Department of Justice Canada
Ministère de la Justice Canada

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0H8

3 1936 00029 237 3

TABLED DOCUMENT NO. 24-12 (7) TABLED ON FEB 27 1995

SELF-INDUCED INTOXICATION AS CRIMINAL FAULT

INFORMATION NOTE

FEBRUARY, 1995

N.W.T.
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
FEB 28 1995
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Canada

SELF-INDUCED INTOXICATION AS CRIMINAL FAULT

INFORMATION NOTE

THE AMENDMENTS

This bill contains proposals for amendments to the *Criminal Code* that have the result of removing the defence of extreme intoxication for general intent crimes of violence.

This issue of intoxication as a defence was recently addressed by the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of *Daviault v. The Queen*. The common law rule was that self-induced intoxication is never a defence to a crime of general intent. The Supreme Court in the *Daviault* case maintained the common law rule, but recognized an exception to it, by which intoxication may be a defence to a general intent crime if the intoxication is so extreme that the person is in a condition akin to automatism or insanity. The Court concluded, in the absence of legislation associating self-induced intoxication with criminal fault, that to convict a person who was in a condition akin to automatism or insanity would violate the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. The Court observed that it is open to Parliament to legislate in this area of intoxication and criminal fault.

When the Supreme Court released its decision, review of the defence of intoxication was already underway through the project to recodify the General Part of the *Criminal Code*. Broadly-based consultations disclosed the deep-seated moral view, which the government shares, that people who do violence to others while in a state of self-induced intoxication to the point of loss of control or awareness of their behaviour, should be held criminally responsible for that violence. Those consultations also raised questions about the extent to which alcohol intoxication leads to loss of control or awareness.

These amendments would accept and reflect that moral view, by legislating for the first time in our criminal law a legal concept of criminal fault based on extreme self-induced intoxication, in relation to crimes of violence.

The amendments would address the most pressing issue of intoxication as a defence to "general intent" crimes of violence. Other issues relating to intoxication as a defence will be addressed over the longer term in the more comprehensive reform of the General Part of the *Criminal Code*.

The Standard of Reasonable Care

The new law would for the first time set out a standard of care to apply to self-induced intoxication. It would declare that people who voluntarily become so

intoxicated that they lose conscious control of their behaviour or become unaware of what they are doing, and who cause harm to others, breach the standard of reasonable care generally recognized in Canadian society. The new law would define this breach as criminal fault sufficient for criminal liability, and that fault would prevent the intoxication defence from being used.

This would mean that for any crime of violence, the defence of extreme self-induced intoxication could not be used to show that the person doing the criminal harm did not act voluntarily or with the basic intent to do the harmful act. The defence could not be used because Parliament would have declared that to voluntarily become so intoxicated and cause harm to others is grossly unreasonable and criminally blameworthy.

The new standard of care would reflect in the criminal law the widely-shared moral values of Canadians as to the responsibility of intoxicated individuals for harm they do to others.

Crimes of Violence

The amendments would apply to the basic intent element in all crimes of violence. These crimes, which include sexual violence and domestic assaults, have the gravest effect on their victims, and therefore most concern the public.

Intoxication is found in close association with violence, not necessarily causing violence, but often creating an environment in which violence is more likely to occur. The new standard of care would reinforce the obligation of all Canadians not to do violence to others and would make clear that this obligation applies even in situations of extreme intoxication.

Violence and the threat of violence have played a significant role in placing women and children at risk and in denying women and children the right of equal participation in society. The new standard of care would require all members of society to take responsibility for not harming others, thus helping to protect the rights of all Canadians to security of the person and to equal benefit and protection of the law.

A Preamble

The bill includes a preamble to set out Parliament's intention in amending the *Criminal Code* in this way. The preamble will be a useful guide to courts applying the amendments, and will also provide a record of Parliament's reasons and considerations for legislating, which include:

- grave concern about the incidence of violence in society
- the particularly disadvantaging effect of violence on the equal participation of women and children in society and on the rights of women and children to security of the person and to the equal protection and benefit of the law as guaranteed by the *Charter*
- the close association between violence and intoxication, and the concern that self-induced intoxication may be used socially and legally to excuse violence, particularly violence against women and children
- the well-known potential effects of alcohol and certain drugs on human behaviour, and scientific evidence that many intoxicants, including alcohol, may not cause a person to act involuntarily
- the moral view of Canadians that people who violate the physical integrity of others while in a state of self-induced intoxication are blameworthy in relation to their harmful conduct and should be held criminally accountable for it
- the intention to legislate a concept of criminal fault in relation to incapacity due to self-induced intoxication, and to promote and help to ensure the *Charter* rights of all Canadians, including victims of violence
- recognition of the continuing existence of the common law principle that intoxication short of loss of control or awareness is never a defence to a crime of general intent
- the need to legislate a standard of care, the breach of which constitutes criminal fault.

LEGAL BACKGROUND

Our *Criminal Code* does not include a defence of self-induced intoxication. This defence has been developed by the courts in the case law. Before the September 30, 1994 decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the *Daviault* case, intoxication could be a defence to crimes of "specific" (or special) intent, but could not be a defence to crimes of "general" (or basic) intent. Specific intent offences require a special purpose in addition to the basic intent to do the act.

Examples of specific intent offences are murder, theft, robbery, and break and enter with intent to commit an indictable offence. Examples of general intent offences are manslaughter, sexual assault, and assault.

In the *Daviault* sexual assault case, the Supreme Court examined the common law rule that intoxication is no defence to crimes of general intent, and found an exception to it. The Court said that extreme intoxication which results in a condition akin to automatism or insanity may be a defence to any crime, even a general intent crime. To come within this exception, the intoxication must be so severe that the person is incapable of forming even the most basic or simple intent to do the act.

The Supreme Court was of the view that cases of extreme intoxication resulting in a condition akin to automatism or insanity will be rare and exceptional. To restrict the defence, the Supreme Court added two requirements to this exception to the common law rule. First, the accused person must bear the burden of proving the defence on a balance of probabilities (normally the prosecution must disprove defences beyond a reasonable doubt). Second, there must be expert evidence (from, for example, a toxicologist) to support the defence. Otherwise, the Supreme Court upheld the common law rule that intoxication is not a defence to crimes of general intent.

THE NEED FOR REFORM

The Supreme Court in *Daviault* emphasized that its ruling involved the interpretation of a common law rule, not Parliamentary legislation. It noted that there was no legislation making voluntary intoxication the basis of criminal fault, and noted that Parliament is entitled to legislate to deal with the matter of intoxication in the criminal context.

The initiative to recodify the General Part of the *Criminal Code* had already begun its review of the defence of intoxication and provided a convenient forum for the development of a response. In November, the Minister of Justice released a consultation paper which discussed the defence of intoxication as one of many General Part issues, and offered a number of options for reform.

Initial responses to the widely-distributed consultation paper indicated a strong public desire that Parliament respond quickly to the issue raised in the *Daviault* case. The consultations also disclosed a strong and broad societal view that people who voluntarily become intoxicated to the point of losing control or awareness and doing harm to others are blameworthy in relation to that harm. Significantly, that general view also clearly considers that the level of the person's blameworthiness is not reduced by their intoxication. The government shares that view.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

Various options to implement these policies were examined from the perspective of reflecting this basic moral view in a manner which is legally strong and effective.

Many of the consultants assumed at first that the best response would be a new offence, such as "criminal intoxication", to fill the void when an accused has a successful defence of intoxication. If a person is found not guilty, of for instance sexual assault, because of their intoxication, they could be convicted of the new crime of "criminal intoxication". In recent years in Canada and in other common law jurisdictions there has been much discussion of possibilities along these lines.

After much consideration and consultation with legal and other experts and the general public, this option was not adopted to address the immediate issue, for several reasons.

First, the penalty. It became clear that the maximum penalty for any new offence of "criminal intoxication" should be the same as the maximum penalty for the original offence. Otherwise, the new offence would be offering what has been called a "discount for drunkenness", which is considered to violate collective notions of responsibility and accountability. But, if the maximum penalty for the new offence of criminal intoxication were to be the same as the maximum penalty for the original offence, this would essentially be a long and complicated way of saying that intoxication is no defence.

The second reason for not pursuing the option of creating a new offence of "criminal intoxication" relates to the "labelling" of the offence. The "criminal intoxication" option rests on the person being found not guilty of the original offence (for instance, assault), and instead found guilty of the new offence of criminal intoxication. The consultations disclosed the view that a person who voluntarily becomes intoxicated to the point of losing conscious control or awareness, and assaulting another, is at fault for the assault, and should be held criminally accountable for that offence and nothing less. To acquit the person of the assault, and convict them instead of a new offence of criminal intoxication, would send the message that they were not criminally responsible for the assault.

Third, detailed examination of the "criminal intoxication" option in its various forms, and consultation with criminal law experts, indicated that many of the *Charter* and legal theory problems identified by the Supreme Court in relation to the common law rule (as related to basic intent) would apply with almost as much force to any such new offence. The legal and practical concerns include:

- (if the new offence were required to be charged) there would be no opportunity to lay the charge where, as often occurs, the issue of intoxication does not arise until trial

- (if, on the other hand, the new offence were to operate as an included offence, with conviction to follow automatically from acquittal of the main offence) a successful defence to the main offence (which needs to be proven by the accused only on a balance of probabilities) would be taken as proof beyond a reasonable doubt of the new offence of criminal intoxication - this may raise *Charter* problems

- (if conviction for an included offence of criminal intoxication were to be at the discretion of the judge or jury) would the simple fact of acquittal on the basis of intoxication be sufficient, or would the Crown be required to adduce additional evidence of intoxication, and if so how?

- would the new offence include an element of causation (that the intoxication caused or led to the harm in question), and, if so, would that element be conceptually sound and capable of proof?

- how would the new offence accommodate multiple defences without being overly complex?

- the Crown could be obliged to argue contradictory positions at trial (i.e. first, that the accused was not intoxicated enough to be acquitted of the main offence, but second, that the accused was so intoxicated that he or she should be convicted of the new offence.)

THE OPTION OF A REFERENCE TO THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA

The proposed amendments would reflect Canadian values about justice and criminal accountability. They are designed to be fair and just, not only to victims of violence but also to accused persons who would be held accountable for intoxicated acts of violence on the basis of a clear legislated standard of fault.

The Supreme Court in *Daviault* examined a common law, judge-made rule, not a legislated statement of Parliamentary policy. The new law would provide a basis in law for an approach to criminal fault and intoxication that did not exist previously in the common law. Before this bill, there was no legislation declaring self-induced intoxication to be criminally blameworthy.

The public policy considerations underlying the new standard of care were not presented to the Supreme Court, and therefore could not be factored into the Court's *Charter* analysis, particularly as it related to sections 7, 11(d), and 1. The Court in *Daviault* was not asked to examine a Parliamentary statement of well-developed and widely-supported public policy, such as in this bill: it examined a pre-existing common law rule on the basis of legal theory, not Parliamentary policy.

There will inevitably be some uncertainty with respect to the state of the law after the amendments are passed into law. The Supreme Court has not yet had an opportunity to rule on the approach which these amendments would take. One of the options available to the Minister of Justice is to ask the Supreme Court, on a reference, to review these amendments immediately after they are passed by Parliament, but before they come into force. A decision has not yet been made as to whether to refer the amendments to the Court.

A reference would provide an early opportunity for the Court to consider the legislation, in the light of the extensive information that will be gathered in the Parliamentary Committee proceedings.

On the other hand, the advantages of a reference may possibly be outweighed by those of the immediate implementation of the amendments.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE STUDY

Whether or not the Minister of Justice refers the bill to the Supreme Court before its coming into force, the record of Parliamentary Committee proceedings will be enormously helpful to the courts in their application of the bill and in the event of a *Charter* challenge.

Evidence in Committee will explain the policy of the bill, and will supply background information as to such matters as the nature and extent of the problem of violence in our society, its association with intoxication, and its particularly disadvantaging effect on the equal participation of women and children in society.

It is expected that the Parliamentary Committees will wish to explore the medical relationship between extreme intoxication and automatism. The Committees may find it helpful to hear evidence on the medical effects of intoxicants, including that extreme intoxication by some intoxicants, such as alcohol, may not lead to the hallucinatory or dissociative state associated with automatism.

These and other issues can be fully aired in Committee, generating a detailed record of the underlying legal, empirical, and policy considerations to assist the application and any review of the new legislation.

ᓇᔾᒥᓂᖅ ᑯᖓᔾᔭᕋᓱᓐᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒐᓱᐊᕈᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐱᔾᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ

ᑐᑭᓯᑎᕐᓯᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᖅ

ᑕᕝᕕᒃᐊᓇ, 1995

ᓇᖅᒥᓂᖅ ᐋᖓᔾᕋᓱᓐᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒐᓱᐊᕈᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᒃ

ᑐᑭᓯᑎᑦᓯᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᖅ

ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ

ᐅᓇ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᒃᓴᖅ ᐃᓗᓕᖅᑲᕐᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᒐᓱᐊᕈᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᕐᔪᐊᕆᔭᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᐲᖅᑕᐅᑎᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᒐᓱᐊᕐᓂᐊᕐᓱᓂ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᑭᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐋᖓᔾᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᐅᖏᓕᕈᑕᐅᑭᒃᑐᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᖅᑐᐃᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐊᑦᑕᕈᓱᓐᓂᖅᖏᓗᐊᖅᑐᒃᑯᑦ.

ᐋᖓᔾᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᕐᑐᖅ ᒫᓐᓇᓴᖓᓚᐅᕐᑐᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᕆᔭᐅᓚᐅᕐᐳᖅ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᖏᑦᑕ ᕐᑯᑦᓯᓂᖅᐹᖓᓐᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑏᐃᐅ (ᑭᖑᒃᑲᓂᖑᒥᓗᑎ) ᐊᑭᓴᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑯᐃᓐᒧᑦ. ᒪᓕᓴᔭᐅᒐᔪᒃᑐᖅ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᑮᓚᐅᓐᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᒪᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᔭᓗᐊᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᐅᑕᐅᓚᕿᔪᐃᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ. ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᑦ ᕐᑯᑦᓯᓂᖅᐹᖓᑦ ᑏᐃᐅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᒪᓕᓴᔭᐅᒐᔪᒃᑐᖅ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᕐᐳᖅ, ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᓕᑕᖅᓯᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᐳᑦ ᐊᑐᓐᖏᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ, ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐋᖓᔾᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᐅᔪᖅ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐊᓂᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᐃᓄᒃ ᐋᖓᔾᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᐅᑎᑕᐅᑐᐃᓐᓇᓇᐊᖃᕐᓯᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᔪᐃᓂᐅᒋᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᑦ ᐅᑭᑦᔫᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᐃᑭᓯᒪᔪᐃᓂᐅᒋᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᑦ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᑖᑎᖃᕐᐅᔪᖅ, ᒪᓕᒃᑕᖃᕐᑎᓐᓇᒍ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᒃ ᐋᖓᔾᕐᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒐᓱᐊᕈᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ, ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᐃᓂᐅᒋᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᑖᓐᓇ ᐃᓄᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᔪᐃᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐅᑭᑦᔫᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᐃᕈᑎᓯᒪᔪᐃᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒃ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᐅᑎᑦᓯᒐᓗᐊᕐᐸᑦ ᓯᕐᑯᒥᑦᓯᓂᐅᒐᔭᓇᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᑦ ᐃᓅᑉ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᒋᔭᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᖅᓱᕈᓐᓇᐅᑎᒋᔭᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒃ ᐅᔾᔨᕈᓱᓚᐅᕐᐳᖅ ᒪᑐᐃᖓᔭᓇᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒃᔪᐊᖑᔪᖅ ᒪᓕᒃᓴᓕᐅᕈᓐᓇᓇᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᕐᓂᕐᒃᑐᐃᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᓇᐊᒃᓴᓂᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓴᓕᐅᕈᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᒃ.

ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᑦ ᕐᑯᑦᓯᓂᖅᐹᖓᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕈᑎᖃᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐋᖓᔾᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᑐᖅ ᕿᒥᕐᕈᔭᐅᓕᓇᓚᐅᕐᐳᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔪᓐᓕᐊᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᓱᓕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓇᓱᐊᕐᓱᓂ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᕐᔪᐊᖓᑦᑕ ᐃᓚᖓ. ᐊᒥᓱᐃᖅᑕᖅᓱᑎᒃ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᔾᔪᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐊᒥᓱᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᓚᐅᕐᐳᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑦᓯᐊᕈᔪᓇᔭᖏᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᖅᓴᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ, ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒋᔾᔪᑎᒋᓯᒪᓪᓗᓂᒋᑦ ᒐᕙᒪᐅᔪᑦ, ᑕᒪᑯᐊ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᕐᓯᐊᕐᓂᐊᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᐃᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᔪᐃᓂᐅᓗᐊᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᐃᕈᓯᒪᔪᐃᓂᐅᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐊᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᕈᖅᑎᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᒃᓱᕈᑕᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᑦᑐᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᖏᑎᒍᑦ. ᑕᒪᑯᐊ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒌᓐᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᓚᐅᓇᕐᑐᑦ ᐊᐱᖅᑯᑎᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᑎᒋ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃᓯᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᔾᔪᑕᐅᑮᒪᖓᑕ ᐃᓱᒪᐃᕈᑎᓯᒪᔾᔪᑕᐅᑮᒪᖓᑕᓗ.

ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᐊᖏᕈᑎᖃᕐᖃᔭᕐᐳᑦ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑦᓯᓗᑎᓪᓗ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑦᓯᐊᑮᐅᕈᐊᖃᕐᑐᓇᔭᖏᓐᓂᑦ, ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓇᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐃᓗᓕᖃᓪᓗᓂ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᐅᖃᑦᑕᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᔪᓕᖅᑐᖃᕐᑐᓂᐊᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᖃᕐᑐᐃᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᓄᒃᒥᒃ.

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕐᔭᕐᐳᑦ ᐊᒃᓱᕈᑕᐅᓂᖅᐹᖓᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᐋᖓᔾᔭᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᐅᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᓄᑦ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᑮᓐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ "ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒥᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᑮᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᕐᓯᑎᒃ. ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓕᖓᔪᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᔭᖃᑦᑕᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᕐᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᓇᔭᐅᓂᐊᕐᐳᖅ ᓯᕕᑐᓂᕐᓴᒻᒧᑦ ᐃᓕᖓᓂᓇᔭᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᓗᐃᒃᑲᐅᓈᕐᓂᖅᓴᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᓕᔭᐅᖃᓯᐅᔾᔭᐅᓗᓂ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᕐᔪᐊᓇᔭᐅᔪᒧᑦ.

ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓱᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ

ᓄᑖᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᓇᔭᐅᓂᐊᕐᑐᖅ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅᐹᒻᒪᓇᒻᒥᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓱᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᕐᓂᐅᕈᖅᑐᓄᑦ. ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᔾᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᓕᓗᐊᖅᐸᒃᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᓇᓕᖅᓯᑎᒃ ᓇᕐᒥᓂᕐᓗ ᐊᐅᓕᑦᓯᐊᕈᓐᓇᐃᓕᓪᓕᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᕝᕙᓗᓐᓃᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᖅᑐᕈᓐᓃᖅᐸᒃᑐᑦ ᐋᖓᔾᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᕐᒥᓗᑦ, ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᖅᑐᐃᓂᐅᓗᑎᓪᓗ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒥᓂᒃ, ᓯᕐᑯᒥᑦᓯᒐᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓇᔭᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐃᓕᑕᓇᔭᐅᓯᒪᒐᔪᒃᑐᒥᒃ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᖑᔪᓄᑦ.

ᓄᑖᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐃᓯᒪᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᑕᒪᑐᒥᖓ ᓯᕐᑯᒥᑦᓯᓂᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᒋᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᓐᓂᖃᕋᔭᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑭᓛᔭᕆᐊᖃᕋᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᒋᒃᑯᑎᐅᓕᕋᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐋᖓᔭᓗᐊᕐᑐᕕᓂᐅᓂᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᔭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᓴᐊᕋᔭᕐᑐᕕᓂᕐᓄᑦ.

ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᑐᑭᖃᓕᕋᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᖃᕐᑐᕕᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᓴᐳᒻᒥᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓴᓯᐊᕐᓂᐅᓴᔭᕐᑐᖅ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᕐᑐᖃᕐᑐᕕᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᐃᓪᓕᓴᔭᕐᓂᖓᓂᑦ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᑦᓯᓴᓯᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᑎᑦᓯᓴᓯᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᒃ ᐋᖓᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᕕᓂᕐᒥᓄᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᐅᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᕕᓂᐅᒋᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᔪᕕᓂᐅᒋᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓪᓗᓂ ᐊᓯᒥᓂᒃ. ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᐃᓪᓕᓴᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᕐ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒃᔪᐊᖓ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᓯᒪᓕᕋᔭᕐᒪᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᓕᖅᑐᕕᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᓯᒥᓂᓪᓗ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᕕᓂᐅᓕᖅᐸᑕ ᓈᒻᒪᖏᓐᓂᖃᕋᔭᒻᒪᓇᓐᓂᖓᓂᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᓕᕋᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᕕᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

ᓄᑖᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓯᓯᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑕᑯᒃᓴᐅᑎᑦᓯᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᓕᓇᓂᐅᑉ ᒪᓕᒐᖏᓐᓂ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᒥᓯᓄᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑦᓯᐊᕙᐅᒐᓯᐊᕐᓂᐅᑎᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᑦ ᐃᓄᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᕐᓯᐊᕐᐸᒃᑐᑦ ᑲᒪᔨᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᓯᒥᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᕕᓂᐅᒃᐸᑕ.

ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ

ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᓴᓯᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᓴᔭᕐᐳᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᕈᓯᒃᓯᑎᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᕕᓂᕐᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᐃᓐᓂ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ, ᐱᖃᓯᐅᑎᓯᒪᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᕙᒃᑐᑦ ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᓪᓗᓴᓯᐊᕐᓯᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᖏᕐᕋᒥ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ, ᐊᒃᓯᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᖅᐹᖑᔪᓂᒃ ᓯᕋᖅᑎᕐᓇᖅᓂᖅᐹᖑᔪᓂᓪᓗ ᐃᒃᐱᓐᓂᖅᑎᕐᓯᕙᒻᒪᖓᑕ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᖅᑕᐊᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᑕᐅᔪᕕᓂᕐᓂᓪᓗ, ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᒧᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓘᑕᐅᓂᖅᐹᖑᖃᑕᐅᕗᑦ.

ᐋᖓᔭᕐᓂᐅᔪᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᓕᖅᓯᒪᕗᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓕᕋᔪᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐱᒋᐊᖅᑎᑦᓯᓚᕿᕙᓐᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᓯᓂ, ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᓚᕿᓕᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᐅᒐᔭᕐᑐᓂᒃ. ᓄᑖᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓯᓯᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᓐᖏᑦᑎᒃᐹᓪᓕᕈᑕᐅᒻᒪᓇᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐱᔭᐅᕐᑯᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᖑᔪᓐᓂ ᐊᓯᒥᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᖃᑦᑕᕐᑯᔨᓐᖏᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒻᒪᓇᒐᔭᕐᓯᑎᒃ ᐱᑦᓯᐊᕋᓯᓯᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᖅᑐᒻᒪᓇᐊᓗᒃᑕᖃᕋᓗᐊᕐᐸᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ.

ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑲᐸᐃᐊᓵᓇᓂᖅ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒃᓯᒻᒪᓇᐊᓗᒃ ᐊᕐᓇᓂᒃ ᓱᕈᓯᕐᓂᓪᓗ ᐅᓗᓇᐊᓇᖅᑐᒥᑎᑦᓯᖃᑦᑕᕐᓯᒪᕗᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᕐᓇᓂᒃ ᓱᕈᓯᕐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᔭᐅᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᑎᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑕᐅᑦᓯᐊᖅᑎᑦᓯᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᓇᑎᒃ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂ. ᓄᑖᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓯᓯᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᑎᑦᓯᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐃᓅᖃᑕᐅᔪᓕᒫᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᓇᐊᖃᕐᓕᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐊᓯᒥᓐᓂᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔭᓇᐊᖃᓐᖏᓐᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖅᓴᐅᒐᔭᕐᓯᑎᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᓕᒫᑦ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᒋᔭᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᑦᑕᕐᓇᖅᑐᒥᕐᑯᓇᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓕᒋᔭᐅᑦᓯᐊᖃᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᓯᕐᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓴᐳᑎᔭᐅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᑎᒍᑦ.

ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓇᔭᐅᔪᖅ

ᐱᕐᑯᔭᒃᓴᖅ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔾᔨᓯᒪᕗᖅ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓕᐊᓇᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᑐᒥᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒃᔪᐊᖓᓂ ᐱᓕᓇᐊᓇᔭᐅᒐᓯᐊᕈᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᕐᑯᓪᓗᒍ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᔭᔭᕐᑐᓕᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᕐᔪᐊᓇᔭᐅᔪᒥᒃ. ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓕᐊᓇᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᑑᑎᖃᒻᒪᓇᓐᓂᐊᕐᐳᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐅᑎᑕᐅᒐᓯᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑦᓯᓂᐊᕐᑐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᒃᑯᑕᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓯᓂ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒃᔪᐊᖓᓐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑏᑦ ᓱᓇᓂᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓯᒪᒻᒪᖓᑕ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᑭᑎᖃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᖓᑕᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᑭᑎᒋᔭᕐᒥᓄᑦ, ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔾᔨᓯᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ:

- ᐃᓱᒫᓗᖕᓇᖅᑐᒻᒪᕆᐅᓂᖓ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᕆᓂᖅ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂᑦ

- ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᒥᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐃᓂᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᔭᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᐅᓂᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᐃᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓱᕈᓲᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᐃᑦ ᓱᕈᓲᓪᓗ ᓴᐳᔾᔭᐅᓱᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᐃᓄᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᔾᔨᖓᓂᒃ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᔭᐅᓱᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓂᖃᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᓪᓕᕆᒃᑎᑕᐅᖓᒪᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᔪᐊᕐᒥᑦ

- ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᖕᓄᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᕆᓂᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐋᖓᓲᕐᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒫᓗᖕᓇᖅᐳᖅ ᐃᒻᒥᖕᓂᒃ ᐋᖓᓲᓕᖅᑎᐸᐸᒃᑐᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᓂᒃ ᓱᕋᐃᓇᑎᒃ ᓱᕋᑕᐅᓐᖏᓐᓂᕋᐃᓂᖓᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ, ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᐃᑦ ᓱᕈᓲᓪᓗ

- ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓱᑦᓱᐊᕙᐅᓱᕆᔭᖏᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑎᒥᖏᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᐱᓂᕐᓗᐃᕙᒃᑐᑦ ᐊᓱᒥᖕᓂᒃ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖅ ᐋᖓᓲᓕᖅᑎᓱᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐸᓱᔭᒃᓴᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᔪᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ

- ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖓ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐋᖓᓲᕐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓱᐅᔪᓄᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᓄᖅᑐᑦ ᐋᖓᓲᓕᕐᓇᖅᑐᑦ, ᐃᓚᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃ, ᐃᓄᖕᒥᒃ ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᕆᖏᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔾᔨᑭᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᑎᑦᑎᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ

- ᒪᓕᒐᓐᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᓂᖓ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐃᓪᓕᔪᑦ ᐃᒻᒥᓂᒃ ᐱᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐋᖓᓲᖅᑐᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᑎᑦᑎᕝᕙᓪᓕᕋᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᕋᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃᓗ ᑐᒃᖓᕕᒃᔪᐊᒥᑦ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑕᐅᔪᓕᒫᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ, ᐃᓚᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᑦ

- ᐃᓕᑕᕆᔭᖃᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᔾᔭᖏᓐᓇᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖓᓂᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᐅᔭᕆᐊᓕᒃ ᐋᖓᓲᓗᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔪᓐᓈᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᑭᓱᒍᓐᓂᕐᓂᕐᓗ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑎᐅᓐᖏᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᐱᔭᕆᓗᓂ.

- ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑕᖃᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᒃᑐᒥᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᓱᕋᒥᑦᓱᔪᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐸᓱᔭᒃᓴᐃᑦ.

ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᑭᖑᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓱᒪᔪᑦ

ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᓱᕋᒥᑕᐅᑦᑕᐃᓕᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑦᑎᖏᒻᒪᑕ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐋᖓᓲᓕᖅᑎᓱᒪᔪᓂᒃ. ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓱᒪᕗᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᓂᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥ. ᑭᖑᓂᐊᒍᑦ ᓱᑎᐱᓇ 30, 1994-ᖑᓚᐅᖅᑐᒥ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕈᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓐᓇᒍ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒻᔪᐊᖓᓂ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᕝᕙᓪᓕ (Daviault) ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐋᖓᓲᕐᓂᖅ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᐃᓚᐃᓐᓇᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑭᓱᓪᓚᓇᖕᒧᑦ (ᐅᕝᕙᓗ ᐊᔾᔨᐅᖏᑦᑐᓄᑦ) ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᕐᓂᐅᔪᓄᑦ, ᑭᓱᐊᓂ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᓐᖏᓚᑦ "ᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ" ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᐅᔪᓄᑦ (ᐅᕝᕙᓗ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ) ᐱᔭᔪᑎᐅᔪᓄᑦ. ᑭᓱᓪᓚᓇᖕᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᖅᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᐅᖏᑦᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᓪᓗᒍ ᖃᓄᓪᓚᓇᒃ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᓂᐅᔪᒧᑦ.

ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᑯᐊ, ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᑐᑦ ᒪᑯᐊᖑᒍᕗᑦ ᐃᓄᐊᕐᓂᖅ, ᑎᒡᓕᖕᓂᖅ, ᓱᒋᐅᑎᔭᕐᓗᓂ ᑎᒡᓕᖕᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᓱᕐᑯᒥᑦᑎᑉᓗᓂ ᐃᑎᕐᕕᖕᕐᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᒪᑉᓗᑎᒃ. ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᑐᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒻᒥᒃ ᐅᑯᐊᖑᒍᕗᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒥᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᐊᕐᓂᖅ, ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᕐᓗᖕᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᒥᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓴᐃᓂᖅ.

Daviault ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖕᒐᓂ, ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᕐᓗᒃᑕᐅᔪᒥ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᒍᔪᒥ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᒃᑯᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᑕᑎᒃᓴᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒐᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒻᒥᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓕᐅᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᔨᑦ ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᔨᔪᓐᓇᐃᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑐᑭᖃᕈᓐᓃᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ, ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᖕᒋᑦᑑᒐᓗᐊᓄᓪᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐱᖃᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᑦ, ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃᓯᒪᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᓇᒃᓗᓂ ᐱᒋᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓐᓇᖕᒋᒻᒪᓇᓕᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᔪᒻᒪᓇᒃᓗᓂ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᓇᐊᒃᓴᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ. ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᑦ ᐱᔭᕋᔭᒃᑐᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᑰᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᑦ (ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᒋᐊᖃᖃᑦᑕᖅᐳᖅ ᑕᒻᒪᕐᓂᕋᐃᒋᐊᖃᓲᖕᒍᕗᖅ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᐅᖃᑎᒋᔭᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕋᐃᔪᓂᒃ). ᑐᒡᓕᐊᓂᒃ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᑕᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᒻᒪᓇᐅᔪᑦ (ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᐃᒥᐊᓗᖕᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᒻᒪᓇᒃ) ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᖕᒋᑉᐸᑕ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᒡᔪᐊᖅ ᑕᐃᓯᓂᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᖅᑑᒋᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓂ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᒋᐊᖃᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ.

ᓄᑖᓐᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᖅ

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒃᔪᐊᖅ Daviault ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖕᒐᓂ, ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᑕᐃᓯᔾᔪᐅᑕᓂᕐᕐᓗᒍ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑐᑭᑖᖕᒍᑎᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ, ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓇᖕᒋᒻᒪᒍ. ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑕᖃᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃᑐᑦ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᕈᒪᑉᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᕈᔭᒃᐸᑕ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᑉᓗᓂ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᓚᐅᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐊᔪᖕᒋᓐᓂᖃᕐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕈᑎᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ.

ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᒋᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᓂᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᒃᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᒥ ᐱᒋᐊᖅᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᓕᐊᓂᒃᐳᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐ ᑲᔪᓯᒋᐊᖅᓯᒪᓕᐊᓂᒃᐳᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔾᔪᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᒥᒃᓗ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓯᒪᒋᕗᖅ ᐱᕈᖅᐸᓪᓕᐊᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᒃᓴᒥᒃ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᓄᑦ. ᓄᕝᒪᐳᕆᒥ, ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓚᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖅᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᓕᐊᒥᒃ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᐃᓚᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᐋᖕᒐᔭᓗᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᖃᑕᐅᑉᓗᓂ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᓇᓱᖕᓂᖕᒐ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖕᒋᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᕆᔭᐅᓇᔭᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᕗᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖕᒐᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂᒃ.

ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᓄᑦ ᑐᓴᖅᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᖃᑦᑕᐅᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖅᑕᐅᔪᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᑦ ᐱᔪᒪᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒋᔭᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᖑᔨᖕᒪᑕ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᓇᔭᖕᒐ Daviault ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖕᒐ. ᐅᖃᖃᑦᑕᐅᑎᔾᔪᓯᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᓇᕗᑦ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᑦ ᐃᒥᓗᐊᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᑐᑭᖃᕈᓐᓃᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᓐᓃᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᖕᒋᓐᓄᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᑉᓗᑎᒃ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑐᖅᑕᒃᓴᐅᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓂᕐᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᑎᐊᓇᕗᖅ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᓯᓇᒋᐊᖃᖕᒋᑕᖕᒋᑦ ᒥᒃᓵᑎᑕᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ. ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒥᖕᒐ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᑕᐅᕗᑦ.

ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᒃᓴᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ

ᐊᔾᔨᒌᙱᑦᑐᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᒃᓴᐃᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕐᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᓴᙵᕆᓂᖃᖅᑐᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᑉᐳᑎᒃ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᔾᔪᑎᖃᑦᑎᐊᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦᓗ.

ᐊᒥᓱᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓄᑖᙳᓂᐊᕋᓱᒋᐸᓗᒍ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᑦ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᓯᖓᑦ, "ᓲᕐᓗ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ", ᑕᑎᒋᓂᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᑭᓇᒥᐊᖅ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᖑᖏᓐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒃᐸᑦ, ᐅᑯᑦᔫᓐᓃᑦ ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᕐᓗᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᑎᒍᔭᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᐳᑦ ᓄᑖᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᔪᒃᑯᑦ "ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ". ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᖃᖓᑦᑎᐊᓴᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᖃᖅᑐᓂ ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᓇᒃᐳᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᕐᑯᔭᐅᐸᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᓂ.

ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᖏᔪᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒋᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑭᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᐃᑦ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓚᖅ ᐃᓱᒫᓗᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ, ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐅᖏᑦᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓗᑎᒃ.

ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ, ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑎ. ᓇᓗᓇᕈᓐᓃᓚᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᖁᑦᑎᓛᖅ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᓄᑖᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ "ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᔭᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ" ᐊᔾᔨᖃᕆᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᒧᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪ-ᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᓯᑐᖃᕐᒧᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᖏᑉᐸᑕ ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᓯᐅᔪᖅ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑎᖃᖃᑦᑕ-ᕋᔭᖅᐳᖅ "ᒥᒃᓵᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᕆᓚᐅᖅᑕᖓ ᐊᖓᔭᕐᓂᕆᔭᖓ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ", ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᖏᑦᑕᕆᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᖃᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᑕᒃᓴᐅᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᓂᒃ. ᓯᐊᒃᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᑖᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᐸᑦ ᖁᑦᑎᓛᒧᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓂᑯᒧᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒧᑦ, ᐊᑯᓂᓗᐊᖅ ᐱᔭᕐᓂᖏᓗᐊᕐᓗᓂᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᖏᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ.

ᑐᒡᓕᖓ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᖏᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᑕᒃᓴᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ "ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ" ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᖅᐳᖅ "ᑕᐃᒫᓯᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᖓᓂᒃ" ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᑉ. "ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ" ᑐᓐᖓᑎᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᒥᒃ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᐅᖏᓐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖓ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ (ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᑎᒥᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓴᒃᓯᓗᓂ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᓂᖅ), ᐊᒻᒪ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᕈᖅᑎᑕᐅᖓᖅᓗᓂ ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᕕᐅᓗᓂ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖓ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᓂᖓᓄᑦ. ᐅᖃᖃᑦᑕᐅᑎᔾᔪᓯᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᕗᑦ ᑭᓇᒥᐅᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᑐᖅ ᓇᖏᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᕐᓗᓂ ᐋᖓᔭᓕᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᔨᓐᓃᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑐᑭᖃᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑎᒥᐊᒍᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᔪᑦ, ᐱᔭᒃᓴᐅᕗᖅ ᐱᔭᖅᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᓇᖃᖅᐳᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓂᖅᑎᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᐱᔭᖅᓚᐅᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ. ᐱᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᐸᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᒍᑎᒋᔭᖓᓄᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᒍᔭᐅᓂᐊᖅᐸᑕ ᐊᑭᓛᑎᑕᐅᓗᑎᒡᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᑎᑕᐅᖏᖓᕐᓗᑎᒃ, ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᖅᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑑᑕᐅᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᓚᐅᖅᑕᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

ᐱᖓᔪᐊᓐᓂᒃ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ "ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ "ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ" ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᖓᒋᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᙱᑦᑐᒃᑯᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒋᔭᐅᑉᐳᑎᑐᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐅᔪᑦ, ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᐊᒥᓱᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᓇᒻᒪᒋᔭᔪᐅᔪᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒡᔪᐊᓂ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᑐᖃᖏᑦ (ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᓇᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᓯᒥᒃ) ᑐᖓᓄᑦ, ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕋᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖃᖅᑯᔭᐅᓗᓂ ᓄᑖᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᖅᑐᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᑕᐅᔾᔪᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᐃᓱᒫᓗᑕᐅᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᒐᔪᒃᑐᓂ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓚᖅᐳᑦ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ:

- (ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ) ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᖃᕋᔭᖕᒋᓚᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᖕᒐᓐᓇᐃᒐᔪᖕᒪᑕ, ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓚᓴᕆᐊᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑕ, ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐃᓐᓇᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑦ.

- (ᐱᖃᑖᒍᑦ, ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᐸᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᖃᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓂᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᑐᒡᓕᐊᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᖃᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ) ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ (ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᒋᐊᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᒻᒪᓇᓕᐅᕐᓂᕋᐃᓗᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᒋᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ) ᑕᒪᓐᓇᓗ ᓴᖅᑭᔭᕈᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᓄᑖᒧᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ - ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓕᑕᓇᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᑎᒍᑦ ᓇᒻᒪᖕᒋᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᑐᓐᓇᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ

- (ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕈᒧᑦ ᐅᑯᑖᓐᓂᑦ ᓇᓚᒃᑎᓄᑦ) ᓇᒻᒪᒐᔭᖅᐸᖃᐃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᖅᓂᑐᐃᓐᓇᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᒐᒃᓴᖅᒍᐃᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅ, ᐅᑯᑖᓐᑯᑖ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᖅᔭᖅᐸᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᓇᓚᐅᕐᓂᕋᐃᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᓄᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᑕ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᔭᖅᐸᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᕐᓗᑎᒃ?

- ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐸ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓐᓂᒃ (ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐅᑯᑖᓐᓂᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸ), ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ, ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐ ᐊᑲᐅᓇᔭᖅᐸ ᐊᒻᒪ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᓗᓂ?

- ᖃᓄᖅ ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᖓᓱᐃᓕᖓᔪᓄᑦ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᒃᐱᒋᔭᐅᓇᔭᖅᐸᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᖅᓯᑎᑕᐅᓗᐊᖕᒋᓪᓗᓂ?

- ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᑦ ᑎᓕᔭᐅᖃᑦᑕᕋᔭᖅᐳᑦ ᐊᐃᕝᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᑯᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᐃᕝᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓇᓗᓕᖅᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᖕᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔪᓂᒃ (ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅ, ᐸᓯᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐋᖓᔭᓚᐅᖕᒋᒻᒪᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᖕᒋᓗᐊᓚᐅᖕᒋᒻᒪᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᔭᖓᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖕᒋᑦᑐᖅ, ᑐᒡᓕᐊᓂᒃ, ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᓚᐅᕐᒪᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᓂᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ)

ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒃᔪᐊᒥ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ

ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᕐᑯᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐳᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᑕᐃᑦ ᐱᔪᒥᒋᔭᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ. ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᓇᓕᒧᒋᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᕐᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᕕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑭᓯᒥᐅᖕᒋᑦᑐᖅ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓄᖕᒐᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᕋᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖕᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᒋᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᑎᒋᔭᖕᒋᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᖕᒋᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐱᑦᑎᐊᖕᒋᓐᓂᕋᐃᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ.

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒃᔪᐊᖅ Daviault-ᒥ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖓᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᒐᔪᒃᑐᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᔨ ᑎᓕᓯᖕᒪᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᒥᒃ, ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖕᒋᒻᒪᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ. ᓄᑖᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᑐᓐᖓᑎᒃᓴᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᖃᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᓇᔾᔪᓯᕐᒥᒃ ᓴᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑕᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥ ᓴᖅᑭᔭᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒋᓚᖅ ᓯᕗᓂᐊᓂ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᒃᓴᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᓚᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑕᖕᒐᓚᐅᖕᒋᓚᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᖕᒥᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᒥᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖅᑖᖕᒐᔪᓂᒃ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᒋᓕᕐᓗᒍ.

ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᑎᑦᑎᔪᑦ ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᑐᓂᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓚᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒡᔪᐊᓄᑦ, ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᖏᓚᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᖓᓐᓄᑦ, ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖅᑲᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᓚᖏᓐᓄᑦ 7, 11(d)-ᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ 1-ᒥ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒃ ᑎᕙᐅᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᔨᖓᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᕐᑯᔭᐅᓚᐅᖏᓚᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᑭᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ, ᓱᕐᓗ ᑕᒡᕙᓂ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᕐᒥ: ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᔭᖅᑐᑐᖃᕐᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᓇᔾᔪᓯᐅᔪᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᓇᖏᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᓇᓗᓇᖏᓚᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᖅᓯᔪᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᐅᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᕐᓂᒃᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒡᔪᐊᖅ ᓱᓕ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᖏᓚᖅ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᒃᓴᖏᑦᑕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖏᑦᑕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᑦ. ᐊᑕᐅᓯᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᐅᓇᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒧᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐱᕆᓗᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒡᔪᐊᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᕐᑯᓗᒋᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᑕᒡᕙᒃᐅᑎᒋ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑕᐅᕐᓂᒃᐸᑕ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᓄᑦ, ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂ. ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᓇᓱᒪᖏᓚᑦ ᓱᓕ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᖓᓄᑦ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᓇᐊᒃᓴᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᖓᓂ.

ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᖓᓄᑦ ᐱᕝᕙᒃᓴᖅᑲᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᓯᕗᕝᕙᖅᑎᑦᑎᓗᓂ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᖅᑲᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ, ᐊᒥᓲᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑐᓴᖓᒃᓴᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖅᑲᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᓛᖏᓐᓂ.

ᐱᖃᑖᒍᑦ, ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖃᖏᑐᐃᓐᓇᕆᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᑲᐅᑎᒋᒃᐸᑕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ.

ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᓛᖏᑦᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕝᕕᑦᑕᖏᑦ

ᒥᓂᔅᑕᖓᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒡᔪᐊᓄᑦ ᑐᓂᓯᒃᐸᑕ ᑐᓂᓯᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᓪᓗ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ, ᑎᑎᖃᐅᑎᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔾᔪᑎᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᓛᖏᑦᑕ ᐃᑲᔪᑎᖃᒻᒪᕆᖓᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᖓᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᒃᓴᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᖅ ᓴᓚᐅᓇᓱᒃᑎᓪᓗᒍ.

ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᓛᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᒋᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᒃᓴᐅᑦ ᐃᓗᓕᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᑐᓴᒐᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᑎᑦᑎᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓗᐊᓃᑦᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᓇᒻᒪᒋᔭᐅᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᓇᒻᒪᖏᓐᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂ ᓄᓇᑉᑎᓐᓂ, ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᕈᑎᖃᖏᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᕐᓄᑦ ᓄᑕᖅᑲᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᑉᑎᓐᓂ.

ᐃᓱᒪᕗᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᓚᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᔪᒪᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔾᔪᓯᖏᑦ. ᐋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᓚᑦ ᑐᓴᕆᕈᒪᓇᔭᖅᑐᒃᓴᐅᕗᑦ, ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐋᖓᓴᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᖏᑦᑐᓴᓗᐊᑦ, ᓱᕐᓗ ᐃᐅᑲᕼᐊᓪᓗ, ᑕᐅᑐᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᔭᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᔪᑐᑦ ᐃᓚᖅᑯᓯᖃᓕᕐᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐃᖏᓐᓂᐅᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᓇᓕᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᕆᖏᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᓛᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔪᓐᓇᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ, ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᓂᒃᑲᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ, ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐃᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᑐᒃᓱᕋᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓂᒃᓗ ᓄᑖᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
CANADA

ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᑯᖓᔭᕋᓱᓐᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒐᓱᐊᕈᑕᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ

ᑐᑭᓯᑎᕐᔪᒥᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᖅ

SELF-INDUCED INTOXICATION AS CRIMINAL FAULT
INFORMATION NOTE

ᐃᖮᐊᓇ, 1995
February 1995

ᐊᖃᑦᑕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᒃ ᓄᓇᕗᑦ ᑕᓯᕗᓂᖅᑕᐅᓂᖅᑕᐅᓂᖅᑕᐅ

ᓄᑖᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᔭᐃᓯᒪᒐᔭᕐᓗᖅ ᑕᒪᑐᒥᖓ ᓱᖑᒥᑦᓯᓂᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᒋᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᑦ ᓈᒻᒪᓐᓂᖃᕋᔭᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᑭᓖᔭᕆᐊᖃᕋᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᑏᒃᑯᑎᐅᓕᕋᔭᕐᓗᖅ ᐋᖓᔭᓗᐊᕐᑐᕕᓂᐅᓂᕐᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᔭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᒐᓱᐊᕋᔭᕐᑐᕕᓂᕐᓄᑦ.

ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᑐᑭᖃᓕᕋᔭᕐᓗᖅ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᖃᕐᑐᕕᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᓴᐳᒻᒥᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᒐᓱᐊᕐᓂᐅᒐᔭᕐᑐᖅ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᕐᑐᖃᕐᑐᕕᓂᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᐃᓪᓕᒐᔭᕐᓂᖓᓂᑦ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᑦᓯᒐᓱᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᑎᑦᓯᒐᓱᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᓄᒃ ᐋᖓᔭᓗᐊᕐᓂᕕᓂᕐᒥᓄᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᐅᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᕕᓂᐅᒋᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᒍᓐᓃᖅᓯᒪᔪᕕᓂᐅᒋᐊᖓᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓪᓗᓂ ᐊᓯᒥᓂᒃ. ᓴᐳᒻᒥᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᐃᓪᓕᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒡᔪᐊᖓ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᓯᒪᓕᕋᔭᕐᒪᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᓕᖅᑐᕕᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᓯᒥᓂᓪᓗ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᕕᓂᐅᓕᖅᐸᑕ ᓈᒻᒪᖏᓐᓂᖃᕋᔭᒻᒪᓇᓐᓂᖓᓂᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕋᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᕕᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

ᓄᑖᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓱᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᑕᑯᒃᓴᐅᑎᑦᓯᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᑦᑐᓕᓇᓂᐅᑉ ᒪᓕᒐᖏᓐᓂ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᒥᓱᓄᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᑦᓯᐊᕙᐅᒐᓱᐊᕐᓂᐅᑎᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᑦ ᐃᓄᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᕐᓯᐊᕐᐸᒃᑐᑦ ᑲᒪᔨᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᓯᒥᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔪᕕᓂᐅᒃᐸᑕ.

ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ

ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᕈᑕᐅᒐᓱᐊᕐᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ ᑐᕌᖓᒐᔭᕐᐳᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᕈᓯᒃᓱᑎᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᕕᓂᕐᓄᑦ ᑕᒪᐃᓐᓂ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐱᕋᔭᓐᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ, ᐱᖃᓯᐅᑎᓯᒪᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᕙᒃᑐᑦ ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᓪᓗᒐᓱᐊᕐᓱᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᖏᕐᕋᒥ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᐅᕙᒃᑐᑦ, ᐊᒃᓱᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᖅᐸᖑᔪᓂᒃ ᓱᕋᖅᑎᕐᓇᖅᓂᖅᐸᖑᔪᓂᓪᓗ ᐃᒃᐱᓐᓂᖅᑎᑦᓯᕙᒻᒪᖓᑕ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᖅᑕᐊᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᑕᐅᔪᕕᓂᕐᓂᓪᓗ, ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᒧᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓄᑦ ᑭᒃᑯᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓘᑕᐅᓂᖅᐸᖑᖃᑕᐅᕗᑦ.

ᐋᖓᔭᕐᓂᐅᔪᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᓕᖅᓯᒪᕗᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓕᕋᔪᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐱᒋᐊᖅᑎᑦᓯᓚᕿᕙᓐᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᕐᓯᓂ, ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᓚᕿᓕᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᐅᒐᔭᕐᑐᓂᒃ. ᓄᑖᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓱᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᓐᖏᑦᑎᒃᐸᓪᓕᕈᑕᐅᒻᒪᓇᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐱᔭᐅᕐᑯᔭᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᖓᔪᓄᑦ ᐊᓯᒥᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᖃᑦᑕᕐᑯᔨᓐᖏᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓯᒻᒪᓇᒐᔭᕐᓯᑎᒃ ᐱᑦᓯᐊᕋᓱᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒥᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᖅᑐᒻᒪᓇᐊᓗᒃᑕᖃᕋᓗᐊᕐᐸᑦ ᐃᓄᓐᓂᒃ.

ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑲᑉᐱᐊᓈᓇᓂᖅ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᓂᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒃᓯᒻᒪᓇᐊᓗᒃ ᐊᕐᓇᓂᒃ ᓱᕈᓯᕐᓂᓪᓗ ᐅᓗᓇᐊᓇᖅᑐᒥᑦᓯᖃᑦᑕᕐᓯᒪᕗᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᕐᓇᓂᒃ ᓱᕈᓯᕐᓂᓪᓗ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᔭᐅᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᑎᑐᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑕᐅᑦᓯᐊᖅᑎᑦᓯᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᓇᑎᒃ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂ. ᓄᑖᖅ ᐋᖅᑭᐅᒪᓂᓇᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᕋᓱᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᑎᑦᓯᒐᔭᕐᐳᖅ ᐃᓅᖃᑕᐅᔪᓕᒫᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂ ᑲᒪᑦᓯᐊᓇᐊᖃᕐᓕᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐊᓯᒥᓐᓂᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔭᓇᐊᖃᓐᖏᓐᓂᕐᒧᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᔾᔪᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖅᐱᐅᒐᔭᕐᓱᑎᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᓕᒫᑦ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᒋᔭᖏᓐᓂᑦ ᐃᓄᐃᑦ ᐊᑦᑕᕐᓇᖅᑐᒥᕐᑯᓇᒋᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓕᒋᔭᐅᑦᓯᐊᖃᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᓯᕐᑯᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᐳᑎᔭᐅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᑎᒍᑦ.

ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓇᔭᐅᔪᖅ

ᐱᕐᑯᔭᒃᓴᖅ ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔾᔨᓯᒪᕗᖅ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓕᐊᓇᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᑐᒥᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒡᔪᐊᖓᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᓇᔭᐅᒐᓱᐊᕈᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᕐᑯᓪᓗᒍ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐱᔭᔭᑦᑐᓕᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᕐᔪᐊᓇᔭᐅᔪᒥᒃ. ᐅᓂᒃᑳᓕᐊᓇᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᑑᑎᖃᒻᒪᓇᓐᓂᐊᕐᐳᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᒃᓴᐅᑎᑕᐅᒐᓱᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑦᓯᓂᐊᕐᑐᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓯᒪᓂᖏᓐᓂᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᒃᑯᑕᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᑎᑎᖅᑲᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓯᓂ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᒡᔪᐊᖓᓐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᖅᑎᑦ ᓱᓇᓂᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓯᒪᒻᒪᖓᑕ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᖃᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᖓᑕᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕈᑎᒋᔭᕐᒥᓄᑦ, ᐱᖃᓯᐅᔾᔨᓯᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ:

- ᐃᓱᒪᓗᖕᓇᖅᑐᒻᒪᕆᐅᓂᖓ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᕆᓂᖅ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂᑦ

- ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᐅᓐᖏᑦᑐᒥᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐃᓂᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᔭᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓚᐅᓂᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᐃᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᓱᕈᓱᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᓂᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑎᖏᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᐃᑦ ᓱᕈᓱᓪᓗ ᓴᐳᔭᐅᓱᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᐃᓄᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐊᔾᔨᖓᓂᒃ ᓴᐳᒻᒥᔭᐅᓱᒪᔭᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᑲᔪᕐᓂᖃᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᑕᐃᒪᐃᓕᖓᓪᓚᕆᒃᑎᑕᐅᖓᒪᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒃᔪᐊᕐᒥᑦ

- ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᖕᓄᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᕆᓂᖅ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐋᖓᒌᔭᕐᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᖕᓇᖅᐳᖅ ᐃᒻᒥᖕᓂᒃ ᐋᖓᒌᓕᖅᑎᐸᐸᒃᑐᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᖃᑎᒌᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᓂᒃ ᓱᕋᐃᓇᑎᒃ ᓱᕋᑕᐅᓐᖏᓐᓂᕋᐃᓂᖓᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᕆᓂᕐᒥᒃ, ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᐃᑦ ᓱᕈᓱᓪᓗ

- ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓱᑦᓱᐊᕝᕕᐅᓱᕆᔭᖏᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᑎᒥᖏᑦᑎᒍᑦ ᐱᓂᕐᓗᐃᕝᕕᒃᑐᑦ ᐊᓱᒥᖕᓂᒃ ᓇᒻᒥᓂᖅ ᐋᖓᒌᓕᖅᑎᓱᒪᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐸᓱᔭᒃᓴᐅᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓱᔪᓐᓇᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ

- ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᖅᑎᑦᑎᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖓ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃ ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐋᖓᒌᔭᕐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓱᐅᔪᓄᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᕐᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐅᓄᖅᑐᑦ ᐋᖓᒌᓕᕐᓇᖅᑐᑦ, ᐃᓚᐅᓪᓗᓂ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃ, ᐃᓄᖕᒥᒃ ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᕆᖏᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᔾᔨᑭᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᑎᑦᑎᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ

- ᒪᓕᒐᓐᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᓂᖓ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐃᓪᓕᔪᑦ ᐃᒻᒥᓂᒃ ᐱᓪᓗᑎᒃ ᐋᖓᒌᔭᖅᑐᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᑎᑦᑎᕝᕕᓪᓕᕋᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᕋᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃᓗ ᑐᒃᖓᕕᒃᔪᐊᒥᑦ ᐱᔪᓐᓇᐅᑕᐅᔪᓕᒫᓂᒃ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ, ᐃᓚᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᑦ

- ᐃᓕᑕᓇᔭᖃᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᒌᔭᖏᓐᓇᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒌᒃᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖓᓂᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᐅᔭᓇᐊᓕᒃ ᐋᖓᒌᔭᓗᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᐅᓚᑦᑎᔪᓐᓂᖅᑐᑦ ᐅᔾᔨᑭᓱᒍᓐᓂᕐᓂᕐᓗ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑎᐅᓐᖏᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᐱᔭᓇᓗᓂ.

- ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑕᖃᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖓᓂᒃ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᒃᑐᒥᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᐅᔭᓇᐊᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓄᑦ, ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᓱᕋᒥᑦᓱᔪᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐸᓱᔭᒃᓴᐃᑦ.

ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᑭᖑᓂᑦᑎᓐᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓱᒪᔪᑦ

ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᓱᕋᒥᑕᐅᑦᑕᐃᓕᔭᕆᐊᓖᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑦᑎᖏᒻᒪᑕ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᓐᓇᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐋᖓᒌᓕᖅᑎᓱᒪᔪᓂᒃ. ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓱᒪᕗᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᖕᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᓱᒪᔪᓂᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥ. ᑭᖑᓂᐊᒍᑦ ᓱᑎᐱᓇ 30, 1994-ᖑᓚᐅᖅᑐᒥ ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᕈᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓐᓇᒍ ᑲᓇᑕᐅᑉ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᐃᒃᔪᐊᖓᓂ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᒋᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᕝᕕᐅᓪᓚ (Daviault) ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᐋᖓᒌᔭᕐᓂᖅ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᕐᒪᑕ ᐃᓚᐃᓐᓇᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᑭᓱᓪᓚᓇᖕᒧᑦ (ᐅᕝᕙᓗ ᐊᔾᔨᐅᖏᑦᑐᓄᑦ) ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᕐᓂᐅᔪᓄᑦ, ᑭᓱᐊᓂ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᓐᖏᓚᑦ ᐲᖃᓄᐃᑦᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦᑑ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᐅᔪᓄᑦ (ᐅᕝᕙᓗ ᑐᓐᖓᕕᒋᔭᐅᓪᓗᑎᒃ) ᐱᔭᔪᑎᐅᔪᓄᑦ. ᑭᓱᓪᓚᓇᖕᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᖅᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᔾᔨᐅᖏᑦᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᓪᓗᒍ ᖃᓄᓪᓚᓇᒃ ᐱᔭᔪᑎᖃᕐᒪᖔᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᓂᐅᔪᒧᑦ.

ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᐅᑯᐊ, ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᑐᑦ ᒪᑯᐊᖑᕗᑦ ᐃᓄᐊᕐᓂᖅ, ᑎᒡᓕᖕᓂᖅ, ᓱᒋᐅᑎᔭᕐᓗᓂ ᑎᒡᓕᖕᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᓱᖑᒥᑦᑎᑉᓗᓂ ᐃᑎᕐᕕᖕᕐᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᒪᑉᓗᑎᒃ. ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᑐᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒻᒥᒃ ᐅᑯᐊᖑᕗᑦ ᐃᓅᖃᑎᒥᓂᒃ ᐃᓄᐊᕐᓂᖅ, ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᕐᓗᖕᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᒥᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓴᐃᓂᖅ.

Daviault ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖕᒐᓂ, ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᕐᓗᒃᑕᐅᔪᒥ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔪᒥ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᕆᔨᕐᔪᐊᒃᑯᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᑎᓕᓱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᑕᑎᒃᓴᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒐᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒻᒥᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓂᕋᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓚᐅᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᔨᑦ ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᔪᑦ ᐊᐅᓚᔨᔪᓐᓇᐃᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑐᑭᖃᓐᓂᕈᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ, ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᖕᒋᑦᑑᒐᓗᐊᓄᓪᓗᓐᓂᑦ ᐱᖃᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᒪᑦ, ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃᓱᒪᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᒻᒪᓇᒃᓗᓂ ᐱᒋᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓐᓇᖕᒋᒻᒪᓇᓕᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᔪᒻᒪᓇᒃᓗᓂ ᖃᓄᑐᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᓇᐊᒃᓴᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ. ᓱᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᑦ ᐱᔭᕋᔭᒃᑐᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᑰᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᑦ (ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᒋᐊᖃᖃᑦᑕᖅᐳᖅ ᑕᒻᒪᕐᓂᕋᐃᒋᐊᖃᓱᖑᕗᖅ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᐅᖃᑎᒋᔭᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕋᐃᔪᓂᒃ). ᑐᒡᓕᐊᓂᒃ, ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᑕᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᒻᒪᓇᐅᔪᑦ (ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᐃᒥᐊᓗᖕᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᒻᒪᓇᒃ) ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᖕᒋᑉᐸᑕ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᒡᔪᐊᖅ ᑕᐃᓱᓂᐊᖅᐳᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓗᐊᖅᑑᕈᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓂ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᒋᐊᖃᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ.

ᓄᑖᓐᖑᖕᑎᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᕐᓂᖅ

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒡᔪᐊᖅ Daviault ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖕᒐᓂ, ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᑕᐃᓱᔾᔪᐅᑕᓂᕐᕐᓗᒍ ᑎᓕᓱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑐᑭᑖᖕᒍᑎᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ, ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓇᖕᒋᒻᒪᒍ. ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑕᖃᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᒃᑐᑦ ᓇᖕᒥᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᒋᒪᑉᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᒋᔭᒃᐸᑕ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᑉᓗᓂ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓂᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᓚᐅᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐊᔪᖕᒋᓐᓂᖃᕐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᒋᓐᓇᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓗᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᕐᕕᐅᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᐅᒋᑎᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ.

ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᒋᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᓱᓂᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᔭᒃᑐᓕᕆᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᒥ ᐱᒋᐊᖅᑎᑕᐅᓱᒪᓕᐊᓂᒃᐳᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐ ᑲᔪᓱᒋᐊᖅᓱᒪᓕᐊᓂᒃᐳᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔾᔪᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᒥᒃᓗ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓱᒪᒋᐅᖅ ᐱᑭᖅᐸᑦᓕᐊᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᒃᓴᒥᒃ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᓄᑦ. ᓄᑦᒃᐳᕆᒥ, ᒥᓂᔅᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓇᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖅᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᒃᓴᓕᐊᒥᒃ ᐅᖃᖅᓱᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᐃᓚᖃᖅᐳᑦ ᐋᖕᒐᔭᓗᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᖃᑕᐅᑉᓗᓂ ᑕᑎᒋᔭᐅᓇᓱᖕᓂᖕᒐ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖕᒋᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓱᓇᔭᐅᓇᔭᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᖕᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖕᒑᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂᒃ.

ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᓄᑦ ᑐᓴᖅᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐅᖃᖃᑦᑕᐅᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂ ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖅᑕᐅᔪᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᑦ ᐱᔪᒪᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒋᔭᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᕐᕕᔨᖕᒪᑕ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᓇᔭᖕᒐ Daviault ᐅᓂᒃᑳᖕᒐ. ᐅᖃᖃᑦᑕᐅᑎᔾᔪᓱᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᓇᕗᑦ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᑦ ᐃᒥᓗᐊᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᑦ ᑐᑭᖃᓐᓂᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔪᓐᓂᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᖕᒋᓐᓄᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓱᑉᓗᑎᒃ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑐᖅᑕᒃᓴᐅᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓂᕐᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ. ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑦᑎᐊᓇᕗᖅ ᑭᑐᒥᐊᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᓱᓇᒋᐊᖃᖕᒋᑦᑕᖕᒋᑦ ᒥᒃᓕᑎᑕᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓱᒪᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ. ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᑕᒪᑐᒥᖕᒐ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᑕᐅᕗᑦ.

ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᓴᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓴᖕᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓂᖏᑦ

ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑐᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᒃᓴᐃᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕐᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖃᖅᑐᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᑉᐳᑎᒃ ᐃᖏᕐᕋᔾᔪᑎᖃᑦᑎᐊᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᓪᓗ.

ᐊᒥᓱᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑎᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᓄᑖᖑᓂᐊᕋᓱᒋᑉᐳᒍ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᑦ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᓯᖓᑦ, "ᓲᕐᓗ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ", ᑕᑎᒋᓂᐊᕐᓗᒍ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᑭᓇᒥᐊᖅ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᖑᖏᓐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒃᐸᑦ, ᐅᓐᑯᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᓄᓕᐊᕐᓂᕐᓗᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᑎᒍᔭᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᕈᓐᓇᖅᐳᑦ ᓄᑖᒃᑯᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᔪᒃᑯᑦ "ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ". ᑲᓇᑕᒥ ᖃᖓᑦᑎᐊᔭᖅ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᖃᖅᑐᓂ ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖃᕐᕕᐅᔪᓂ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᓇᒃᐳᑦ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᐊ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᕐᑯᔭᐅᑉᐳᑎᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᓂ.

ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐊᖏᔪᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒋᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔨᑦ ᐊᓯᖏᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑭᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᐃᑦ, ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓚᖅ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ, ᐊᑕᐅᓯᐅᖏᑦᑐᒥᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓗᑎᒃ.

ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒥᒃ, ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑎ. ᓇᓗᓇᕈᓐᓃᓚᐅᖅᐳᖅ ᖁᑦᑎᓛᖅ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᓄᑖᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ "ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᔭᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ" ᐊᔾᔨᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᒧᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪ-ᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᓯᑐᖃᕐᒧᑦ. ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᖏᑉᐸᑕ ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᓯᐅᔪᖅ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑎᖃᖃᑦᑕ-ᕋᔭᖅᐳᖅ "ᒥᒃᓱᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᓇᓚᐅᖅᑕᖓ ᐊᖓᔭᕐᓂᓇᔭᖓ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ", ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᖏᖃᑎᒌᒍᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᖏᑦᑕᓇᐊᒃᓴᖓᓂᒃ ᑲᒪᒋᔭᖃᑦᑎᐊᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᑕᒃᓴᐅᓂᕐᒧᓪᓗ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᓂᒃ. ᓯᐊᒃᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᑦ ᓄᑖᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐊᔾᔨᒋᔭᐅᓚᐅᖅᐸᑦ ᖁᑦᑎᓛᒧᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑐᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᓂᑯᒧᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᕐᒧᑦ, ᐊᑯᓂᓗᐊᖅ ᐱᔭᕐᓂᖏᓗᐊᕐᓗᓂᓗ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᐅᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖅ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᖏᓐᓂᖓᓂᒃ.

ᑐᒃᓕᖓ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᖏᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᑕᒃᓴᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒥᒃ "ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ" ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᖅᐳᖅ "ᑕᐃᒍᓯᖃᖅᑎᑕᐅᓂᖓᓂᒃ" ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᑉ. "ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ" ᑐᓐᖓᑎᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᑭᓇᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᒥᒃ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᐅᖏᓐᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᔪᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖓ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ (ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᑎᒥᒃᑯᑦ ᑲᓴᒃᓯᓗᓂ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᓂᖅ), ᐊᒻᒪ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᕈᖅᑎᑕᐅᖓᖅᓗᓂ ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᔭᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᕐᕕᐅᓗᓂ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖓ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᓂᖓᓄᑦ. ᐅᖃᖃᑦᑕᐅᑎᔾᔪᓯᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᕗᑦ ᑭᓇᒥᐅᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᑐᖅ ᓇᖏᓂᖅ ᐃᒥᕐᓗᓂ ᐋᖓᔭᓕᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᔨᔪᓐᓃᕐᓗᓂ ᐊᒻᒪ ᑐᑭᖃᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑎᒥᐊᒍᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᔪᑦ, ᐱᔭᒃᓴᐅᕗᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᖓᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᓯᓂᖓᓄᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᓇᖃᖅᐳᖅ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓂᖅᑎᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᓇᖃᖅᐳᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᓚᐅᕐᓂᖓᓄᑦ. ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᐸᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᔭᖓᓄᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᑎᒍᔭᐅᓂᐊᖅᐸᑕ ᐊᑭᓛᑎᑕᐅᓗᑎᒡᓘᓐᓃᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓂᖏᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᑎᑕᐅᖏᖓᕐᓗᑎᒃ, ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᖓᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᑎᒃᑯᐊᖅᑑᑕᐅᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᓚᐅᖅᑕᖏᓐᓄᑦ.

ᐱᖓᔪᐊᓐᓂᒃ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ "ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ "ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ" ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᖓᒋᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐊᔾᔨᒌᖏᑦᑐᒃᑯᑦ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐅᖃᖃᑎᒋᔭᐅᑉᐳᑎᑐᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔨᐅᔪᑦ, ᐅᖃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᐊᒥᓱᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᑎᒍᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᓇᒻᒪᒋᔾᔪᐅᔪᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᐃᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒃᔪᐊᓂ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᑐᖃᖏᑦ (ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᕆᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᔭᖅᑯᒻᒥᒃ) ᑐᖓᓄᑦ, ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᕐᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖃᕐᕗᔭᐅᓗᓂ ᓄᑖᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᖅᑐᑦ ᓯᐊᒃᑕᐅᔾᔪᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ. ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᓗᑕᐅᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᒐᔪᒃᑐᓂ ᐃᓱᒪᒋᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᓚᖅᑲᖅᐳᑦ ᐅᑯᓂᖓ:

- (ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓱᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ) ᐸᓯᔭᒃᓴᖑᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᖃᕋᔭᖕᒋᓚᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᖕᒐᓐᓇᐃᒐᔪᖕᒪᑕ, ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᒍᓕᓴᕆᐊᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑕ, ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᑭᓯᐊᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᓕᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑕᐃᓐᓇᖃᑦᑕᕐᒪᑦ.

- (ᐱᖃᑖᒍᑦ, ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓱᐊᒃᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᐸᑦ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᖃᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᑐᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᓂᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᑐᒡᓕᐊᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᖃᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ) ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ (ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐅᖃᖅᓯᒪᒋᐊᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᒻᒪᓇᓚᐅᕐᓂᕋᐃᓗᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᒋᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ) ᑕᒪᓐᓇᓗ ᓴᖅᑭᔭᕈᑕᐅᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᓄᑖᒧᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᒧᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᕐᓗᓂ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᖃᕐᓂᕐᒧᑦ - ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐃᓕᑕᓇᔭᐅᓯᒪᔪᒃᑯᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᑎᒍᑦ ᓇᒻᒪᖕᒋᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᑐᓐᓇᓇᐊᖃᖅᐳᖅ

- (ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᑕ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᓐᓗᒧᑦ ᐅᑯᓐᓂᓐᓃᑦ ᓇᓚᒃᑎᓄᑦ) ᓇᒻᒪᒐᔭᖅᐸᖃᐃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᖅᓂᑐᐃᓐᓇᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᓗᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᒐᒃᓴᖑᐃᑎᑦᑎᓂᖅ, ᐅᑯᓐᓂᑯᓐᓂ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᒻᒪᓇᓚᐅᕐᓂᕋᐃᔾᔪᑎᓂᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᖃᓄᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᖅᐸᑕ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ ᖃᓄᐃᓕᐅᕐᓗᑎᒃ?

- ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᖅ ᐃᓚᐅᑎᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐸ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓐᓂᒃ (ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐᓂᒃ ᐅᑯᓐᓂᑯᓐᓃᑦ ᐋᓐᓂᖅᑎᓇᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ), ᑕᐃᒪᓐᓇᐃᒋᐊᖃᕋᔭᖅᐸᑦ, ᑭᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᖕᒐ ᐊᑲᐅᓇᔭᖅᐸ ᐊᒻᒪ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᕐᓗᓂ?

- ᖃᓄᖅ ᓄᑖᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐱᖓᓱᐃᓕᖓᔪᓄᑦ ᓴᐳᓐᓂᐊᕈᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᒃᐱᒋᔭᐅᓇᔭᖅᐸᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᖅᓯᑎᑕᐅᓗᐊᖕᒋᓪᓗᓂ?

- ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᑦ ᑎᓕᔭᐅᖃᑦᑕᕋᔭᖅᐳᑦ ᐊᐃᕝᔾᔪᑎᖃᕐᑯᔭᐅᓗᑎᒃ ᐊᐃᕝᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᓇᓗᓕᖅᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᖕᓂ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔪᓂᒃ (ᐆᒃᑑᑎᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᓯᕗᓪᓕᖅ, ᐸᓯᔭᐅᔪᖅ ᐋᖓᔭᓕᐅᖕᒋᒻᒪᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᖕᒋᓗᐊᓕᐅᖕᒋᒻᒪᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑎᒋᔭᖓᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖕᒋᑦᑐᖅ, ᑐᒡᓕᐊᓂᒃ, ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᓕᐅᕐᒪᑦ ᐸᓯᔭᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᓇᐊᖃᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᓂᖕᒐ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ)

ᐃᓕᖑᑯᓯᓇᔭᐅᓂᐊᖑᑐᖑ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᓄᑦ ᐃᖑᖅᑐᐃᕕᒃᔪᐊᒥ ᑲᓇᑕᒥ

ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᕐᑯᔭᐅᔪᑦ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐳᑦ ᑲᓇᑕᒥᐅᑕᐃᑦ ᐱᔪᒥᒋᔭᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᓇᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᕋᔭᖕᓂᕐᒧᑦ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ. ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᖕᒪᑕ ᓇᓕᒧᒋᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓇᓱᒃᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᕐᓄᑦ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᕕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᑭᓯᒥᐅᖕᒋᑦᑐᖅ ᑕᒪᒃᑯᓄᖕᒐᑦᑕᐅᖅ ᐱᕋᔭᒃᑐᓄᑦ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᖃᕋᔭᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓚᐅᕐᓂᖕᒋᑦ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᖕᒋᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᓗᒋᑦ ᑐᓐᖓᑎᒋᔭᖕᒋᑦ ᓇᓗᓇᖕᒋᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ ᐱᑦᑎᐊᖕᒋᓐᓂᕋᐃᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᑦ.

ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒃᔪᐊᖅ Daviault-ᒥ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖓᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᒐᔪᒃᑐᒥᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ, ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᔨ ᑎᓕᓯᖕᒪᑦ ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᒥᒃ, ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖃᖕᒋᒻᒪᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ. ᓄᑖᖅ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᑐᓐᖓᑎᒃᓴᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒧᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᖃᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᕐᒥᒃ ᓴᑦᑎᔾᔪᑎᒋᓂᐊᖅᑕᖕᒋᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥ ᓴᖅᑭᔭᓚᐅᖅᓯᒪᖕᒋᓚᖅ ᓯᕗᓂᐊᓂ. ᑖᓐᓇ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᒃᓴᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᓚᐅᖕᒋᓐᓂᖕᒐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑕᖅᑲᓚᐅᖕᒋᓚᖅ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐃᖕᒥᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᒥᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓱᒪᐃᓐᓇᖅ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖅᑖᖕᒐᔪᓂᒃ ᓴᑕᐅᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᐱᓂᕋᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᓕᕐᓗᒍ.

ᒐᕙᒪᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᖏᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᑎᑦᑎᔪᑦ ᓄᑖᒥᒃ ᑐᓂᔾᔪᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓚᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒻᔪᐊᓄᑦ, ᑕᒪᓐᓇ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐃᓚᓕᐅᔾᔭᐅᔪᓐᓇᓚᐅᖏᓚᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᖑᓐᓄᑦ, ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖅᑲᖅᑎᓪᓗᒍ ᐃᓚᖏᓐᓄᑦ 7, 11(d)-ᒧᑦ ᐊᒻᒪ 1-ᒥ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒃ ᑎᕙᐅᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᕆᔭᖓᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᕐᑯᔭᐅᓚᐅᖏᓚᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐅᖃᐅᓯᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒃᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᒥᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᖅᑐᖅᑕᐅᑦᑎᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᑭᑐᑐᐃᓐᓇᕐᓄᑦ, ᓱᕐᓗ ᑕᒡᕙᓂ ᐱᕐᑯᔭᕐᒥ: ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᓚᐅᖅᐳᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ ᓴᖅᑭᔭᖅᑐᑐᖃᕐᒥᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᓕᕆᔾᔪᓯᐅᔪᖅ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᑎᓪᓗᒍ, ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᕆᖏᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᓇᓗᓇᖏᓚᖅ ᓇᓗᓇᖅᓯᔪᑦ ᑕᐃᒪᐅᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᕐᓂᒃᑎᓪᓗᒍ. ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒻᔪᐊᖅ ᓱᓕ ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᖏᓚᖅ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᒃᓴᖏᑦᑕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᑎᒃᓴᖏᑦᑕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖃᖅᑐᑦ. ᐊᑕᐅᓯᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᕈᓯᐅᓇᔭᖅᑐᖅ ᒥᓂᔅᑕᒧᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ ᐊᐱᕆᓗᓂ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒻᔪᐊᒃᑯᓐᓄᑦ, ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᕐᑯᓗᒋᑦ ᑖᒃᑯᓂᖓ ᑕᒡᕙᖃᐅᑎᒋ ᑲᔪᓯᑎᑕᐅᕐᓂᒃᐸᑕ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᓄᑦ, ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂ. ᐃᓱᒪᓕᐅᓇᓯᒪᖏᓚᑦ ᓱᓕ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᖕᓄᑦ ᑎᓕᓯᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᓇᐊᒃᓴᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᔪᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᖕᓂ.

ᒪᓕᒃᑕᒃᓴᖅ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᖕᓄᑦ ᐱᕝᕕᒃᓴᖅᑲᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᔭᖅᐳᖅ ᓯᕗᕙᖅᑎᑦᑎᓗᓂ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑎᖅᑲᕐᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᒥᒃ, ᐊᒥᒍᓂᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᑐᓴᖓᒃᓴᐅᔪᑦ ᐊᑐᖅᑕᐅᒋᐊᖅᑲᕐᓂᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᖏᓐᓂ.

ᐱᖅᑲᑖᒍᑦ, ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖅᑲᕈᓐᓇᖅᑐᖅ ᐃᑲᔫᑎᖅᑲᖏᑐᐃᓐᓇᓇᐊᖅᑲᖅᐳᖅ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᑲᐅᑎᒋᒃᐸᑕ ᐋᖅᑭᒋᐊᖅᑕᐅᓚᐅᖅᑐᑦ.

ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᖏᑦᑕ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᓐᑕᖏᑦ

ᒥᓂᔅᑕᖓᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᓕᕆᔨᒃᑯᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᒻᔪᐊᓄᑦ ᑐᓂᓯᒃᐸᑕ ᑐᓂᓯᖏᒃᑲᓗᐊᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᓪᓗ ᐊᑐᓕᖅᑎᑕᐅᓚᐅᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂ ᒪᓕᒐᖅ, ᑎᑎᖃᐅᑎᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔾᔪᑎᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᖏᑦᑕ ᐃᑲᔪᑎᖃᒻᒪᕆᖕᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᖅᑲᖅᑐᐃᕕᖕᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖃᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᒃᓴᒥᒃ ᐊᒻᒪ ᒪᓕᒐᕐᔪᐊᖅ ᓴᓚᐅᓇᓯᒃᑎᓪᓗᒍ.

ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓂ ᓴᖅᑭᑎᑕᐅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᑐᑭᓯᒋᐊᖅᑎᑦᑎᔾᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐅᑦ ᐱᖁᔭᒃᓴᐅᑦ ᐃᓗᓕᖏᓐᓂᒃ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᑐᓴᒐᒃᓴᓂᒃ ᐊᑐᐃᓐᓇᐅᑎᑦᑎᓗᑎᒃ ᐃᓗᐊᓃᑦᑐᑦ ᖃᐅᔨᒪᔭᐅᓂᐊᖅᐳᑦ ᓇᒻᒪᒋᔭᐅᖏᑦᑐᓂᒃ ᓇᒻᒪᖏᓐᓂᐅᔪᓂᒃ ᐱᕋᔭᒍᑕᐅᖃᑦᑕᖅᑐᓂ ᓄᓇᑉᑎᓐᓂ, ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓂᖅ ᐱᔾᔪᑎᒋᓗᒍ, ᐊᒻᒪ ᐱᓗᐊᖅᑐᒥᒃ ᐃᑲᔪᕈᑎᖃᖏᓐᓂᖏᑦ ᐊᕐᓇᕐᓄᑦ ᓄᑕᖅᑲᓄᑦ ᓄᓇᑉᑎᓐᓂ.

ᐃᓱᒪᕗᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓚᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕐᔪᐊᓂ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᐃᔪᒪᓂᐊᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᓗᐊᖅᑐᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᖃᕈᓐᓃᖅᑐᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖓᔾᔪᓯᖏᑦ. ᐋᓐᓂᐊᖅᑐᓕᕆᓂᒃᑯᑦ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓚᑦ ᑐᓴᓇᕈᒪᓇᔭᖅᑐᒃᓴᐅᕗᑦ, ᐃᓚᖏᑦ ᐋᖓᔭᕈᑕᐅᔪᓐᓇᖅᑎᓪᓗᒋᑦ ᐃᒥᐊᓗᖏᑦᑐᒐᓗᐊᑦ, ᓱᕐᓗ ᐃᐅᑲᐊᑦ, ᑕᐅᑐᓕᖅᑎᑦᑎᓇᔭᖏᓐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐃᒥᖅᓯᒪᔪᑦ ᐃᓕᖅᑯᓯᖅᑲᓕᕋᔭᕐᓂᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᒃᑐᐊᓂᖃᖅᑐᓂᒃ ᐃᖏᓐᓂᐅᖏᑦᑐᖅ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᓇᓕᖅᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ ᐊᐅᓚᑕᓇᖏᑕᖏᓐᓂᒃ.

ᑖᒃᑯᐊ ᐊᒻᒪ ᐊᓯᖏᑦ ᑲᑎᒪᔨᕋᓛᓄᑦ ᐱᓕᕆᐊᖑᔪᓐᓇᖅᐳᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᓗᑎᒃ, ᓴᖅᑭᑦᑎᓗᑎᒃ ᐅᓂᒃᑲᑦᑎᐊᖅᓯᒪᔪᓂᒃ ᒪᓕᒐᖅᑎᒍᑦ, ᓴᓐᖏᓂᖅᑲᖅᑐᓄᑦ ᐊᑐᐊᒐᐃᓪᓗ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᔾᔪᓯᖏᓐᓄᑦ ᐃᓱᒪᒃᓴᖅᓯᐅᕈᑕᐅᔪᓄᑦ ᐃᑲᔪᑕᐅᓂᐊᕐᓗᑎᒃ ᑐᒃᓯᕋᐅᑎᓂᒃ ᖃᐅᔨᓴᖅᑕᐅᓂᖏᓂᒃᓗ ᓄᑖᑦ ᒪᓕᒐᐃᑦ.