal Services, Roads, etc.) Should it have control over more things? (e.g. School, Welfare, Co-op)?*

Comments in Answer

4th Speaker "In the South do ~~the~~ Councils alone make decisions? Are there any individuals who must agree? or any others? (Note: tone rhetorical; intended to imply contrast with local Council's situation. Brief statement of traditional patterns of public official decision-making in South given by consultant).

Speaker "Who should make laws?"

5th Speaker "How come the Commissioner can make the laws? Could (the Dept. of) Local Government enforce that the Council have a little more power?" (brief explanation of T.G. constitutional organization).

11th Speaker "Who is going to change laws?" (Note: rhetorical - implied meaning - "we are not")

12th Speaker "We have now had a Council a long time and we should now definitely run things. Before, the Inuit had no Council. Up to now we followed the White Man in learning about the Council. If the Council paves the way the people will be better. We are living more and more in the White Man's way and it is very hard to learn quickly enough. We get help from the (Dept. of) Local Govt. but it is still slow. In voting for a Council the people should elect good people who are good speakers (note: i.e. "spokesmen"). When our children grow up they will probably improve on what we can do."

5th Speaker "Does Council do mainly what the Govt. asks them to or what the people ask them to do?" (rhetorical: implies the former not the latter)."

12th Speaker "When we consult the people we usually have their backing for what we do."

- 5th Speaker "Does the Council get what it asks from the Govt?" (indicating tone expecting answer - 'NO')
- 12th Speaker "Yes, for the most part - but it takes time. We asked for a water truck at a time we thought it urgent but it took 2 years to get it."
- 5th Speaker "It takes a long time - but finally they reply!"
- 12th Speaker "Upon this - and on many things - like housing for instance - the Government says - 'yes, we agree with you, you should have this or that - but there are only so many trucks or houses and some settlements must wait.' But we have no idea who gets what or when. We have no say in this. The Council should have some say about these priorities."
- 1st Speaker "The question of whether all the people should come together (to decide such priorities) (in a meeting of Settlement Councils?) or only the Council (Territorial Council?) should be the decision of Council (Territorial Council?) - not the Dept. of Local Govt."
- 4th Speaker "We need the Settlement Council rather than Settlement Manager. The People are not informed correctly if they have only Settlement Managers. And should we go back to the old ways? If we did - it would not work out in the old way. We should not go back - but forward - with a Council to speak for us."
- 12th Speaker "Though we are not going back - but forward - we have our own language and beginnings and we should have our own teachers so that we can keep them."
- 13th Speaker "Would it be better without a Council? Would it be better if P.I. were run by people from the South? Would a Settlement Manager handle our problems correctly? I would like answers."  
(? = these are indeed difficult questions)  
(? = I would like our Council Leaders to speak)
- 4th Speaker "We (Council) are all in favour of a Council. The people in the Settlement should run the Settlement."

- 12th Speaker "Yes."
- 9th Speaker "How would the Government react if somebody wanted to go back to the old ways?"  
(brief explanation of Government policy by consultants).
- 10th Speaker "The Hamlet should include all our usual Hunting Grounds." (P.I. is to become Hamlet April 1, 1975).
- 14th Speaker "The power of the Council has faded recently (in comparison with Government - in Settlement).
- Speaker "I want to say that neither the Inuit Tapirisat nor the Council should make enemies of the Whites. ITC makes enemies."
- 15th Speaker "Game laws and limitations create a problem. We should have more say in this."
- 12th Speaker "Council does not know who should make decisions about the use of Settlement (government-owned) vehicles and equipment. At one time we were told that we had this authority. Now we are told we do not. Council does not know the answer."
- 1st Speaker "The trouble is that we have only one Water Truck; this cannot do the work. We should have two."
- 16th Speaker "But the Council are doing a good job in looking after what they must look after."
- Speaker "The Government gives poor service, in vehicle repairs; parts are hard and slow to get."
- 4th Speaker "We have separate organisations at the moment for Education, Welfare and so on. But they all feel linked to the Council and report to the Council."
- Speaker "If we don't say anything about certain things (certain Govt. programmes) it is because it is hard to say anything when pushed. But if we do not say anything it doesn't mean we agree with everything."
- Speaker "About that third question - would we be blamed for the way the other programmes go if we had Hamlet Status?"

- 8th Speaker "The Council is doing a good job but other people make rules about the Settlement and don't come here very often." (to defend their position?)
- 17th Speaker "When you say - Should Council 'control' certain programmes - what do you mean by control?"  
(brief clarification by consultant).
- 1st Speaker "Council should not be involved (in the control of major programmes); we don't know enough. Council authority should be limited. But in the future we can control things - when we know more."
- 18th Speaker "The organisations we have now - like the Council, the School Committee, the Co-op - should remain separate but should co-operate."
- General Question 4. *Any other comments about Local Government - how it could be changed for the better?*

Comments in Answer

- 19th Speaker "We do not get enough water."
- 20th Speaker "When the Government makes its policies for everybody it should let those settlements who don't agree with it be exceptions."
- 21st Speaker "Council is not going after its employees. It should. I see a lot of employees going to work late."
- 22nd Speaker "A lot of funds are wasted on charters and wasteful travel and such things."
- 23rd Speaker "The Government doesn't communicate with us very well."
- 4th Speaker "The reason the Government makes policies for everybody is because they must be responsible for all the people - not just for one Settlement. All the Settlements should be allowed to give their opinions but no one Settlement can be the boss."
- 5th Speaker "Shall we have a meeting for Game Laws - like we are having this one for local government?"

8th Speaker "We do not obey the Kadlunaat Game Laws because they are not ours. It will be the same with other laws. We are sorry!"

22nd Speaker "We are thankful in some ways."

17th Speaker "Local Government should help in the matter of Economic Development Officers when we cannot get help we need."

"The Department of Local Government does not make laws (legislate); it gives out the information about laws."



REPORT - IGLOOLIK SESSION

Date: November 4, 1974

Council met with the staff as part of a regular Council meeting on the understanding that if they felt it necessary, once having gone over the topic of discussion, they would call a public meeting. In the end a public meeting was not called, Council feeling that they could represent the community's views adequately. After an introductory explanation of the purpose of the paper, the main points made were as follows:

- A: We greatly disapprove of Game regulations being made up by personnel in Yellowknife without the Inuit taking part.
- Q: *If you could go back to the time before there was a Council, would you start up a Council, or have a different kind of organization?*
- A: Before there was a settlement, people lived apart and had no need of a Council. Now a Council is very important. When people first came together everything was done through the Settlement Manager. The Inuit were very "low class" and could not say anything. Now anything to be done has to be approved by the Council and the people know what is going on.

The only thing that bothers us is that we have a very small power - not enough to control the things it should. Upto date we have no complaint about the Department of Local Government, but we are puzzled about the N.W.T. Government which will not approach the Council. There seems to be not enough communication between the Federal and Territorial Governments, for example in the past projects have been approved by the Territorial Government but, on approaching the Federal Government they have been turned down. However, we are grateful to Local Government for involving local people in the administration of their programs for the past two years.

Q: *What kinds of powers or authority do you think the Council should have?*

A: The power to set hunting regulations and quotas; this can be easily done by the community. We should have control over the hunting (resource-harvesting) area around the settlement.

Q: *Are there any major changes in the Government in Yellowknife that you would like to see?*

A: Yes

Q: *Is it possible to say why you say "yes"?*

A: If a miracle can happen then the Government would say to the local government "get your own quotas". We disapprove of a lot of things Game Management does, e.g. you need a licence now to fish domestically.

Q: *Except for matters relating to Game, does the Council have all the power it needs?*

A: Council should have control over major things without having to approach the Territorial Government.

Q: *How are the people affected by your not having enough power?*

A: The Council is trying its best to control what is good for the community. They have to be careful because they are working for all the Inuit. If the Territorial Council puts down the Council, they are putting down the people too, and everyone is unhappy.

Q: *You referred to control over major things a little while ago. What are some examples of these major things?*

A: The town plan. For example, staff houses were placed and built without Councils permission. They would not be where they are now if the Council had been consulted.

Q: *Should Council have control over the hiring of Territorial staff to work in the community?*

A: Yes - not all Government employees are alike; some are good, some are bad. We have no say in whether they stay for one year or a long time. It seems that the Government moves the good staff too soon and the bad ones stay. Also, the Government is always complaining about being short of money, but they seem to spend a lot just moving staff around.

Another Area: the R.C.M.P. They do what the Government wants, but do not take action until a law has been broken. Two years ago the settlement wanted their own policeman but we were turned down, by the Commissioner, who said we could perhaps have it when we were a Hamlet. We would prefer our own police because they would be able to prevent crimes, and the community would know what to do to help. An R.C.M.P. man should stay to work in the office and write reports.

Q: *Should Council have any direct authority over education or welfare?*

A: When a teacher or social worker is sent into the settlement, they are told what to do by the Government. It is hard to change their attitude. What should happen is that the Government should continue to hire staff but direction should be given by the Council.

Q: *Is there any area of authority that should be left entirely to the Government?*

A: Absolutely nothing

Q: *You would get more authority by becoming a Hamlet?*

A: But we are not ready.

Q: *Do you feel you should still have the powers referred to, even though you are not a Hamlet?*

A: Of course; we are only waiting to become a Hamlet because we are not sure about being able to administer so much money. Someone is being trained to handle this administration. When he is trained, we will become a Hamlet.

REPORT - FROBISHER BAY SESSION

Date: November 13, 1974

The Village Council was invited by letter to participate in sponsoring a meeting with Department officials to discuss the paper. It was left up to them to determine whether a public meeting was advisable, or simply a meeting with Council. They elected the latter. Unfortunately, owing to some confusion about the scheduling, the meeting was held in the afternoon, and only three Councillors were in attendance. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chairman asked that questions be left in order that the full Council might discuss them and send in a written brief. Following is a summarized account of the meeting.

(introduction by Mr. Creery)

A. Why was Mr. Hamelin not able to come to Frobisher?

There are no bad feelings between the Department of Local Government and the Council, but housing is a real problem: both Inuit and non-Inuit should have proper housing.

When Frobisher Bay became a Hamlet, a lot of attention was paid to the turnover of facilities and equipment, but we were, and are, more interested in the social aspects of the community, such as welfare, education, and housing. We feel that the local people should have more input and control over these areas.

Yes; a year ago Council had authority over housing, but the Government created the Housing Corporation. But these are precisely the things the people locally should be involved in rather than roads, water deliver, etc.

(A number of specific issues regarding housing were then brought up. Mr. Creery replied, saying that his Department no longer had authority for that area, and that he would pass their comments on to the Housing Corporation).

Q. *Does the Council feel it has authority over the right kinds of things? Should the local authority extend to other areas?*

A. As we said, at one time housing and the Council were amalgamated and thus the Council had direct input into housing. With the present setup, control is fragmented. We should also have direct input into Social Development and Education. In Greenland people have more control over social things - we just have equipment and the dirty work.

For one and a half years we have been asking for control over the liquor store but have been put off by the Government. There are too many divisions and sections in the Government - it is set up poorly. They always send us from one to another.

Q. *If you were to start over again building a Council, would you follow the same path, or would you do things differently?*

A. We would just talk to the local people and follow what they wanted us to do; we would ignore instructions from Yellowknife. We would rather go by the people's demands and how they would run the community Council. It is not a good idea to get instructions from Yellowknife; we are elected by the people, but get our instructions from the Government.

Everything the Council says is forgotten, even when Government officials are present; it is not absorbed, it disappears. Even when notes and minutes were taken down, nothing seemed to go to the Executive. We would like you to take note that we are concerned about meetings like this. In the past, Federal Officials would laugh about our problems; we are glad to see you are not doing this.

Mr. Creery: I would like to caution you - the points raised so far are not exactly to do with our purpose in being here, so please do not expect action to be taken. We have a different reason for being here.

A. The Department of Local Government seems to have gone through stages - we used to get cooperation, but things are diversified in Yellowknife now; there are different "empires". We do not seem to have much to do with the Department any more. We have to go to different places to see about different areas of responsibility. The Government should have an agency for Councils to function through to other Departments and agencies. Now, our only liaison with the Department is over ordinances and legislation and instructions.

Mr. Creery: Perhaps that function is useful for settlements, but as they progress into municipalities, they should need help less and less.

Q. *Are Councils able to represent the people properly? Could other forms be better? Should Inuit and White People be together on Councils or should there be separate Councils for each?*

A. There is no problem when the Council is made up of both people together; we can get along very well. But sometimes there are difficulties: the majority of people are Inuit in this area; it seems silly that our Territorial Councillor is non-Inuit. Many Inuit are willing to become Territorial Councillors, but do not come forward because they are not sure what they can do as one. Perhaps in the beginning, when elections took place, the people did not know what kind of person was needed, so they elected the present Councillor.

We understand, however, that Local Government people are here to discuss something else.

Q. *Should there be a program of public education about government for the people in the communities?*

A. The Government seems to always be changing direction; people should be brought up to date.

With reference to the previous question; there are mostly Inuit people in the Baffin when these bodies and organizations were set up. Now another body (Housing Corp.?) has been set up. Too many different organizations in a community divide that community. It works better when there is one senior body and committees reporting to it.

Mr. Fuller: The Housing Corp. legislation was passed by Territorial Council, it can be changed by them. Why not go to that Council? Where does the process break down?

A. Councils were never asked about the formation of the Housing Corp., it was done out of the blue. We have not had much success with the Territorial Council.

REPORT - HAY RIVER SESSION

Staff:

Date: 19 November 1974

The Town Council was notified of the Department's intention to hold a public meeting. The meeting was advertised and held in the Legion Hall. Approximately 10-15 people attended. What follows is a summarized account of the points made. As the discussion focussed on two main issues, the points are grouped under those issues.

1. Involvement of the native people

- the present local government structure allows for everyone's participation
- however, complicated procedures and red tape discourages native participation
  - one way to encourage native participation might be to grant decision-making authority to local councils without having complex procedures.
- there are actually two forms of local government: one native, one white. Unnecessary conflict was created by introducing an extra form (settlement council).
- on the question of the reserve here: it is unfair that Indians can vote for municipal councillors, but residents of the municipality cannot vote for band council representation. Indians should really be given land to hold collectively under a free hold title, rather than setting up reserves.
- decreasing native participation is inevitable with increasing urbanization, particularly in communities with a white-oriented economic base. These communities grow with a majority of white people in them; the percentage of educated, sophisticated people grows; they naturally rise to leadership positions. Why should the native people bother to get involved?
- Where there is enough time allowed for unforced development, then one can expect native participation. This is not the case in Hay River. Perhaps the native people should have to fight for representation.

- there should be an emphasis on Band and Settlement Councils as a means to educate and involve native people.
- underrepresentation only becomes a problem when it results in an unequal distribution of benefits. When there is a lack of funds to develop all areas equally, there is bound to be an unequal distribution. We have enough problems trying to service our own outlying areas, let alone the reserve. When it comes down to it, those who can afford to pay will get the services. It is impossible to finance an area with no economic base.
- if there are distinctly separate groups with separate interests, then they will form distinct kinds of communities and should have correspondingly distinct forms of local government.
- senior government programs and attitudes have forced a segregated society up here by always treating white and native differently.
- natives have been encouraged to go on welfare. A dependency on government has been created which effectively excludes them from participation.

## 2. Authority of Local Council vs Territorial Government

- If benefits are to be equalized, funds must be controlled at the local level.
- municipal budgets are like welfare - and produce the same kind of apathy.
- municipalities should have control over the social aspects of community life, not just the physical: e.g. education, welfare, housing.
- we have the first and third levels of government, but not the second; the Territorial Government is neither representative nor responsible; that is the reason for lack of participation generally in municipal politics: thier funding comes from a huge controlling system which amounts to a farce on government.



- when decisions are made in the Territorial Government, they are arbitrary; they go beyond setting rules and guidelines. There should be a due process of decision-making laid down, giving some recourse to municipalities from arbitrary decision-making.
- with regard to changing the way the Territorial Government conducts its affairs:
  - it is impossible to change the way in which municipalities are developed or their eventual relationship to the Territorial Government when that Government is solely controlled by a small group at the top - the Executive. Even Department Directors have very little autonomy.
  - even the Territorial Council cannot change the Government; meetings have been held again and again but nothing has been done - why should it be different this time?
- when developing the N.W.T. we should have started with responsible government and then built on that. Native participation would be no problem if the N.W.T. Government was responsible. Even if the same type of control was exercised over municipalities, at least the Government would be accessible.
- concerning public education programs: programs have been mounted before by the Territorial Government, but the whole point is that control still lies in their hands; the Housing Corporation is a case in point: it was set up without consultation and has from the beginning excluded participation.

REPORT - HAY RIVER BAND COUNCIL

DATE:           NOVEMBER 20th, 1974.

The discussions began with the Chief enquiring how long Department of Local Government had existed.

- A. The Department of Local Government was started when the Territorial Government came to Yellowknife in 1967 and 1968.
- Q. This is the first we have heard of Local Government, would you explain what it is?
- A. A lengthy explanation of Local Government followed.
- Q. Do you see the town and the willage as separate?
- A. There are certain things we help each other with and there are certain things we do not. There are things that we want to get into such as water delivery and a road to the village for the school bus. There are other project we want to get into, but we are still looking into. Once we have decided, we will approach the Commissioner and Indian Affairs. It is not that the people here are fighting with one another, but if some people have been on the land so long, others should not come and bother him to make money. One can easily compare from both sides of the river. The town side has good houses but the other side is not so good. If the people are happy, it is

not my job as Chief to say they should have better housing, maybe when they are ready.

Q. Do you see the Department of Local Government as having a role here?

A. I can't tell you at this time. This is the first time we have heard of you. Maybe after meeting with you some more times in the future, we will be able to give you some idea of how Local Government can help us.

REPORT - YELLOWKNIFE SESSION

DATE: NOVEMBER 21st, 1974.

Public Meeting - Approximately 30 - 35 attending.

The meeting was a lengthy and free wheeling one with a wide variety of issues coming under discussion. The issues raised fall mutually under two headings: Involvement in Local Government processes; this discussion related both to the native and non-native groups; and Municipal Territorial relations.

Q. The present form of municipal government is now being implemented in the N.W.T. has been taken from the south and this has been done for a number of good reasons. But with its strengths, it also has its weaknesses, the most noticeable of which is its apparent inability to significantly involve natives of the N.W.T. in the more senior forms of municipal government. Our question is whether there might be some changes which would better adapt municipal government to the N.W.T.

The following are representative remarks made in response to this question; included also are responses to a later question posed from the floor dealing with general electoral apathy.

- A. Historically when the Government and Industry moves in, the Native people are pushed to left field ... everything has been done for them so why should they stand for election.
- A. Native or white makes no difference, the real problem is the lack of competent people on Council ... the reason that better people do not run for Council is that it is too difficult in its masochism.

- A. In a democracy the majority shall rule ... this is a white southern city transported to the north. Rightly or wrongly, the native people have nothing to do with it ... it's nonsense to think that everyone can play monopoly by different rules. The system is here; we're here.
- A. There is nothing stopping natives or anyone else from running for Council.
- A. The present system only allows businessmen and professionals to run, it eliminates 98% of the white people. Wages of aldermen should be subsidized to let ordinary people run. Also there should be education in municipal government.
- A. In the village, there is a Chief and Council, what the people want to say is said through them. That is why there are no Native Councilors in Yellowknife.
- A. (In response to a question of whether the City Council might consider a Local Government Development Effort in Yellowknife). The Village has Community Development Workers coming out of its ears. I hope you are not suggesting we do the same.
- Q. The following remarks relate to Territorial Municipal relations.
- A. When Local Government began in the north, their definitions were confused. Rather than giving responsible Government, they gave responsibilities ... the main problem is that we don't have the tools to do the job, and we don't have enough money.
- A. There is no communication between different levels of Government ... one group is elected and responsible to the people and one group is not.
- A. The Native-White thing is not the real problem. The real problem is lack of money ... we are just not communicating.

- A. Territorial employees should be encouraged to buy their own houses ... that would increase the number of rate payers and likely increase participation on City Council.
- A. Council in the past has left the social responsibilities i.e. welfare with the Territorial Government; this may change in the next few years.
- A. The high rate of government turnover does not help the community nor does it contribute to participation.

REPORT - RAE-EDZO SESSION

Staff:

Date: 22 November 1974

After preliminary contacts by letter and briefly meeting with Chief Arrowmaker, staff were invited to a special meeting of the Band Council, co-chaired by the Chief and the Chairman of the Hamlet Council. Advertisement of the Department's interest in the meeting was made via the media. Following is a summarized account of what took place.

Introduction by Mr. Creery

A. (Chief Arrowmaker) We have heard of and attended a lot of meetings in the past. To date we have not heard anything about Indians doing anything. It will take more than one meeting to settle this subject.

All meetings (of Territorial Council) talk about where and how much money is to be spent; they never talk about how the Indians will do it or even how much money one Indian is going to get.

When we are deciding to make a councillor (Territorial), candidates come around - at election time, never afterwards. They think we do not understand anything, that we are just dumb Indians - everyone here tonight feels this way. Once elected, the people never get a chance to speak,

and after they are elected, they forget about the people. Regarding the present issue: Band Councils should be over town (settlement) councils. The Band Council does more than the town council, but you only hear about the town council. Band Councils were here before town councils; why should the town councils be over (accorded more recognition, status) Band Councils? Town Councils being started on recently just create trouble.

When a "boss" is made in a settlement, or something is done (i.e. when decisions are made), those in charge should go to the Chiefs first; this is their country, their land. At present everyone goes to the town council when they want to consult with the people, but the chiefs know more. If any rules are going to be changed they should see the chief. When they do not, it looks like they are sneaking behind our backs.

The Territorial Council has never said a good (relevant, informed?) thing about northern people.

- Q. Does the municipal model, which is essentially a southern import, suit the north? You say that the Band Council should be over the town council, but not everyone in a community is Indian. How can non-Indian people participate if the Band Council is governing the community? The reason town councils were established in the north is that there is a mix of people up here.



A. We do not have any quarrel with having a town council, but before they do anything, they should ask the Chief first and get his permission.

Q. If the Band and town councils disagree, will the Chief always win?

A. The reason why we ask for control is because the Band Councils have been neglected.

Q. Would each Council have the same areas of responsibility, or would some go to one and some to the other?

A. As long as the town Council doesn't change the rules of anything on their own, before they let the Chief know.

Q. Are Band Council members on the Hamlet Council?

A. The reason we are talking about town councils is that when the white men came here he built wherever he wanted to build. In Yellowknife things are so poor that people now cannot even live on their own land the way they want to. We (the Chiefs) have been talking about this for quite a while; we plan on getting rid of town councils or having them operate through the Chief. This should be the way because the Band Councils have been here for a very long time.

For example, if someone here tonight wanted to build a liquor store or beer parlour, they could go ahead without asking the Indians, who have been here the longest.

Another example - the town council goes ahead and gives trapping licenses to white people without consulting the

Indians.

Q. Maybe the law is wrong here and should be changed. But while it is the law everyone, including the Chief, has to live by it.

A. (disagreement) The white man just goes ahead and he is right.

The Head Game Warden says he gets orders from the Territorial Council to give licenses - this is why he brought it up.

(Following this, there was a dialogue on the Territorial Council, its ability to change the law and Rae-Edzo's representation on it that, due to translating errors, eventually became confused. Only one point could be taken from the exchange; that there should be translation of Territorial Council debates, and these should be available immediately.

Chief Joe Charlo (Yellowknife): The town council in Yellowknife should consult with the Chief and Band Council. It seems now that the people are on one side and the Chief on the other. When the town council in Yellowknife has a meeting it would be better if they came to the Chief and worked with him.

Hamlet Council Chairman: When you advertised this meeting, you said you wanted to discuss local government. You should have said at that time what questions you wanted to ask.

Chief Arrowmaker: We would like another meeting with you to talk some more about local government.

REPORT - INUVIK SESSION

Date: 28 November 1974

As with the other larger municipalities, a letter was sent to the Town Council, asking for their participation in a public meeting to be sponsored by the Department. The meeting was advertised, and took place in the evening with an attendance of 15. An additional letter had been sent to C.O.P.E., also requesting their participation. After an introduction by Mr. McDiarmid, and some initial clarificatory questions regarding the role of the Department in incorporated municipalities (that of an ongoing advisor status), the following issues were raised and points made.

1. Involvement of Native People

- the Council here has native members; there is not the conflict and polarization that you might find in Yellowknife. There would be more members if not for a lack of interest; the last Federal election proves that they can dominate the elected representation if they want to.
- this is an artificially created town. As there were not previous political structures, like the Band Council, the problems of other places do not apply here (e.g. Ft. Franklin).

2. Municipal - Territorial Relations

- the big problem here is the strong Government presence. This disintegrates the tax base, and makes for a highly transient population. Even with a large grant in lieu of taxes, the assessment (by the Federal Government) is still controlled by Government. We estimate their assessment to be about 25% low.
- With no policy of encouraging home ownership, and with a large civil servant population, a large segment have no real ties to the community.

- housing:

- the Government created barriers, actually two communities, when they built Inuvik by extending utilidor service to one part of the town only. Now the error has been made, the town is left to cope with it; the onus should be on the Government to solve this problem, since they created it.
- it seems that extending utilidor servicing to new government staff housing is no problem, but very little is done about financing extensions to the rest of the town. For example, when low cost housing was built here, they were unserviced, and the town was offered the program on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Now we have to upgrade the servicing at our own initiative, and get relatively little government help, apart from regular programs offered to all municipalities.
- with regard to more authority in the social aspects of the community, the way it is now (advisory boards) no power is given along with responsibility, so there is no interest. If we were to be given the authority (as with the Yellowknife school board, even though the funding is 90% government) we are not sure right now what we would like to take on, but there should be a program laid out for developing municipal authority into those areas.
- the priorities of government seem to be mixed up - if basic standards of living are considered a priority
- in the control of programs the real problem is economic control, which rests with the Territorial Government. We have no political recourse to that Government. That is the real problem. There is no way for us to change general fiscal priorities even if, say, an arrangement was made between the Federal and Territorial Governments to give Federal grant in lieu funds to the Territorial Government to pay.
- fiscal policies are now created by civil servants who usually have very little experience and are transient anyway.
- there seems to be an upper limit to the exercise of encouraging local government. It becomes futile if the higher government is not representative. We would be happier even if definite times to stages of political development of the N.W.T. were announced. There should be a definite plan of development for the N.W.T. in this regard.

- The Territorial Council is really only effective if the Government wants to implement what they recommend. It is like the development of a Settlement Council; there seems to be a fear of allowing people to make mistakes. The feeling of power is given, but not the actual power. This is a built-in frustration. Even the municipal progression from Settlement, Hamlet, etc. to City only allows for the exercise of certain kinds of powers - municipal services.
- there is increasing Federal presence up here - is the Territorial Government really in control? (Mr. Creery - we probably will not get very far until a land settlement has been reached). There is no indication of a plan for the political development of the N.W.T.
- the end of the local government program should be representation and responsibility at the Territorial level.
- the Carrothers Commission recommended a review in 10 years, which is almost here. For example, the split of the Territories into West and East was rejected in 1971, but the economics of the Territories should dictate this split. There is a good possibility that the West could become economically independent shortly, and would contribute more that way to Canada as a whole.

#### Developmental Support from the Department

- we need the Department's assistance in rectifying the problem of mixed up priorities in the Territorial Government.
- has Local Government considered assuming an ombudsman role within the Government?
- public education on government:
  - there should be much more of this directed generally.
  - also through school programs
  - the Department and the C.B.C. should get together and put on programs directed towards the communities
  - few people generally know what the forms and structures of government are about, e.g. a plebiscite. Local Government should take the initiative to educate people in these.
- Local Government should provide an education facility to local organizations on democratic procedures.
- here, we are trying to extend knowledge through the use of sub-committees, involving wider segments of the population.

- the training of municipal employees should be undertaken by the department through developing programs, involving them in departmental activities, and funding training positions.
- how can you expect feedback on your department in meetings like this when people do not know that much about what your department is doing, or supposed to do. This applies to other departments also.

REPORT - SESSION WITH INUIT TAPIRISAT

DATE: OCTOBER 22nd, 1974.

The consultation was with Mr. A. Gamble, Consultant to ITC and the President, James Arvaluk.

Points made by these ITC spokesmen were:

1. That ITC has not to this date been able to formulate an official position on local government. The Association has not had time to establish its organization and to work up from the grass roots collective positions on all the main areas of policy - of which local government is certainly one of the most important.
2. Significant changes in Territorial Policy and Legislation vis-a-vis local government should not be undertaken without thorough consultation with ITC (and other native organisations). The proposed submission of Education and Game Ordinances to the Territorial Council had been postponed in order to provide for such consultation; the same principle should apply in connection with local government.
3. However, there was a difference in the case of a statement of philosophy and ITC would not wish it to be held up unless the paper contained views clearly in conflict with ITC's general purposes and such policies as were so far developed. ITC would be unable to make a formal statement of views - but if given the opportunity to see a draft of the proposed paper the Executive

of ITC would be willing to give an unofficial account of its reactions to it.

4. The major preoccupation of ITC was with the matter of Land Claims. In general the Association held that any development which had - or might have - bearing on the ownership of land and rights to exploitation of the land, should await the settlement of Land Claims by the Inuit. On this principle, for example, ITC had opposed the Strathcona Sound Mine Development but its opposition had been ignored. The matter of land ownership clearly had a general bearing on the development of local government and ITC would probably be reluctant to take a firm position on long-term policy vis-a-vis local (or Territorial) government structures and policies until the land issue was settled.
5. However, ITC staff (here I report the President) had generally good opinions of local government and were in fact intimately connected with it in much of their activity. There was considerable cross-representation between ITC Directors and local settlement ITC representatives and members of Settlement Councils. In very many settlements ITC normally communicated with the people through the Settlement Council. Settlement Councils were mainly the bodies asked to appoint - or organize the appointment of - settlement representatives to ITC meetings and conferences.



6. In many (some?) instances Settlement Councils saw ITC as their collective spokesman, that is to say, as the voice of official local opinions on given issues. This is most notably true on the matter of land claims. It is likely that this tendency will intensify with the establishment of Regional Inuit Associations (now in process) in Baffin, Keewatin, and the Central Arctic. These Associations - affiliated with ITC - may very well take on many of the aspects of Regional Councils of Local Government. While ITC had not thought this through - they had no immediate reactions against such a development.
7. In general, ITC was certain of its desire and intention to play a major role in the development of government both local, regional, and territorial but its methods and organization for doing so had not yet fully evolved.

REPORT - SESSION WITH C.O.P.E.

Staff:

Date: 29 November 1974

Preliminary requests for a meeting with C.O.P.E. were made by letter and telephone; it finally took place in Inuvik. A pointed and lengthy discussion brought to light the following points:

Relationship of Native People to Municipalities

- how can local government cope with someone who's occupation takes him in and out of town (trapping)?
- in the larger municipalities, there is little input from the people, not like in the smaller settlements.
- a municipal government is the white man's way of running things (implication - we cannot get involved)
- it is usually businessmen sitting on Council who control things; the native people do not realize they are controlling things for their own ends - they have the most to gain.
- no one feels confidence in people (elected representatives; those in authority) to go to anyone for advice. Council (in Inuvik) is a white structure.
- Council decides things on their own; they do not go to the people - we do not feel we can do anything about it.
- (in Tuk.) the pressure is on them to decide something. They do not realize what it means when they are representing someone; this is a new way of doing things.

- the Council (in Inuvik) do not go to the people; they should get more information before deciding things; it is usually settled among themselves
- we do not seem to be able to get lots - then we have to move to a serviced area - even if a lot purchase there is approved, it takes years to get through the Government. People from the north seem to be able to get a lot easier than us.
- Council (in Inuvik) seems to be forgetting the human environment; it is too concerned with finances.

#### Political Exclusion of Native People

- in terms of development: as more people come in from the South, the native people are losing control.
  - Southerners are brought up in and trained in their system (which they have brought up here and imposed). It seems that in this system everything is budgeted, decided in advance. This is not the native way; when the problem comes up, you deal with it. - here, we sit on Council and spend all our time trying to fit into it.
- how can you have development when people do not feel strong and confident. Everything the white man brings in seems to undermine us: welfare; the native people were not asked if they wanted it. The next thing was houses - no one asked for houses, just for some help with freight rates. When something goes wrong in the houses, we have to ask a white man to fix it - in this way we are made dependent.

- gradually the land is taken away by people with money and knowledge - so native people go on welfare
  - the few people that are left that own their own houses have to pay taxes that are so high no one can afford them. We used to own the land - now we have nothing.
- so many of our people are just like "sleeping" - if a meeting is boring, you go to sleep. You do not realize that it is important if you do not know why it is being held.
- most of us do not have any knowledge of the white man's system. People with that knowledge are stepping in and taking over.
- our awareness is growing, but it always seems that as soon as we think we have mastered something, the rules are changed. Developments up here are moving so quickly they are outstripping our ability to learn, even if we are more aware
- there should be some protection for native people in local government, we need this because we really do not know how to work the system. We have only accomplished one millionth of what we have to do.
- this protection should give us some time so that people can learn
  - a possibility is a residence restriction on voting ability - say, two years before one can vote in any election up here.

- it is because we do not have this protection that we form native groups and associations in order to get involved. This allows us to get involved on our own terms. But people then accuse us of being racists.

REPORT - Session with Metis Association  
and Indian Brotherhood

Date: December 3, 1974.

After initial contact, a meeting was arranged with the two organizations during their talks about a potential merger. As a result, the meeting contained representatives from both groups although it was stressed that this constituted an informal discussion only. Four issues were raised and discussed over two hours.

1. Flexibility

- There should be more flexibility in the local government program; there is too much policy and strict guidelines; local people should be allowed to say what is right for them.
- Local conditions should determine the form of local government adopted - different communities will ask for different things.
- It is very difficult for me to believe the Government really wants us, the native people, to run our own affairs.
- The Government has only supported people running their affairs in a certain way and up to a certain point.
- Why not let the community decide what form local government should take?
- Why have Settlement Managers if the community doesn't want them? This should be a community decision. The Department should support communities to go on their own, without a Settlement Manager if they want to.
- This did not happen in Ft. Good Hope or Ft. Norman. A Settlement Manager was put on us when we asked for no Settlement Manager. When there was none, things never ran better in the community.
- When Area Administrators became Settlement Managers, the emphasis was on their developmental role; that they would work themselves out of a job, be phased out. Now they seem to be more like Area Administrators than ever, and have not been phased out.

## 2. Band Councils vs Settlement Councils

- The introduction of Settlement Councils undermined the authority of Band Councils, which have existed for a long time.  
(Mr. Creery: We chose the municipal model because it allows for the inclusion of all people, no matter what their background.)
- More people are coming in from the South, and more will come in with all this economic activity. They have brought in their own systems, and the native people do not know anything about them. The native people got forced out.
- We think that in some places the Band Council should run the community. We would not allow whites on the Band Council because they are transient, they are southern oriented, so they shouldn't have a voice.
- There should at least be a residency restriction voting of 5-10 years.
- You should start development over again and do away with small groups deciding things for the rest of the people; that is not the native way. We decide for ourselves if we have to in general assemblies. When we meet in groups like this we only decide administrative matters.

## 3. Education and Training

- In the past, if you didn't vote for the Hudson's Bay manager, he would give you no credit - the same with the owner of the general store (Ft. Resolution). People still think this is the case. Council has asked someone to come in and explain election procedures, not just in a meeting, but going door-to-door. Local Government should step up its educational programs.
- It is difficult to say anything about the present system of local government when you don't know anything about it. What are you going to educate people about local government? For example people don't know the difference between a Settlement Manager and a Settlement Secretary.
- Community development is the basis of local government programs, but they are inadequate right now in it.
- Whites are more sophisticated, they can talk anybody into something. Not everybody is educated in the communities. I still feel awkward in front of people, wondering if I am going to say the right words.

- It all comes back to education; if you don't know about something, you can't do anything about it. Local Government should increase their education and training programs to reach all the people.
- There should be Local Government representatives trying to promote the idea of local government in all communities - how many old people know what it means when I make a motion?

It was heavily emphasized by the Chairman of this meeting, both at the outset and at points during it, that a subject with the scope of the philosophy of local government should not be considered before a land settlement had been made. All remarks made during the course of the meeting were to be considered subject to this statement.



REPORT - CONSULTATION WITH EXPERT RESOURCE PEOPLE

Through the course of the inquiry into the philosophical foundation of the Department of Local Government it was decided that it would be extremely valuable to introduce into the discussion, individuals, who, because of their specialized knowledge and experience, could contribute theoretical as well as substantive knowledge to the discussion.

The approach that was taken involved, through a series of personal interviews, our respondents analysing the present political structure and operation at all levels of government and especially that of the settlements. We asked the various people to utilize their own knowledge and abilities to analyse the present interactions of ethnic, economic, and technological forces with the development of local government. Furthermore, we tried to have developed, in the course of the discussions, models for the future development of local government in the N.W.T.

Altogether our interviews covered twenty-five separate discussions as well as a workshop at the Boreal Institute, in which another 15 people were involved. Their range of expertise included from members of the Federal bureaucracy who had been the original area administrators under the D.I.A.N.D. programs to individuals with extremely limited practical experience or knowledge in the North.\*

---

\*The breakdown is as follows: D.I.A.N.D. - 9; D.R.E.E. - 1; Provincial Governments (Alberta and Manitoba) - 6; Political Scientists - 4; Geographers - 2; Community Development - 4; Sociologist & Anthropologists - 9; and other - 4.

A number of themes dominated our discussions. Most of these ideas were brought out spontaneously during the course of the interviews, although in the later discussions the interviews prompted some analysis of the points raised earlier.

1. Parallel Development of Political Structures:

The unique character of the development of local government in the Northwest Territories (as compared to the provinces) was pointed out quite often. The ethnically exclusive (the Indian Band) form of local government being at a very rudimentary stage of development and the multiethnic municipality form of government predominating was the fact that was most often brought out. Both Mr. Battle and Mr. Boultly of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs stressed the uniqueness of this situation and raised the possibility that on the completion of the land claims settlements, an increasingly more powerful system of local government at the Band level will develop. The effects of this on the Development Programs of the Department of Local Government will be profound. They foresee a distinct divergence of goals between the Bands and the present municipally oriented programme. No solution was offered except in an oblique manner when it was suggested, by a number of individuals, that Local Government must be prepared to respond to the wishes of the people in the settlements as well as to the various exterior forces (i.e. Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Industrial concerns etc.) that are constantly at hand. The major advice rendered for acting in this manner was "to go slow" in our programme.

A very interesting and quite significant force that must be taken into consideration at this time is the differing perceptions of what local government is by the agency that is most directly involved after this department. This is, of course, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs; Local Government: to the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, is, because of their past experience in the Provinces, Band government. The lack of appreciation for the Department of Local Government programme by this department of the Federal Government must surely be recognized and acted on.

2. (a) The Indian Act's influence on the nature of the structure and the type of development. The Indian Act which allows for the continuing involvement of Department of Indian and Northern Affairs in the area of local government in the N.W.T. is a point that was recognized as a corollary of many of the statements of the individuals from that department. The impact of the Act, as already witnessed in Hay River where the first Reservation has been created, is surely to increase. Again, the effects of a more powerful federal presence, and a presence, that, if not necessarily hostile to Department of Local Government efforts in development, is not very familiar with it, will have a profound impact on our future programme.
- (b) The influence of the Indigenous cultures on the nature of structures and development. This point was especially brought out by those individuals who had contact with both the Indian and the Inuit peoples. Such factors

as the lack of tribal systems amongst the Inuit, we were told, should be reflected in the development of differing local government structures in the Eastern and Western Arctic. Hugh Brody, in his studies of the Inuit has come to the general conclusion that local government must be allowed to develop with a great deal more local autonomy so as to reflect the distinctiveness of the culture of those involved in it.

3. Orientation to Provincial Status reflecting a desire for growth of population. Professor K. J. Rea of the Department of Political-Economy at the University of Toronto expressed the view that, at present, a major governing influence, on the development of Provincial policies, is that of the retention and increase of population. He expressed the fear that, not only is the N.W.T. being presently influenced by such an approach to policy making, but in the future as the Territories attain provincial status, this attitude could predominate. This basis for policy development in the N.W.T. can only act to undermine the development of local government as reflecting the wishes and needs of the indigenous people of the North.
4. The Changing Process of Governance. Professor Rea was the major articulator of this concept of the changing process of government. Essentially, he pointed to the increasing power of the interest group as the major actors in the 'new parliamentary process.' The significance of this in the N.W.T. is especially great when it is considered that, for

all intents and purposes, the Territorial Government is in the position to act as an interest group towards its funding Department, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. Rea's major fears arise out of the Department of Local Government's programme that attempts to foster institutions based on the British Parliamentary model just when those institutions are being seriously questioned and challenged in developed politics. As Rea sees the situation evolving, the major influence on development in the North will not be government, but the multi-national corporation. The responsibility of the Department of Local Government that would follow from the above situation would be to foster and support institutions that could predominate in an extra-parliamentary situation.

5. The Hinterland Concept of Municipal Boundaries. The most profound influence on all actions and developments in the North is the environment. From this premise Professor K. Francis of the Department of Geology, University of Toronto, has come to the conclusion that there is a distinct interrelationship of the natural environment and governance. The environment has developed a natural economy for many of the communities based on hunting and trapping. A great deal of the activities of the communities encompass a hinterland of many hundreds of square miles. The municipal boundaries, to properly reflect the environmental, economic and cultural realities of the situation, should naturally be extended to cover these harvest areas.

6. The Unique Situation in the N.W.T. for Political Change.

This point was made in a general way by a number of individuals. Quite simply, what was said was that because of the lack of historical precedents in the N.W.T., as far as structure of Local Government are concerned, there is a great amount of room available to have the people develop their own styles and manner of government. The warning given to us was that we must be extremely careful not to force our own biases on those people most intimately involved in this development. There were a number of other points raised of a more mechanical nature. These ideas were centered much less on the greater philosophical questions and more on the operational ones.

1) Ward System

First raised by Professor D. Smith of Carleton University this idea is especially relevant in the larger communities. To ensure Indian and/or Inuit representation on the governing bodies of the larger settlements, a system of wards could be created. These wards would not necessarily be racially exclusive, but could reflect certain geographic divisions in a community.

2) Political Authority and Fiscal Responsibility

At this time there is virtually no fiscal responsibility tied into the development of political responsibility in the N.W.T. Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Hendricks of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs and various individuals at the Boreal Institute stressed the belief

that only with fiscal responsibility that included developing a tax base in communities, could the political authority of the various councils be strengthened. Essentially, the argument raised was one that is based on the ability to implement programmes that are free of the necessity of gaining approval from another source (the funding agency). With a tax-base, it is argued, a settlement could develop much more independently than at present.

3) Department of Local Government and the Multi-ethnic Communities.

The need for a greater Department of Local Government developmental presence in the larger communities was brought up at the meeting at the Boreal Institute. The point was made that as the population of the larger centers increased and as the surrounding areas tended to lose population to the largest municipalities, political power tended to be focused into a few white dominated locales. The political development of the native populations within those communities, is therefore increasingly critical so that the settlements will not be completely overwhelmed by the larger municipalities.

## APPENDIX V

### POPULATION OF MUNICIPALITIES AND SETTLEMENTS

By the end of 1974 27,000 of the territorial population was living in incorporated municipalities:

7,500 - City of Yellowknife

11,750 - Towns of Inuvik, Hay River, Fort Smith and Pine Point

3,200 - Villages of Frobisher Bay and Fort Simpson

4,550 - Hamlets of Pangnirtung, Rae-Edzo, Aklavik, Tuktoyaktuk, Fort Franklin, Coral Harbour, and Pelly Bay.

The balance of the population, 15,750 live in 47 communities with populations as follows:

<u>Population</u>	<u>No. of Settlements</u>
50 - 200	15
200 - 400	18
400 - 600	3
600 - 800	9
800 - 900	2

The native people - Indian, Eskimo and Metis - constitute some 60% of the population and the great majority of them live in the hamlets and the unincorporated settlements. The non-native population lives mainly in the towns and in the City of Yellowknife.