

NORTHERN QUEBEC TASK FORCE
ON SELF-GOVERNMENT

REPORT ON TASK FORCE
FIELD TRIP TO INUIT COMMUNITIES
(February - March 1984)

Submitted by:

The Northern Québec Task Force
on Self-Government

May 15, 1984

«No true Inuk hunter will venture out before knowing what he needs for his trip. He has in mind what his game will be and he prepares the necessary equipment and tools with this and tomorrow in mind.»

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page:</u>
A. BACKGROUND	
1. Makivik and Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini.....	1
2. Québec Parliamentary Commission of November, 1983.....	1
3. Northern Québec Task Force on Self- Government	2
B. PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION TRIP.....	3
C. METHODOLOGY OF CONSULTATION TRIP	
1. Information Preceding Consultation Trip.....	4
2. Consultation Teams.....	7
3. Timetable of Community Visits.....	8
4. Consultation Procedure.....	9
5. Consultation through Questions and Responses	12
D. QUESTIONS AND SUMMARY RESPONSES.....	12
E. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS BASED ON CONSULTATION TRIP.....	27
F. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	33
Annex 1	39
Annex 2	41

NORTHERN QUEBEC TASK FORCE ON SELF-GOVERNMENT
FIELD TRIP REPORT (February - March 1984)

A. BACKGROUND

1. Makivik and Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini

For the last ten years in northern Québec there has been a division amongst Inuit with respect to the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement (the «Agreement»).

Basically, a movement consisting of «dissidents» have taken and continue to take the position that the Agreement should never have been signed because it provides for surrender and extinguishment of aboriginal rights of northern Québec Inuit. The dissidents, living mainly in the communities of Povungnituk, Ivujivik and Sugluk, in 1976 formed an organization to represent them in their opposition to the Agreement and this organization is known as «Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini» (I.T.N.).

There is also Makivik which is the legal successor to the Northern Québec Inuit Association which negotiated and signed the Agreement in 1975. Part of Makivik's mandate is to represent Inuit on economic, social and other issues related to the Agreement and to generally protect and promote Inuit rights.

Though of different opinions and views concerning the Agreement and its effect, both I.T.N. and Makivik have, over the last several years, maintained a dialogue off and on. The Inuit recognize that this division amongst the population has weakened Inuit politically in northern Québec and the governments benefit from this division.

2. Québec Parliamentary Commission of November, 1983

In November, 1983 a number of native groups including I.T.N. and Makivik appeared before a Québec Parliamentary Commission examining the «rights and needs of aboriginal peoples».

During the presentation of I.T.N. before the Parliamentary Commission hearings in Québec City, Premier Lévesque indicated that his government would be prepared to re-negotiate a regional government in northern Québec if Inuit could come up with a unified position.

On December 16, 1983, the President of I.T.N., Paulusi Sivuak wrote to Premier Lévesque thanking him for his responses during the Parliamentary Commission hearing in November and committing I.T.N. to working with other Inuit of northern Québec on a more meaningful and effective self-government structure for the region. On March 14, the leaders of the five regional organizations wrote to the Premier to report progress made by them on the self-government issue. The Premier responded by letter on March 28.

The five main regional organizations then met in Povungnituk from January 19 to 21, 1984 to further discuss this commitment by the Premier. These regional organizations were the Fédération des Coopératives du Nouveau-Québec (F.C.N.Q.), I.T.N., Makivik, Kativik School Board and the Kativik Regional Government.

3. Northern Québec Task Force on Self-Government

The five regional organizations which met in Povungnituk in January decided that if Inuit were to develop a common proposal on self-government for northern Québec, they would have to work together through some forum or group. Consequently, these five organizations decided to come together and form a task force known as the Northern Québec Task Force on Self-Government. It was agreed by these organizations that this task force would enable meetings between them to take place, ideas of these various regional entities* to be discussed together and joint proposals to

* Note that any reference in this report to «regional entities» includes I.T.N., F.C.N.Q., Kativik School Board, Makivik and the Kativik Regional Government.

be formulated for eventual negotiation with federal and provincial governments.

Members of the Task Force are the following:

Harry Tulugak	F.C.N.Q.
George Pilotas	F.C.N.Q.
Johnny Uitangak	I.T.N.
Qalingo Tookalak	I.T.N.
Minnie Grey	Makivik
Jobie Epoo	Makivik
Adamie Inukpuk	Kativik School Board
Mary Aitcheson	Kativik School Board
Willie Makiuk	Kativik Regional Government
Peter Matt	Kativik Regional Government

The mandate of the Northern Québec Task Force on Self-Government includes supervision and coordination of the planning stage in any work of northern Québec Inuit on the self-government issue; consultation with northern Québec communities to obtain the ideas and opinions of Inuit on the self-government issue; the study and review of various matters related to self-government; an examination of possible options to Inuit government with a view to achieving the most appropriate system of self-government; approaching those persons, groups, organizations or governments in a position to facilitate progress in this area.

Each of the five organizations has agreed to make contributions of human and financial resources to the work of the Task Force.

B. PURPOSE OF CONSULTATION TRIP

Central to the mandate of the Task Force is to consult and inform the communities of northern Québec on the issue of

self-government. Though the Task Force views «self-government» as the right to have regional and local institutions which enable Inuit to exercise sufficient control over matters affecting our interests, communities and region, it had to consult the population of northern Québec to find out their views and opinions on the issue. More importantly, before the Task Force could be in a position to put forward for consideration by the population of northern Québec various self-government options, the views, opinions and aspirations of Inuit had to be known.

We view this consultation trip as only the beginning in a long process of intensive consultation with the communities of northern Québec on the self-government issue. Nevertheless, it represents an important beginning to the dialogue which must become an ongoing one if Inuit of northern Québec are to have a meaningful and timely input into the self-government issue.

C. METHODOLOGY OF CONSULTATION TRIP

1. Information Preceding Consultation Trip:

It is relevant to note that preceding the consultation trip, certain information concerning the nature of the Task Force, its work and the self-government issue was provided to the communities. In other words, the communities did have some information concerning these issues prior to the consultation trip.

In the first week of February 1984, the leaders and some Executives of the five organizations forming the Task Force made a preliminary information trip to all the communities. Individuals making this trip were as follows:

Mary Simon	Makivik
Mark R. Gordon	Makivik
Paulusi Sivuak	I.T.N.
Eliassie Saluallak	I.T.N.
Josie Tookalook	K.S.B.
Etoua Putayuk	K.S.B.
Paulusi Kasudluak	F.C.N.Q.
Mathewsie Amaroalik	F.C.N.Q.
Josepi Keleutak	K.R.G.
Paulusi Padlayat	K.R.G.

The main purpose of this trip was to demonstrate to the communities that these five organizations had now agreed to work together on the self-government issue and that there was a certain degree of solidarity amongst them. Their trip was done by charter flight in only one week to all the Inuit communities. Community meetings were called in each community, but in most cases, the visit to each community was brief (in some cases just a few hours) and gave little time for detailed consultation on the self-government issue. However, because the goal of the trip was to provide the community with information on the Task Force and its mandate, this trip served to provide some groundwork information for the Task Force consultation trip which followed.

In addition to the information trip of the leaders, the Task Force sent a letter on February 3, 1984 to all mayors of northern Québec and to the leaders of all northern Québec regional organizations. (See Annex 1 of this Report for a copy of this letter.) This letter briefly explained the nature of the Task Force and its work, provided a definition of what the Task Force understood as «self-government» and set forth a series of six questions and requested a reponse to these questions. The questions contained in this letter are the following:

«1) In your opinion, what type of social, political and economic institutions do we require in northern Québec?

2) Should there be diverse regional and local institutions to meet our different needs and interests or should Inuit try to establish a single institution with more centralized powers?

3) What measures are needed to improve collaboration between regional and local institutions?

4) Should Inuit institutions in northern Québec be ethnic or non-ethnic or should we use both types depending on which may be more advantageous?

5) To what extent do existing institutions in northern Québec meet the needs of Inuit? What changes, if any, would you recommend?

6) Is it better to develop further our existing institutions (for example, through increased powers, financing and trained personnel) or should we start all over with the creation of new regional and/or local entities?»

Though this letter was sent on February 3, and the consultation trip commenced on February 27, only a few individuals responded as requested in writing to this letter. Perhaps part of the reason for the lack of overall response to this letter may be the fact that it was sent at a time that provided little delay in which to respond prior to the actual consultation trip passing through various communities. Mayors and leaders may have taken the view that since the consultation trip was soon to pass through their communities, they could use that opportunity to express their opinions rather than respond to the February 3 letter.

One other source of information which reached the communities before the consultation trip was that of the

information and questionnaire sheet prepared by the Task Force for the purpose of the consultation trip. (See Annex 2 to this report for a copy of this information and questionnaire sheet.) This information and questionnaire sheet was sent by dex to the communities on the commencement of the consultation trip and it set forth some basic facts about the Task Force and its work and listed a series of questions which the Task Force would be asking the population when it arrived at the various communities.

Other than these above three sources of information concerning the Task Force and its work and the self-government issue, there was little other formal information concerning these issues which reached the communities prior to the Task Force consultation trip.

2. Consultation Teams

The Task Force visited thirteen Inuit communities between February 27 and March 24. Because of the heavy consultation schedule (2 or 3 days in each community) and the fact that the Task Force did not have unlimited time in which to conduct the consultation trip, the Task Force decided to split its members into two groups to more effectively and efficiently conduct the consultation trip.

This split into two groups, which we will refer to as Group 1 and Group 2, took place after the entire Task Force had visited the first four communities which they consulted. The communities visited by the entire Task Force were Kuujjuaraapik, Inukjuak, Akulivik, Povungnituk and Kangirsuk. The balance of the communities were visited by either Group 1 or Group 2 of the Task Force members. Group 1 and Group 2 consisted of the following persons:

Group 1

Mary Aitcheson
 George Filotas
 Qalingo Tookalak
 Peter Matt (did not show)
 Jobie Epoo

Group 2

Harry Tulugak
 Willie Makiuk
 Adamie Inukpuk
 Johnny Uitangak
 Minnie Grey

3. Timetable of Community Visits

Travel by the Task Force members on the consultation trip was effected by scheduled flights as opposed to charters. In most cases, at least two days, and in some cases three days, were spent in each community consulting with the population. The following chart indicates the timetable of visits to the communities in addition to exactly which Task Force members (Group 1 or Group 2) visited each community.

Task Force Members	Community	Dates of Visit
all Task Force Members	Kuujjuaraapik	February 27-29
all Task Force Members	Inukjuak	February 29 - March 2
all Task Force Members	Povungnituk	March 2-3 & 5-6
all Task Force Members	Akulivik	March 3-4
Group # 2	Kuujjuaq	March 12-13 & 15
Group # 1	Ivujivik	March 13-14
Group # 1	Salluit	March 14-16
Group # 2	Kangiqsualujjuaq	March 13-15
Group # 1	Kangiqsujuaq	March 16-19
Group # 2	Tasiujaq	March 16-19
Group # 1	Quaqtaq	March 19-20
Group # 2	Aupaluk	March 19-20
all Task Force Members	Kangirsuk	March 20-24

4. Consultation Procedure

The consultation procedure employed by the Task Force in each community consisted of the Task Force members arriving in the community and first meeting with the Municipal Council of the particular community to determine in conjunction with the Council how best to consult the population of the particular community. In other words, in a particular community would it be best to consult by use of the FM radio station; by house-to-house visits; or through public meetings. In addition, the Task Force members requested the Council to appoint a special community member to sit with the Task Force during the consultation in that particular community. Once agreement had been reached on these important elements, the Task Force members proceeded in any particular community to consult the population.

The special community member to the Task Force appointed by the Municipal Council not only took part in the consultation process in that community, but was mandated by the Task Force and the community to continue the consultation process (ie. pose questions and obtain answers) even after the Task Force had moved on to another community. This was seen as necessary since the Task Force in its 2 - 3 day visit to a community could not possibly interview every member of the population in that community who wanted to be interviewed. Therefore, even though the consultation trip may formally be over, consultation is still going on in certain communities and written documentation and tapes are still being sent from the communities to the Task Force members in this regard.

On the whole, the Task Force found that public meetings were not very effective because often lengthy arguments would break out between community leaders and the population of a community, thus using up much time. Consequently, as the consultation trips

proceeded, the Task Force found it useful to combine the consultation techniques of public meetings with those of FM radio phone-in programs and house-to-house visits.

The following chart sets forth the method of consultation used in each community and the name of the special community member appointed by each community to the Task Force to assist in the consultation process. It should be noted that each form of consultation --- public meetings, radio phone-in shows and house-to-house visits and in one case, television --- involved the posing of questions by Task Force members to the population and responses to those questions being received. With all these forms of consultation used in the trip, the Task Force estimates that its oral questions, its discussions and its written information and questionnaire sheet reached the vast majority of the population.

Community	Mode of Consultation	Special Community Member to Task Force
Kuujjuaraapik	public meeting; house-to-house visits; FM radio phone-in programs	George Ittoshat
Inukjuak	public meeting; house-to-house visits; FM radio phone-in programs	Sarollie Weetaluktuk
Akulivik	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits. (No public meeting due to lack of space in the community.)	Qaqangarjuk Qumak
Povungnituk	public meeting; house-to-house visits; FM radio phone-in programs	Tomassie Kenuajuak

Community	Mode of Consultation	Special Community Member to Task Force
Ivujivik	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits. (No public meeting due to flu in the community.)	Peter Aullaluk
Salluit	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits (No public meeting due to flu in the community.)	None
Kangiqsujuaq	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits; public meeting	None
Quaqtaq	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits. (No public meeting since small community.)	Harry Ookpik
Kangirsuk	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits; and public meeting	Willie Tumasi
Tasiujaq	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits; public meeting.	Willie Angnatuk
Aupaluk	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits; public meeting; and television appearance.	Josepi Angma
Kuujjuaq	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits.	Sandy Saunders
Kangiqsualujjuaq	FM radio phone-in programs; house-to-house visits and public meeting.	Mark Annanack

5. Consultation through Questions and Responses

A series of questions were used by the Task Force members in their consultations with the communities. In some communities, all of these questions were asked to the population and in other communities, only some were asked of the community or only some were of interest to the community.

These questions represent a consensus of all Task Force members and, as such, all of the five organizations involved in the Task Force ensured that their concerns were fairly reviewed through these questions in the communities.

Responses to questions have been either written down by the Task Force members or members of the population or recorded on an extensive set of tapes. These tapes number approximately 170 (30 minutes to 45 minutes on each side of the tape) and are still in the process of being transcribed. All house-to-house interviews and all FM radio phone-in programs as well as all public meetings were recorded through tapes.

D. QUESTIONS AND SUMMARY RESPONSES OF FIELD TRIP

The following series of questions and their responses constitute the main questions placed by the Task Force before the communities and the main responses which these questions elicited from the communities.

It must be noted that these questions were not always asked in the order in which they are listed below, nor were all questions asked in all communities. Moreover, many of these main questions elicited subsidiary questions from either the Task Force members or the community members and these too have been listed below with their main responses.

These questions are divided into two main series: Series I are those relating to existing structures and Series II are those related to future self-government structures.

In terms of responses, each paragraph appearing under the heading «Responses» represents a different view expressed and consequently may sometimes appear contradictory.

Though the questions and responses listed below are not exhaustive and obviously many other smaller questions and discussions occurred during this month of consultation in the communities, we feel that this section of the report can serve to provide a good beginning overview of what Inuit of northern Québec think with respect to existing government and future self-government issues as well as other vital issues affecting their lives on a day-to-day basis.

SERIES I: QUESTIONS RELATED TO EXISTING STRUCTURES

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
1. Pertaining to today's situation, are you satisfied with government (Québec, Canada and Kativik Regional Government) in general as it applies to you?	No. Our needs are not being met and we do not have enough input into decisions of government, especially those which directly affect us.
2. Are you satisfied with Kativik Regional Government services to the municipalities?	No. Our community needs for infrastructure and services are not being met. Kativik Regional Government is not a real government to us but instead is a messenger of the Québec government.

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
<p>3. Do you think the monies spent by government in northern Québec are sufficient?</p> <p><u>Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>If we do create a new self-government institution in northern Québec, will this mean more monies for the communities?</p>	<p>No. Even after all monies spent by government in the north, there is nothing tangible in the communities to show for it.</p> <p>Our equipment and infrastructures are out of date and not being upgraded.</p> <p>Budgets are set arbitrarily by Québec and do not reflect the real financial and budgetary needs of the communities.</p> <p><u>Response to Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>New self-government institutions may mean more monies to the communities if there is block-funding as well as forms of revenue-sharing from development in the region. In addition, a proportion of all income taxes collected from Inuit of northern Québec should be ploughed back directly into northern Québec.</p>
<p>4. Do you think there is sufficient collaboration between regional and local institutions?</p> <p><u>Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>What measures are needed to improve collaboration between regional and local institutions?</p>	<p>No. Regional institutions are numerous and have failed to coordinate their efforts.</p> <p><u>Response to Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>Create a self-government institution which will involve all regional entities in decision-making concerning the region.</p>
<p>5. To what extent do existing institutions in northern Québec meet the needs of Inuit? What changes, if any, would you recommend?</p>	<p>Our needs are not being met and we do not have enough input into decisions of government, especially those which directly affect us.</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	<p>We have urgent needs which are not being met. For example, adequate housing with proper furnishings. «Paying increases in rent does not make sense when the conditions of our dwellings do not improve. These houses are no more than basic shelter and provide little or no comfort to us.»</p> <p>Our regional institutions find it hard to meet their responsibilities to the people (i.e., satisfy the needs of the people) because they lack adequate funds.</p>
6. Are the Inuit controlling the local institutions or are these institutions controlling the Inuit?	<p>Those elected or appointed to run these institutions are controlling these institutions but are not necessarily running them in a manner that is responsive to the needs of the people.</p> <p>Inuit in the communities are served by local organizations controlled by «galunaat». This contributes to loss of identity.</p>
7. What do you think about the quality of the present education system for our children?	<p>Compared to the former federal school system of about 20 years ago, the quality of education has declined. Under the former system, Inuit were obliged to attend and parents made sure they attended. The system produced positive results.</p> <p>The education system has improved because our children are now talking in Inuktitut and there are more Inuit teachers now. As well, Inuit have more control over their education system now than they had in the past.</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
<p><u>Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>What are the main factors affecting our children's education?</p>	<p><u>Response to Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>TV has accelerated assimilation of our children and loss of their culture. It has also caused them to lose respect for their parents and consequently, tend no longer to listen to their parents who urge them to attend school.</p>
<p>8. What do you think about the current state of Inuit culture?</p> <p><u>Subsidiary Questions:</u></p> <p>a. How can we use the Inuit culture to complement and strengthen self-government?</p> <p>b. How can we use what we have available to promote culture so that it can be used for this purpose?</p>	<p>Our culture is deteriorating due to the education system which promotes English and French.</p> <p><u>Response to Subsidiary Questions:</u></p> <p>a. We can use Inuit culture to complement and strengthen self-government by ensuring that it is promoted and used by all our local and regional entities. Our local and regional entities should respect our culture.</p> <p>b. We should ensure that our culture and traditions are taught in our schools and use the elders to assist in doing so.</p>
<p>9. What do you think about the quality of health and social services in northern Québec?</p>	<p>We are grateful we have some health and social services but there is a vast need to improve these services and facilities.</p> <p>As for social services, we would like to see more Inuit involved in delivery of these services since traditionally Inuit have always provided each other with social help.</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
10. What do you think about the quality and availability of community infrastructures in your community?	We are not satisfied with the present level and quality of community infrastructures and we would like to see this improved in a faster manner.
11. What do you think about transportation services in northern Québec?	<p>We do not have very much choice due to distances and location of our communities and therefore have to use airplanes which are very costly.</p> <p>We would like to have alternative modes of transportation but realize that there can be many negative impacts on the region and our culture if these alternatives are realized.</p>
12. What do you think about the quality and availability of communication facilities (TV, radio and telephone) in your community?	<p>We are satisfied with radio and telephone services compared to those services we used to have even 5 to 10 years ago.</p> <p>With respect to TV, we are not satisfied because we have no control over programming and very limited Inuktitut programming. As well, whatever Inuktitut programming that is available is always out-dated and consequently, the people are not receiving current news. The existing communication organizations should make relevant Inuktitut programming a priority.</p>
13. What do you think about our system of justice in northern Québec?	<p>It is very foreign to Inuit but we recognize the need for a justice system.</p> <p>We are not satisfied with the judicial system in northern Québec because it does not</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
<p><u>Subsidiary Questions:</u></p> <p>a. Are you satisfied with police services?</p> <p>b. Are you satisfied with the travelling court?</p> <p>c. Do you feel that the Court penalties are appropriate for the crimes?</p> <p>d. Do you feel there is adequate information about the system?</p> <p>e. how do you feel about Inuit spending time in southern penitentiaries?</p>	<p>sufficiently meet our needs or reflect our traditional forms of social control.</p> <p><u>Responses to Subsidiary Questions</u></p> <p>a. We are not satisfied with present police services because some communities have no police; a regional police force has not been established; and the special constable program is not functioning properly.</p> <p>When a special constable is hired for his own community, he does not command sufficient respect to perform his police duties.</p> <p>b. We are not satisfied with the travelling court because there is too great a delay between commission of the offense and the trial.</p> <p>c. We do not feel that the penalties are sufficiently appropriate for certain crimes. For example, penalties are not harsh enough for serious crimes. If certain crimes were dealt with in a more strict manner by the Court in the first place, then there would probably be less repeat offenders.</p> <p>d. Unfortunately, there is a complete lack of information about the justice system for our region. For example, many Inuit do not even know what the role of the police officer is.</p> <p>e. Inuit sent south to do time in these penitentiaries tend to develop further expertise in criminality rather than being</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	rehabilitated. There should be detention centres in the north to minimize the negative aspects of spending time behind bars. This would also allow friends and relatives closer and more regular contact with inmates.
14. What do you believe are the problems and solutions in the area of regional planning and management?	We recognize that there is a need for more planning of what goes on in our region.
15. What do you think about environmental and social protection in the region?	We feel our environment must be protected since we live from the land. If there are major developments in our region, we must be consulted since we will suffer the impacts of these projects.
16. How do you view the relationship between social and economic development in northern Québec?	We recognize the relationship between economic and social development, but we feel that the responsible institutions do not sufficiently deal with our economic and social problems.
17. How do you feel about the offshore area? For example, the islands?	<p>We do not appreciate the fact that governments claim that they own the offshore area and its islands when in fact Inuit own this area.</p> <p>We do not understand how the governments can say that these islands belong to the Northwest Territories when Inuit of Québec have always used them for survival.</p> <p>«We should buy an aircraft carrier to protect our ownership of the offshore area.»</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
<p>18. What do you think of taxation and other means of raising revenue?</p> <p><u>Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>What do you think about large-scale development and revenue-sharing in the region?</p>	<p>If there is no large-scale development in the region then the region should receive adequate amounts of block-funding.</p> <p><u>Response to Subsidiary Question:</u></p> <p>A self-government should tax all forms of large-scale development in the region so that it can develop independant tax-base or revenue-base for the region.</p>
<p>19. What do you think of wildlife management in the north?</p>	<p>We want to manage and control our own wildlife resources and we have already begun to do this through Anguvigaq Wildlife Management.</p> <p>We do not like non-Native organizations which focus international attention on our subsistence activities without providing a balanced view of how resources are utilized.</p>
<p>20. What do you think of relationships of regional government with other governments such as Québec and Canada. (For example, regional government negotiating directly with Canada and Québec.)</p>	<p>We feel that our government should have relationships with with both Canada and Québec.</p> <p>We feel our government should only deal with Québec.</p> <p>We feel our government should only deal with Canada.</p>

SERIES II: QUESTIONS RELATED TO FUTURE SELF-GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES

<p>21. In your opinion, what is self-government?</p>	<p>We do not know but we think it would be like the House of Commons and the Québec National Assembly which we see on television.</p>
--	---

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	Self-government is taking into our own hands control over whatever affects us.
22. Why should the Inuit have a government?	<p>We need our own government to protect our culture and to handle our own affairs.</p> <p>We see ourselves as different from any other people and we occupy a territory in which we are a clear majority with our own language, customs and history.</p> <p>With our own government, we could pass laws which promote and respect our way of life.</p>
23. How should such a government be structured?	<p>There should be a council of Inuit which would be the decision-maker and existing regional entities would be under the supervision of this council.</p> <p>In order for this government to fully reflect Inuit ways, there should be a type of elders advisory board to oversee this government.</p> <p>We are not sure but perhaps it should be like the ones we see on TV (House of Commons and the Québec National Assembly).</p>
24. Upon what principles would such a government be based?	<p>Whoever is elected must answer directly to the people who elect them for everything they do.</p> <p>A government must help us preserve our way of life.</p> <p>A government must be a real</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	<p>one (ie., with the power to make laws) and not just a messenger to the people from Québec.</p> <p>We want a government which lets us be responsible for ourselves instead of having someone be responsible for us.</p>
25. What will such a government undertake?	<p>It will undertake programs and policies for the benefit of the Inuit.</p> <p>It will coordinate the efforts of all regional entities in the region.</p>
26. What powers would you want such a government to have?	<p>We want our government to have legislative powers (power to make laws). Such powers would include culture, land-use, wildlife management, education, justice, family law, communications, taxation, language and religion.</p> <p>We want our government to be another level of government, but with not merely delegated powers. We want to be recognized as a separate government.</p>
27. How should such a government be funded?	<p>We want our government to control and use all funds currently expended by Canada and Québec in northern Québec.</p> <p>Our government should receive adequate amounts of block-funding from Québec and Canada.</p> <p>As part of the funds of our government, Canada and Québec</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	should remit all income taxes collected in northern Québec to our region.
28. Should this government be ethnic or non-ethnic or both types depending on which may be more advantageous?	<p>Our government should be ethnic because we want to have a government that is for us and by us.</p> <p>Our government should be non-ethnic so we can serve all persons residing in the territory and so that all our laws will apply equally to everyone.</p> <p>Our government should be a mixture of non-ethnic and ethnic structures as follows: those who govern will be all Inuks and those who are governed will be both Inuks and non-Inuks.</p>
29. What kind of social, economic and political institutions do we need as part of such a government?	<p>I do not know.</p> <p>We do not need any more institutions because we already have too many.</p>
30. What do Inuit as a people have at present that would help us to become more self-sufficient?	<p>We have our wildlife resources, our own language and our culture and our knowledge of our land.</p> <p>We have our determination to have our own government.</p>
31. If we do gain true self-government, to which government should we be attached? (i.e., under whose jurisdiction should we be?) - Québec's? - Canada's? - total autonomy?	<p>We would want our government to be under Québec's jurisdiction.</p> <p>I have always liked the federal government services and therefore I would want to see our government to be under Canada.</p> <p>We want our government to be under the jurisdiction of both</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	<p>Canada and Québec. We want to be able to deal with both these governments.</p> <p>We should be a separate government in northern Québec, fully independant of other governments.</p>
<p>32. As a self-government, what kinds of relationship should we have with other Inuit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- from the Northwest Territories?- from Labrador?- from other parts of the circumpolar region?	<p>We should first organize ourselves with respect to self-government within northern Québec before we attempt to have relations with other Inuit.</p> <p>We should keep each informed of any developments in our respective regions and support each other when necessary.</p> <p>We should create a unified force with Inuit of Labrador and the Northwest Territories.</p> <p>We should keep up to date on circumpolar activities, be involved in issues if we believe they will promote our efforts for greater self-government and recognition as a distinct people.</p>
<p>33. Who would be employed by such a self-government structure?</p>	<p>Employment in our self-government would be open to everyone but wherever possible priority should be given to employment to Inuit. But in any case, all leadership positions in the government must be filled by Inuit.</p>
<p>34. How would the self-government structure achieve its goals and objectives?</p>	<p>First, the self-government must clearly specify its goals and objectives according to the expressed aspirations of the people. Then, the self-government would have to play the role of</p>

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	<p>overseeing that all regional organizations comply with these goals and objectives once established.</p> <p>There must be a mechanism whereby the self-government is answerable to the population for carrying out its mandates always in accordance with the goals and objectives. Our government must always be accountable to the people which it serves.</p> <p>Why does our government need goals and objectives now? We won't understand what our goals and objectives are until our self-government has functioned for many years (10 - 20 years).</p>
35. What are the Inuit priorities which would require immediate attention by such a government?	Inuit priorities requiring immediate attention by our self-government are Inuit employment opportunities, economic development, community infrastructures, education, health services and wildlife management.
36. What are the elements required to achieve true self-government? <u>Subsidiary Question:</u> Where will we find the funds adequate for our government?	We think the elements required for true self-government to be achieved are good teamwork, experienced resource people (both Inuit and qalunaat), full cooperation amongst all Inuit and sufficient amounts of money to run the government. <u>Response to Subsidiary Question:</u> Some of the money for our self-government can come directly from Inuit, some from the cooperatives (contributions from its

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	members by way of a surtax charge on sales) and some from governments.
37. As a self-government, should Inuit take over all government responsibilities immediately or in stages?	Inuit should take over government responsibilities in stages. Not all at once because to do so all at once will be too much to handle considering the limited resources we have on hand and our other daily responsibilities (major opinion). Let's take over all responsibilities at once (minor opinion).
38. Should there be diverse regional and local institutions to meet our different needs and interests or should Inuit try to establish a single institution with more centralized powers?	There should be diverse regional and local institutions to meet our needs because we have so many diverse needs as Inuit and each requires special attention. We think we should get rid of all these diverse organizations and establish just one new self-government institution with enough powers to handle all our diverse needs.
39. Is it better to develop further our existing institutions (for example, through increased powers, financing and trained personnel) or should we start all over with the creation of new regional and/or local entities?	It is better to further develop our existing institutions because enough work and effort has been put into creating these structures already and by just creating new structures we will not solve our problems. We want to keep working on our existing government structures because we do not want to become known as a people that abandon something because there are some problems with it. We do not want to be seen as a people that run from our problems.

Main Questions followed by Subsidiary Questions	Main Responses followed by Responses to Subsidiary Questions
	<p>We should start all over again with new and diverse institutions and learn from and avoid mistakes of our existing institutions.</p> <p>We should carry on with our existing government institutions for the time being but gradually over time phase out those elements of these structures which have not served us well.</p> <p>There is no such thing as starting all over again with completely new institutions with new names because even our existing institutions could be considered new if they had increased powers, such as law-making powers, and sufficient funding, trained personnel under Inuit supervision and control.</p> <p>If we have to start all over again, I want to see a change of substance and not just a change of name for our government.</p>

E. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS BASED ON INFORMATION FROM CONSULTATION TRIP

Based on the responses to the questions and other discussions in the communities during the consultation trip, we do not feel that the information obtained is either complete or conclusive enough to enable us to draw more than some general conclusions from this trip.

These general conclusions are as follows:

1. Self-Government:

Inuit of northern Québec want to govern themselves through some form of self-government. Inuit want a form of government that they can control and that is strong and not one, as the present one, which they feel simply conveys information to them from the central governments. There was no consensus on what form this self-government should take, that is, whether it should be maintaining and improving of the existing regional structures or creating new structures. In addition, the people are tired of having to follow laws which are made by persons who are not familiar with the social, economic and cultural realities of northern Québec and which negatively affect Inuit (eg. construction decrees).

2. Preservation of Inuit Way of Life:

Inuit are concerned with the preservation and growth of their way of life. They want to maintain their distinct lifestyle, preserve a cultural identity, and avoid assimilation. They see one major way of doing this as having a proper education system which promotes Inuit culture and language. At the same time, they see a need to promote the regular use of Inuttituut in their institutions so that it remains a living language. As well, they have indicated that government or self-government structures are not necessarily the solution to preserving their way of life.

3. Self-Sufficiency:

Inuit, as a distinct people, want to be self-sufficient. By self-sufficient, the people explained that this meant having control over their own lives; being responsible for their decisions and actions; and being accountable to themselves. Inuit do not want to have to depend solely on government for financing of their government structures and other needs. Instead, they want the region to have its own system of revenue-raising so that they are not so dependant on Canada or

Québec government assistance, since such assistance will always be limited and will always carry conditions which may not be acceptable to Inuit.

In order to facilitate such self-sufficiency, the people want to see revenue-sharing from large-scale development in the region and eventual control of certain large-scale projects in the region through forms of equity participation.

Block-funding was also seen as one way of promoting greater self-sufficiency amongst Inuit. However, the people suggested that before we could achieve block-funding and other similar mechanisms for generating self-sufficiency in the region, we would have to be able to demonstrate that we can manage monies responsibly. The people feel that at this time our existing entities are not able to demonstrate this and gave the example of Inuit entities competing against themselves in economic activities to underline this point. For example, in some communities, both the Cooperative movement and the Landholding Corporation have both stores and restaurants and compete against each other for the same dollars when the same people are involved in the Cooperative and the Landholding Corporation. The result of this situation is that none of these «duplicated» businesses are able to become viable and constantly require external infusions of cash to keep them alive.

4. Education:

The people view education of fundamental importance to promoting Inuit cultural identity and Inuit self-sufficiency. The people expressed their dissatisfaction with the present education

system in northern Québec and called for substantial improvement, especially in the area of curriculum development. The people suggested that the education system should be redesigned so that it more effectively promotes Inuit cultural identity.

5. Kativik Regional Government:

The people expressed overall dissatisfaction with the role played by the Kativik Regional Government. On the whole, they felt that the Kativik Regional Government as our present self-government institution does not have sufficient powers and the powers which it does in fact have, it does not fully exercise.

The people also expressed concern over the lack of accountability of the regional government to its constituents. Part of the reason for this was the perceived lack of information available to the population concerning issues and activities of the regional government.

The people feel that the Kativik Regional Government has taken on the role of a go-between between the Québec government and the Inuit communities; whereas instead it could be a key tool for the communities for achieving some of their major priorities. The people feel the Kativik Regional Government has become merely a messenger instead of an initiator and planner. The people indicated that considering how long the Kativik Regional Government has existed, it should be in a position to exercise its powers and completely take over services for the region, but has not been able to either.

Many people suggested the need for structural changes in the Kativik Regional Government. For example, some suggested that the mayors should have more input into the work of the regional council so that they can be more directly involved in the

decision-making of the Kativik Regional Government, especially in the determination of community needs and budgetary allocations. But in any case, many suggested that leadership within the regional government requires individuals with the ability to initiate and to deal directly with Canada and Québec when issues arise, rather than persons who simply follow and carry out instructions of outside governments.

6. Coordination Among Entities:

The people expressed concern over the need for greater coordination among regional entities in northern Québec. People pointed out that there appeared to be much duplication of effort by the regional entities and in some cases, these entities seemed to be working at cross-purposes. The people underlined the fact that dealing with Canada and Québec our region would probably be much more effective if all the regional entities were to work together and coordinate their positions and strategies.

7. Mandates of Regional Entities:

Many people expressed concern over many of the regional entities not carrying out their stated mandates. In addition, many people pointed out that even when the regional entities do in fact carry out their mandates, they often do so without consultation with Inuit to determine what are their real needs and priorities. As one community member pointed out: «Having the power and knowing what is needed, are not necessarily the same.».

A number of people suggested that there be a review of the mandates of all the regional entities to determine the extent to which these mandates are being followed by these entities and whether there could not be greater coordination amongst these entities which do have overlapping mandates.

8. Social and Economic Conditions:

Generally, the people expressed a great deal of frustration over the poor social and economic conditions in their communities and the fact that they feel very little is being done by the regional entities to alleviate these conditions. Many of the people feel that the regional entities are not using their funds or their specified mandates to the maximum to relieve these conditions and instead, are spending their money and devoting their many resources to issues and projects unrelated to the immediate needs of the communities.

9. Lack of Consultation:

Over and over again the people expressed concern with the lack of adequate consultation by the regional entities with the population. This lack of consultation, the people suggested, results in the regional entities not being responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people, namely that they want to protect their culture, they want to be self-sufficient, they want a good education system and they want a better form of self-government.

The people stated that the regional entities, instead of responding to the needs of the population, tend to go ahead and give their own understanding and interpretation of their mandates. The people said the result of this situation is that the entities are not fully respecting their mandates as intended, but instead are pursuing activities and options which in many cases are totally foreign to the people because they have not been adequately or meaningfully consulted.

As well, the people said that they feel less and less a part of what these regional entities are doing on a day-to-day basis, supposedly on their behalf. Many people indicated that the

more that the regional entities persist in functioning in an autonomous manner, the more alienated many people are beginning to feel. Some people said that they feel that they are becoming more and more removed from what these entities are doing and saying.

As well, many people expressed their confusion because they simply do not know what their regional entities are supposed to be doing or even what they are doing. They said that they feel that no one is listening to their problems or doing anything about them.

On the other hand, there were many people who stated that the people themselves are partly to blame for this situation because they are the ones that should put pressure on the regional entities if they feel their needs are not being met and that the entities are failing them. But instead, in many instances, the people tend to take the attitude that only those in leadership positions are responsible for solving these problems.

Furthermore, many people explained this apparent autonomous functioning of the regional entities by the fact that the people at the community level cannot take their responsibility seriously enough and consequently, do not apply sufficient pressure to the leadership of the regional entities to force them to be more accountable for their actions.

However, there were many people who felt that part of the reason for the people and leaders of the local community organizations not questioning the regional entities sufficiently concerning their actions and activities is because they do not even know enough about what the regional entities are in fact doing to be in a position to question them.

10. Need for Goals and Objectives:

The people indicated that before Inuit of northern Québec enter into discussions or negotiations on new self-government structures, that we, as a people, must set out clearly what our goals and objectives are. People felt that once this was done, then it would be easier for them to give directions to the regional entities to do likewise, in accordance with the overall stated goals and objectives of Inuit of northern Québec, rather than on some other basis.

Many people felt that until we set our goals and objectives as a people, there is little point in creating new structures because the structures will not give us direction. In other words, many people felt that our needs and our goals and objectives should determine what structures we need rather than the other way around as we may have done in the past.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the consultation trip, the following constitute our major recommendations for consideration of the regional entities at this time.

1. Due to the diversity of opinions and lack of consensus on major issues amongst Inuit of northern Québec, more consultation is required with the communities on the self-government issue. We view the consultation trip of February - March 1984 as only a preliminary step in a much longer process of intensive consultation with the communities on this issue. It is only through such a process that we can ensure that the needs and aspirations of the people are expressed and noted by the regional entities. It is only in this manner that the needs

and aspirations of the people and their stated goals and objectives will serve to determine what self-government structures are required. The people themselves require many more facts and information concerning the regional entities, what they are doing, what their mandates require them to do, and the consensus on the objectives and goals of northern Québec Inuit, before there can be serious consideration of the self-government issue or any new self-government structures. As well, the trip showed that the people have many questions on many issues other than self-government. The regional entities should therefore be spending more time consulting the communities on all these issues.

2. The process of achieving true self-government in northern Québec cannot be rushed. The road to true self-government is a long one, requiring much research, consultation, discussion and negotiation. As well, Inuit must be ready to take control of our own self-government, otherwise there can be no true self-government. We see education as playing a major role in preparing Inuit for this purpose and without properly educating our future leaders, any new self-government structures will be meaningless and will fail.
3. All regional entities should carefully evaluate their respective mandates and examine where they are failing to carry them out. We recommend that the regional entities put their respective operations in order and start using their resources to respond directly to the needs of the people. We

also suggest that Inuit realize there is no magic in a new self-government institution and that any such new structure or institution may not necessarily solve all our problems.

4. We should only proceed to examining detailed self-government options for northern Québec when we have fully determined what our problems are and specifically why our existing structures are not functioning properly in carrying out their mandates in accordance with the needs and aspirations of the people.

We recommend that thorough consultation must be undertaken with the people before the Task Force can consider various options for self-government. Moreover, we recommend that only through honest evaluations of all regional entities, their mandates and the degree to which they are fulfilling their mandates can we come to determine the deficiencies of our existing structures.

5. There is a need for greater coordination amongst the regional entities in carrying out their mandates and in resolving their respective problems. In all activities and actions of the regional entities, since all entities are dealing with the same region and the same people, we find that it only makes sense to coordinate the efforts involved.

We recommend that the regional entities study the need for some mechanism or procedure to facilitate cooperation amongst the regional entities with

similar or overlapping mandates so that we can avoid in future the lack of cooperation, and even competition, which now appears to exist among the entities that were originally created to accomodate the needs of the people.

6. We recommend that the education system for northern Québec, specifically programming, curriculum development and promotion of Inuttituut, be rigorously examined to determine problem areas. We feel that one way to begin this review of the Kativik School Board is through the upcoming Special Symposium on Education to take place in 1984 in northern Québec.

7. We recommend that with respect to economic development, the regional entities should now take a very hard look at what economic development should mean for northern Québec and how it can be used as a tool to assist Inuit in achieving their stated goals of self-sufficiency and true self-government. For this purpose, we further recommend that the regional entities develop jointly a set of economic development principles and objectives as well as possible strategies for accomplishing these. In doing so, the regional entities should focus on creating, on an urgent basis, more jobs and economic opportunities for Inuit in the communities taking into account the present economic subsistence pursuits and skills with which the people are familiar.

We also recommend that the regional entities work together now to prepare a coordinated position on

economic development in northern Québec for discussion and presentation at the upcoming Northern Québec Economic Conference in 1984.

8. Under both the present self-government structure in northern Québec or under any future self-government structures, there are certain limitations placed upon these structures by various provisions of the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. For example, should we want our self-government to be able to raise revenues through taxation or royalties on mineral development in northern Québec, this right was surrendered in the Agreement.

Therefore, we recommend that the Task Force should study the need for possible amendments to the Agreement which would be necessary to facilitate true self-government in northern Québec.

9. We recommend that a Task Force continue the role and mandate of the present Task Force and in addition secure adequate funding in order to continue the consultation process on the self-government issue as well as the necessary research and preparation of information and documents involved in this issue. Part of this research should include a study explaining and analyzing various government structures of other jurisdictions such as Greenland and Alaska.

NORTHERN QUEBEC TASK FORCE
ON SELF-GOVERNMENT

February 3, 1984

Dear

On behalf of the Northern Québec Task Force on Self-Government, we are writing to you to seek information and opinions on the issue of self-government,

Our Task Force is comprised of representatives from the Kativik Regional Government, Makivik Corporation, Kativik School Board, Fédération des Coopératives du Nouveau-Québec and Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini. The mandate of the Task Force is, in part, to research and prepare different options which might provide increased self-government in northern Québec. These options will be further considered at the special general meeting of regional organizations of northern Québec to be held the week of March 19, 1984.

By "self-government", we mean the right to have regional and local institutions which enable Inuit to exercise sufficient control over matters affecting our interests, communities and region.

In order to ensure that the self-government models we put forward take into account the views and aspirations of Inuit, the Task Force is interested in receiving ideas or opinions from individuals and northern organizations. Additional information will be gathered through field trips to Inuit communities and through collection of existing materials and precedents.

In reflecting on this issue, the following questions, among others, may be of relevance in providing us with a response:

- 1) in your opinion, what type of social, political and economic institutions do we require in northern Québec?
- 2) should there be diverse regional and local institutions to meet our different needs and interests or should Inuit try to establish a single institution with more centralized powers?
- 3) what measures are needed to improve collaboration between regional and local institutions?
- 4) should Inuit institutions in northern Québec be ethnic or non-ethnic or should we use both types depending on which may be more advantageous?
- 5) to what extent do existing institutions in northern Québec meet the needs of Inuit? what changes, if any, would you recommend?
- 6) is it better to develop further our existing institutions (for example, through increased powers, financing and trained personnel) or should we start all over with the creation of new regional and/or local entities?

Any comments or information you may have would be appreciated and should be sent to me as soon as possible at the following address:

4898 de Maisonneuve W.
Wesmount, Québec
H3Z 1M8

Yours truly,

Minnie Grey
TASK FORCE MEMBER

MG/mg

