

BRIEF  
TO  
FURTHER CONSULT THE INUIT OF NORTHERN QUEBEC  
ON POLITICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE  
AND  
REAFFIRM THE CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE  
OF MAKIVIK CORPORATION

MAKIVIK CORPORATION

May 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
MAP	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. PURPOSES .....	3
III. SPECIAL STATUS OF INUIT AND 1912 TERRITORY ...	4
IV. JAMES BAY AND NORTHERN QUEBEC AGREEMENT .....	6
4.1 The Agreement as an Evolving Statement of Inuit rights .....	6
4.2 Inuit aboriginal rights .....	9
4.3 Implementation .....	10
4.4 Kativik Regional Government .....	11
V. FEDERAL TRUST RESPONSIBILITY: Section 91(24) B.N.A. Act, 1867 .....	13
VI. QUEBEC'S WHITE PAPER ON SOVEREIGNTY- ASSOCIATION .....	15
6.1 Historical Inaccuracies .....	15
6.2 Comparisons of Inuit and Québec Grievances .....	16
6.3 Implications of the White Paper on Inuit Status, Rights and Interests .....	19
6.4 Incompatibility of Sovereignty- Association with the Basic Principles Underlying James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement .....	21
VII. INUIT RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION .....	24
7.1 Inuit Self-Determination Within the Context of Québec and Canada .....	24

	PAGE
7.2 Inuit Self-Determination on the International Level .....	26
VIII. DECISION FOR SEPARATE INUIT REFERENDUM .....	28
8.1 Reasons for Abstention from Québec Referendum and Reasons for a Separate Inuit Referendum .....	28
8.2 Effect of Inuit Referendum Results on Northern Québec Inuit .....	30
IX. FUTURE PROTECTIONS TO BE SOUGHT BY MAKIVIK ...	31
X. INUIT TUNGAIVINGAT NUNAMINI (I.T.N.) .....	32
XI. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	33
ANNEX I - RESOLUTION RE: SEPARATE INUIT REFERENDUM (MAKIVIK CORPORATION, ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, GEORGE RIVER, QUEBEC)	
ANNEX II - EXCERPT ON NATIVE RIGHTS FROM QUEBEC LIBERAL PARTY'S CONSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL (BEIGE PAPER)	
ANNEX III - QUEBEC'S REFERENDUM QUESTION ON SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION	
ANNEX IV - FEDERAL FUNDING OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE JAMES BAY AND NORTHERN QUEBEC AGREEMENT	
ANNEX V - DECLARATION OF 1970 (excerpt) ON PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW CONCERNING FRIENDLY RELATIONS AND COOPERATION AMONG STATES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS	
ANNEX VI - INUIT REFERENDUM QUESTION	



## I. INTRODUCTION

It is especially timely for all Inuit in northern Québec to examine their individual and collective rights and status in the present context of rapidly changing political and constitutional circumstances. As Inuit, we have moved through the period required to secure a settlement of our aboriginal claims in respect to the region above the 55th parallel in northern Québec, to a new period involving the implementation of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement. However, our rights and benefits under the Agreement may be rendered ineffective and inadequate and our status as indigenous peoples seriously impaired if certain constitutional proposals are adopted.

The Inuit of northern Québec generally view constitutional reform as a much-needed positive step at this time in Canada's and Québec's history. But the constitutional proposals put forward to date by government, special task forces and others do not adequately take into account the interests which are central to Inuit. In some cases, the proposals not only ignore Inuit needs but also constitute a step backwards for all indigenous peoples affected by them.

The challenge facing the Inuit of northern Québec is both a crucial and demanding one. We must consult among ourselves and consolidate our views in respect to the rights, status, institutions and powers which we would need for our own existence and development as a society and culture exercising adequate self-determination. In particular, the future rights of Inuit in the event of a sovereign Québec must be made completely clear through

discussion and negotiation with the governments of Québec and Canada before further efforts are pursued by Québec towards sovereignty-association.

On June 23, 1978, Makivik Corporation was created under Québec law (Bill 27) as the Association to succeed the Northern Québec Inuit Association as the Inuit "Native party" under the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. As the party representing Inuit, Makivik has the responsibility to ensure that the Agreement is implemented so that its members, the Inuit beneficiaries of the Agreement, enjoy the cultural, political, social and economic rights and benefits provided by the Agreement.

In equal importance with its role in economic development, Makivik's statutory objectives are to promote the welfare of Inuit and to foster, promote and protect the Inuit way of life, values and traditions.

Therefore, soon after Makivik's inception, field trips were carried out to inform Inuit communities in northern Québec of current constitutional issues of relevance to Inuit. At the same time, written mandates were obtained from a substantial majority of Inuit of northern Québec to permit Makivik to represent Inuit on constitutional issues.

Presently, there is a growing awareness in Canada as to the urgent need for major constitutional reforms. For such purposes, Makivik feels it is now opportune for the Inuit of northern Québec to demonstrate our collective will to act as a people.

In this regard, we must clarify the issues of fundamental concern to us and stimulate further discussion in the Inuit communities. We must also further our preparation so as to continue to represent ourselves and participate directly in constitutional talks with Québec and Canada.

As a public manifestation of Inuit solidarity and for the purposes outlined in this brief, Makivik is seeking a reaffirmation of its constitutional mandate by way of referendum. This decision was unanimously adopted by the members present at the annual general meeting of the Association in Kangirsualujuak (George River), Quebec, on April 18, 1980.\*

As this brief makes clear, the mandate that Makivik is presently requesting from Inuit is not directed, in either the short or long term, towards any form of Inuit independence from Canada.

## II. PURPOSES

The purposes of this brief are the following:

- a) to continue the ongoing information and consultation process among the Inuit of northern Québec on relevant political and constitutional matters which may affect Inuit rights and interests, particularly Québec's proposal for sovereignty-association;

---

\* See Annex I of this Brief for Resolution re separate Inuit referendum.

b) to inform Inuit on relevant issues so as to allow each individual to meaningfully exercise his or her vote in the Inuit referendum in regard to Makivik's constitutional mandate;

c) to increase the awareness, among other peoples of Québec and Canada, of the special constitutional position of the Inuit and the nature of our rights and interests, as well as the special significance of the 1912 territory (northern Québec).

### III. SPECIAL STATUS OF INUIT AND 1912 TERRITORY

The Inuit of Québec are in a position unique among the peoples of Québec. Although we are a minority within the larger framework of Québec, we are also its original inhabitants. As indigenous peoples, we have been accorded special statutory and political recognition both in section 91(24) of the B.N.A. Act and under the James Bay and Northern Québec settlement of 1975. We also have unique cultural rights known as aboriginal rights.\*

While it may not be generally known, since time immemorial we have occupied a vast area constituting more than one-third the present size of the province of Québec. This territory located north of the 55th parallel was not originally part of Québec. It was only added in 1912 upon the passage of joint federal and provincial legislation known as the Québec Boundaries Extension Acts. It was not until 1964 that the government of Québec began to

---

\* See page 11 of this Brief for a description of aboriginal rights

establish a northern presence in the 1912 Territory with its wealth of wildlife, mineral and water resources. In fact, a large portion of the water resources needed for Québec hydroelectric development is situated here.

We, alone, among all of the minorities in Québec, can state that we have inhabited a defined territory from time immemorial and that we have always constituted a significant majority of those living in this territory which we call our homeland. The territory is very different from other parts of the province. It has a distinct geography, climate, ecology, economy, people and history. It is these very differences which at the same time have created a special community of interests among the inhabitants of the region. The special character of this territory and its Native inhabitants has begun to be recognized by both the federal and provincial governments in the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement through the creation of regional and local institutions with appropriate powers.

It would be difficult for a stronger case to be made by any peoples in Québec for recognition of the principle of their right to self-determination, a principle strongly advocated by the government of Québec. Adequate recognition of this principle in favour of Inuit, which is discussed more fully below, must be assured in matters of constitutional change as in all other spheres of Québec political, economic and social life.

IV. JAMES BAY AND NORTHERN QUEBEC AGREEMENT

4.1 The Agreement as an Evolving Statement of Inuit Rights

The Agreement represents a fundamental document for the Inuit upon which we have based not only our present aspirations, but also our future development as Native peoples and participants in Québec society. Although it only represents a first step, the Agreement is in many ways comprehensive in that it provides benefits not only in the private sector, but equally important, in the public sector.

Both present and future generations of Inuit will be directly affected by the policies and operations of public and quasi-public institutions and bodies established as benefits under the Agreement on a regional basis. For us, the Agreement represents the exchange of some of the rights which we have enjoyed historically from time immemorial for more clearly defined rights of a similar nature and for other rights and benefits which are specified in the various sections of the Agreement. A majority of those rights and benefits constitute obligations on the part of Québec.

While legislation has been passed to enable the Inuit to enjoy certain benefits, to date many of these benefits are not being permitted to flow due to the uncooperative actions of various Québec departments at the administrative level.\*

---

\* For details on implementation, see page 12 of this Brief

As the Inuit Native party to the Agreement, Makivik views Québec's perspective of the Agreement as follows:

i) that the primary purpose of the Agreement was to provide Québec a clear title to the territory and only secondarily to settle the legitimate claims of the Inuit of northern Québec;\*

ii) that the Agreement represents a fixed and static document to be interpreted legally in strict and limitative fashion with respect to Inuit rights and benefits, with little or no regard given to the spirit and intention forming the basis of the Agreement.

However, from the Inuit perspective, the Agreement must necessarily be viewed as a first major step both in the evolution of Inuit-Québec relations and in acquiring an adequate degree of self-determination on a regional basis within both Québec and Canada. Where necessary therefore, the Agreement must be built upon. It must be seen as a "living" document, capable of adapting to new government policies and to changing political, economic and social circumstances. For such purposes, the Agreement must not be seen as closed, static or final.

---

\* See An Act approving the Agreement concerning James Bay and Northern Québec, S.Q. 1976, c. 46, which makes no mention of the objective of settling Inuit aboriginal claims in the territory. See also page 55 of the Quebec White Paper on sovereignty-association.

Evidence of Québec's static approach to the Agreement appears from the fact that new land use\* and taxation powers\*\* conferred upon municipalities in other parts of Québec have not been extended to the territory above the 55th parallel. While those powers would have to be adapted to suit a northern context, it is inconceivable that Québec would have specifically excluded their application from the region where the municipalities which would benefit from them most are located.

The principle in this regard is stated in subsection 2.11 of the Agreement:

"Nothing contained in this Agreement shall prejudice the rights of the Native people as Canadian citizens of Québec, and they shall continue to be entitled to all of the rights and benefits of all other citizens as well as those resulting from any other legislation applicable to them from time to time".

---

\* See An Act respecting land use planning and development, S.Q. 1979, c. 51. Section 266 of this Act provides:

"This act does not apply in the territories situated north of the 55th parallel nor in the Territory described in the schedule to the James Bay Region Development Act (R.S.Q., c. D-8), after excluding the municipalities contemplated in section 40 of the said act."

\*\* See An Act respecting municipal taxation and providing amendments to certain legislation, S.Q. 1979, c. 72. Section 1 of this act excludes northern village corporations in the territory from the definition of municipal corporation under this act.

It follows that additional benefits contained in new legislation of general application in the province must automatically apply with appropriate adaptations to our northern territory.

#### 4.2 Inuit aboriginal rights

Inuit aboriginal rights consist of rights pertaining to land based on use and occupation since time immemorial, such as hunting, fishing and trapping rights and the right to name geographic places in the territory. Aboriginal rights also include Inuit traditions and customs relating to Inuit language and culture, as well as to marriage, family and adoption.

Inuit aboriginal rights still exist to their full extent in the large offshore areas around northern Québec. The same, however, is not presently true for the territory in northern Québec insofar as those rights relate to lands.

With respect to northern Québec, the government of Québec insisted on obtaining both a surrender and an extinguishment of Inuit aboriginal claims in and to such lands as a mandatory condition for settlement of such claims under the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. In our view, while existing aboriginal rights may be altered in exchange for other rights and benefits, it is unnecessary to totally eradicate the concept of aboriginal rights. Such rights are unique to indigenous peoples and are inseparable from our cultural identity. Due to the cultural importance to all Inuit of maintaining the concept of aboriginal rights, Makivik is in the process of seeking to legally

restore and protect this concept through constitutional and other discussions with government.

#### 4.3 Implementation

Implementation of the Agreement has been characterized by a narrow interpretation by Québec of its failure to respect the obvious spirit and intent of the Agreement in certain cases and by the ignoring of obligations in other cases.

Historically, relations between the Québec government and its indigenous peoples have often been somewhat strained. The Agreement, if implemented with the proper spirit, might yet represent an important positive step in the evolution of Québec-Inuit relations. But in our view, the present situation in respect to implementation represents the most serious threat to date to relations between the Québec government and Inuit.

In speeches made from time to time to Québec's Native peoples, the Government of Québec has repeatedly promised that its Native peoples would enjoy much greater benefits in a sovereign Québec. Québec's failure to fulfill obligations under the Agreement which are completely within its jurisdiction causes us to question whether greater benefits would in fact result for its Native peoples in a sovereign Québec.

While laws representing rights and benefits under the Agreement are in many instances already in force, many of the powers conferred upon regional and local bodies in the territory are unable to be exercised in the manner intended because of a lack of adequate budgets from Québec.

The creation of social, economic and governmental institutions in favour of Inuit beneficiaries serves no useful purpose if these institutions are not adequately funded. Substantial benefits for Inuit are most often tied to the annual budgets of the various Québec departments responsible for implementing different sections of the Agreement. To date, the negotiation of these budgets has often been fruitless and, in some cases, non-existent. In this connection, the Kativik Environmental Committee (Section 23), the Inuit Hunter Support Program (Section 29), the Kativik Regional Development Council (Section 23), and the Kativik Regional Government (Section 13) serve as examples.

The autonomy of these regional entities in their spheres of jurisdiction is illusory if they do not have access to adequate financial resources to meet their responsibilities.

A partial solution to these budgetary problems, to date rejected by Québec, would be the establishment of a formal process for negotiating adequate budgets for the many bodies established under the Agreement and for implementing all other matters related to the Agreement.

#### 4.4 Kativik Regional Government

One of the most significant public bodies established by the Agreement is the Kativik Regional Government. It is more than a mere municipal corporation of a regional nature. As a central benefit for Inuit under the Agreement, its funding is instrumental both for the exercise

of its powers and for the fulfillment of the spirit and intention of the Agreement. Decisions on its budget cannot be viewed, as has been the case up to now, as simply the exercise of administrative discretion on the part of Québec.

Furthermore, as a primary institution for regional administration in the Territory, the regional government must be capable of responding to the needs of the territory and all of its inhabitants by receiving sufficient powers from time to time for such purposes.

To date, the Regional Government has been prevented from exercising many of its powers and functions. With respect to its planning function, for example, Québec has suggested that its proposal to formulate a land use plan for the territory north of the 55th parallel is "premature" despite Québec's intention to proceed with several major hydro-electric and other developments within the territory.

More generally, the Regional Government has been denied the budget necessary to carry out its responsibilities in the areas of municipal and social programs and services.

In addition, the autonomy of the Regional Government is being undermined by the failure of the Ministère des Affaires Municipales to allow it to determine its own program priorities and by the emergence of parallel structures consisting of northern branches of various Québec departments.

In general, it has also become apparent that Québec is refusing to locate the daily operations and administration of bodies created by the Agreement in the north as intended. Such actions, contrary to the spirit of the Agreement, are evidence of a continuing colonial attitude towards Inuit and our aspirations for sufficient control over matters affecting us and the territory.

V. FEDERAL TRUST RESPONSIBILITY: Section 91(24), B.N.A. Act, 1867

Before evaluating the implications for Inuit of the Québec White Paper on sovereignty-association, it is worth noting the significance of the existing federal trust responsibility in favour of Inuit.

Unlike the United States, where the federal trust responsibility for native peoples finds its basis in judicial decisions, the trust responsibility in Canada is specifically provided for in section 91(24) of the B.N.A. Act, 1967. This section in the Canadian Constitution provides that "Indians and lands reserved for the Indians" are matters of federal legislative jurisdiction. Moreover, the Supreme Court of Canada decided the word "Indians" in section 91(24) refers not only to Indians, but also to Inuit. Therefore, the federal government may pass laws directly relating to both Inuit and Indians.

It is still unclear to what extent provincial legislatures can pass laws which directly or indirectly affect Native peoples. For matters such as wildlife, environment, marriage, adoption and culture, among others, research must still be undertaken to define more clearly the

constitutional limits of provincial legislative jurisdiction so that it does not unduly encroach upon Native rights and interests. In this manner, the scope of section 91(24) may be determined with greater certainty.

In this regard, a fundamental principle is provided in the Québec Liberal Party's constitutional proposal (the "Beige Paper") entitled "The New Canadian Federation"\*, at pages 83 and 84:

"There is no question of our proposing a transfer of legislative jurisdiction over the native peoples, as any such transfer should only occur with their consent. We would certainly hope that the native peoples would integrate and participate more in the life of Québec. However, any forced transfer of authority can only serve to further alienate them from Québec and from the Francophone community of Québec."

Generally, it can be said that the federal trust responsibility requires the government and Parliament of Canada to protect and enhance Inuit rights and interests. The trust responsibility, therefore, is evidence in Canada's Constitution of the special rights and status possessed by Inuit as beneficiaries of such trust. Such responsibility and special status is a result of the federal government's historical and unique legal relationship with the Native peoples of Canada, including Inuit. In contrast it is important to note that no equivalent trust relationship exists between any province and its Native peoples.

---

\* See Annex II for a more complete excerpt on native peoples. Unlike the Québec White Paper on sovereignty-association, the Beige Paper does include some fundamental principles in respect to Native rights and culture.

In the future, it will be necessary to define more clearly in the Constitution the nature and extent of the many complex aspects of the federal trust responsibility for Native peoples. Up to the present time, the federal government has often hesitated to protect the rights of Native peoples when faced with conflicts between provinces and Native peoples. This is due in part to the passive federal policy sometimes referred to as "alert neutrality". However, the mere existence of the trust in the B.N.A. Act has served to deter over-zealous provincial legislatures from passing laws interfering with Native activities and rights since such laws could, if challenged, be declared unconstitutional by the courts.

## VI. QUEBEC'S WHITE PAPER ON SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION\*

### 6.1 Historical Inaccuracies

From the outset there is contradiction in Québec's White Paper. On the one hand, it refers to Quebecers as "men and women of Québec of whatever origin". Yet, in tracing the origins of Québec and its peoples, their history is described as only "beginning in the 17th century".

While this historical account may accurately reflect the more recent history of Québec's European population, it totally ignores the existence of Inuit and other indigenous peoples since time immemorial in the geographic region now known as the province of Québec. Moreover, the White Paper repeatedly uses such terms as

---

\* See Annex III of this Brief for text of Québec's Referendum Question on Sovereignty-Association.

"discovering", "claiming", "occupying" and "homeland" in describing the historical activities of the ancestors of francophone Quebecers. Ironically, such terms more appropriately describe the use, occupation and other rights of indigenous peoples of Québec, who by definition are its original inhabitants.

Another significant inaccuracy in the White Paper concerns the 1912 territory and its natural resources. In this regard, the White Paper provides:

"Québec's resources are permanent; we do not owe them to a political system, or to specific circumstances. They are a gift of nature, which has favoured us more than others in this respect by allowing us to play a more important economic role, thanks to our resources ..." (Emphasis added)

Far from being a "gift of nature", it was in fact a "gift" by the federal government to Québec through the 1912 Québec Boundaries Extension Acts. It was precisely due to a political system and to specific circumstances that Québec came into possession of this important territory. Moreover, this federal-provincial transfer was effected in the absence of any participation of or consultation with the Inuit of northern Québec.

## 6.2 Comparisons of Inuit and Québec Grievances

Québec has alleged a number of grievances against the federal government in the White Paper. A partial list of those grievances would include:

1. Québec's objection to its colonial ties (page 3 of the White Paper); ↴

2. Québec's objection to being excluded from the economic field, namely, from "big business and industry" (page 7);

3. Québec's objection to a general referendum (on conscription) which bound the francophone minority to the overwhelming majority vote of anglophones in Canada (page 11);

4. Québec's objection that francophones were never regarded in Canada as a society with a history, a culture and aspirations of its own and to the attempts to assimilate them (page 12);

5. Québec's objection to managing programs which are conceived and directed by the federal government and to having its initiative undermined and its priorities set by others (page 20);

6. Québec's objection to federal intervention in cultural matters within Québec (pages 22-23 and 92-93).

The grievances cited above are an indication of Québec's objections to the federal government's attitude in dealing with it. The merit of those alleged grievances may be debated. However, when we examine the record of Québec's treatment of its Inuit minority we find a number of parallel grievances which suggest that it might be appropriate for Québec to set its own house in order:

1. Despite the fact that the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement provides for a decentralization of power and a transfer of programs to the region north of the 55th parallel, Québec, in many cases, is refusing any real power or control to the territory. This colonial attitude is further evidenced by Québec's insistence that the daily administration of regional bodies be in the south, namely, Québec City.

2. With respect to Inuit, Québec shows no indication of facilitating Inuit participation in the economic benefits of non-renewable resource development in the territory. In fact, in the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement, Québec sought to exclude Inuit from having any interest relating to any such resources. This attitude continues to prevail despite the need for our involvement in economic development in the territory.

3. For the reasons we elaborate in section VIII dealing with a separate Inuit referendum, Inuit also have objections to being bound by a simple majority vote by all Québecers in the up-coming Québec referendum.

4. As evidenced in the White Paper and in our comments in this brief, Québec has ignored the history of its indigenous peoples, treated them merely as a linguistic minority and generally denied Inuit, as the majority population in the region, the exercise of adequate control over matters affecting the region.

5. With respect to programs, we have already discussed how the powers of the Regional Government are being interfered with by parallel structures of a

centralized nature and how its priorities are being determined by Québec through manipulation of its budgets.

6. Finally, with respect to cultural matters, Inuit object to Québec laws and policies which deny regional control over archaeological property and sites relating to Inuit ancestry. We also object to our lack of participation in geographic place-naming in the region so as to retain our regional identity. A further objection relates to the concept of aboriginal rights. As discussed on page 8 of this brief, legal recognition of the concept of aboriginal rights continues to be denied to Inuit despite the cultural significance of such rights. In this regard, it is the continuing policy of Québec to eliminate the concept of aboriginal rights insofar as it affects lands.

### 6.3 Implications of the White Paper on Inuit Status, Rights and Interests

As mentioned previously, there is no trust relationship between the government and legislature of Québec and the Inuit. In the event of a sovereign Québec where there would no longer be federal legislative jurisdiction, Inuit would lose the benefit of the federal trust responsibility and our special status under section 91(24) of the B.N.A. Act.

Secondly, there is very little reference in the White Paper to Native peoples. The main paragraph which deals specifically with Indians and Inuit provides as follows:

"The Amerindians and Inuit communities, if they so desire, will be in full possession on their territory of institutions that maintain the integrity of their societies and enable them to develop freely, according to their own culture and spirit." (Emphasis added)

In regard to the Inuit, does the phrase "on their territory" refer to the entire territory above the 55th parallel which is the region provided for in the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement? Or does it refer solely to their communities and immediate surroundings? The fact that the paragraph refers to "Inuit communities" and not to "Inuit" would clearly suggest that the latter interpretation is the correct one. That is, the extent of Inuit self-determination appears to be related solely to the immediate areas within which our communities are located and not to the overall region north of the 55th parallel. The White Paper, in effect, offers little or nothing more than Inuit have already obtained, on a broader regional basis, under the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement.

Moreover, the promise of being in "full possession" of institutions on our territory in the future has little credibility based upon our present experience with Québec's attitude in implementing the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement.

A third fundamental concern relates to the important role envisioned for hydro-electric development in a future sovereign Québec. Most of the undeveloped rivers feasible for major hydro-electric development lie north of the 55th parallel. If Québec is relying primarily on the future development of its renewable hydro-electric resources

to sustain a sovereign Québec, Inuit will face increased pressure on our renewable resource base, mainly wildlife, which is inevitably adversely affected by such projects.

The use of such rivers and their resources by Inuit for subsistence purposes may be in direct conflict with Québec's proposed conversion of such rivers to a single purpose, namely, the production of hydro-electric power. This would lead us to conclude that the price of Québec sovereignty will in part take the form of a continual erosion of Inuit's subsistence rights and other rights pertaining to wildlife resources.

Such a conclusion is not unreasonable in the absence of any attempt in Québec's White Paper, or in its laws and policies to date, to integrate Inuit rights and interests into Québec's overall energy and resource policies. Therefore, we take issue with Premier Lévesque's concluding statement in the White Paper (page 106) that "the recognition of the homeland will not impoverish anyone".

#### 6.4 Incompatibility of Sovereignty-Association with the Basic Principles Underlying James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement

Sovereignty-association by definition excludes federal legislative jurisdiction for all matters affecting a sovereign Québec. On the other hand, the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement specifically affirms a permanent and continuing role for the government and Parliament of Canada in respect to Inuit rights and benefits under the Agreement. Consequently, sovereignty-association is incompatible with the basic principle of continuing federal responsibility for Inuit.

In addition to the trust responsibility provided for in section 91(24) of the B.N.A. Act, the James Bay and Northern Québec Native Claims Settlement Act (Bill C-9) provides in its preamble in part as follows:

"AND WHEREAS Parliament and the Government of Canada recognize and affirm a special responsibility for the said Crees and Inuit".

The function of the preamble in this legislation incorporating the Agreement is to provide guidance in interpretation of the Agreement and to give some indication as to its scope.

When entering into the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement, Inuit considered it a fundamental principle that two government parties be involved. In particular, the role of the federal government was considered to be essential by us due to its continuing trust responsibility which would act as a check and balance in ensuring that Québec carry out its obligations. In addition, the trust responsibility would generally serve to protect Inuit rights and interests. In this regard, Bill C-9 provides:

"The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development shall, within sixty days after the first day of January of every year including and occurring between the years 1978 and 1998, submit to the House of Commons a report on the implementation of the provisions of this Act for the relevant period." (Emphasis added)

It is important to note that although Bill C-9 is a federal law, Québec was involved in its drafting stages and either approved or did not object to its

provisions before the federal government recommended their enactment to Parliament.

A second basis for incompatibility between sovereignty-association and the principles of the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement relates to federal funding obligations to Inuit under the Agreement.\*

While the White Paper pledges to maintain certain acquired rights of classes of individuals, there is no specific reference to the collective and individual rights of Inuit under the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. Presently, with both the federal and provincial governments, Inuit have access to two independent sources of government funding for Inuit economic and social programs and services. In the event of a sovereign Québec, however, there will only be one source of government funding.

We are convinced that in a sovereign Québec, likely to be hard-pressed economically, our remote territory already economically disadvantaged, will be the first to suffer from budgetary cutbacks. Similarly, funding for federal programs provided for by the Agreement, if assumed by a sovereign Québec, would also be subject to severe budgetary cutbacks. Such lack of funding would seriously affect the ability of the Inuit to exercise powers conferred upon regional and local bodies under the Agreement.

In this regard, we remember that during negotiations on Bill C-9, Québec refused to expressly provide in law that the Crown in right of Québec is bound by

---

\* See Annex IV of this Brief for the nature and extent of federal funding obligations under the Agreement.

such legislation. If Québec has been reluctant to expressly bind itself in law to fulfill its existing obligations under the Agreement, we feel that it is unlikely that it would readily fulfill Canada's funding obligations, as well as its own, in the event of a sovereign Québec.

For all these reasons, removal of the federal government as party to the Agreement, in the event of a sovereign Québec, would fundamentally alter the Agreement in respect to existing funding obligations.

## VII INUIT RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION

Generally, there are two forms of self-determination. First, "internal" self-determination of a people refers to, for our own purposes here, the free determination of our political status and free pursuit of our economic, social and cultural development in a regional context within Québec and Canada. Second, "international" self-determination of a people is that described in the international covenants and declaration cited below. Self-determination in the international sense refers to the right to seek an independent State, based on certain established criteria, or some other form of sovereignty, such as sovereignty-association or other form of union with other sovereign states.

### 7.1 Inuit Self-Determination Within the Context of Québec and Canada

To date, Inuit use of the term self-determination has been in the internal sense. In this regard, we have often stated our difficulties in achieving an acceptable level of control of matters affecting us on a regional level.

A list of such difficulties would include the following:

1. Implementation of rights and powers conferred upon Inuit and our regional institutions through the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement;

2. The reluctance of government to build upon the rights and powers provided under the Agreement, to include, more specifically:

i) adequate cultural rights and powers;

ii) meaningful participation by Inuit in natural resource development and management, both renewable and non-renewable;

iii) adequate regional land use powers for the territory north of the 55th parallel; and

iv) adequate regional fiscal powers (taxation);

3. Lack of effective political representation of Inuit in Québec's foremost political institution, namely the National Assembly, at least partly due to the present configuration of electoral boundaries in northern Québec.\*

---

\* See Makivik Brief to the Commission de la Représentation électorale du Québec in Respect to the Region North of the 55th Parallel submitted February 21, 1980.

## 7.2 Inuit Self-Determination on the International Level

As Inuit, we have no intention of declaring our independence from Québec and Canada. While there may be regional differences in many areas of Canada, we remain convinced that constitutional problems of whatever nature can best be resolved through constitutional reforms in Canada. It is, nevertheless, prudent at this time to examine the international criteria established for a people to exercise their right to self-determination on the international level. Inuit of northern Québec may ultimately be compelled, in the likelihood of a sovereign Québec, to decide whether to opt to continue our links with Canada and with other Inuit from Canada or to consent to form part of a sovereign Québec. In such circumstances, we must be aware of the legal and political implications on the international level.

The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) identically provide for the right of self-determination of peoples as follows:

- "1. All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.
2. All peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic cooperation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit and international law. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence."

In addition, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (1970)\* provides the reasoning for the right of self-determination in the following terms:

"... that the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples constituted a significant contribution to contemporary international law, and that its effective application is of paramount importance for the promotion of friendly relations among states, based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality."

In terms of international criteria, no definitive conclusion can be reached at this time in regard to Inuit. However, the Inuit of northern Québec appear to have the following relevant characteristics:

1. Inuit constitute a people;
2. As a people, we live in a defined territory as a distinct majority and are capable of manifesting a common will;
3. There exists a strong will as a people to live together;
4. There exist regional infra-structures to potentially exercise the rights and powers necessary to adequately administer matters affecting Inuit and the territory.

---

\* For a more complete excerpt of the substantive provisions of this Declaration on the Rights of Self-Determination, see Annex V of this Brief

The issue of self-determination on the international level is an extremely complex one. Which peoples gain recognition at such level as having the right to seek self-determination and which peoples are eventually recognized as achieving the status of a sovereign state, is not easily predetermined. It is instead decided by the international community on an ad hoc basis.

### VIII. DECISION FOR SEPARATE INUIT REFERENDUM

#### 8.1 Reasons for abstention in Québec Referendum and Reasons for a Separate Inuit Referendum

In regard to the Québec referendum, the position of Makivik was determined at the annual general meeting at Kangirsualujuak (George River), northern Québec.

The status of the northern Québec Inuit as indigenous peoples gives us the right to represent ourselves in any negotiations on constitutional reform.\* There can be no question of Inuit giving a mandate to any government to negotiate on our behalf the future rights, status, institutions and powers of particular application to us.

---

\* This view has recently been confirmed by Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau in a speech to Indian, Inuit and Métis leaders at the First Nations' Constitutional Conference, Ottawa, April 28-May 1, 1980: "...we set a valuable and historic precedent by involving native peoples directly, with the federal and provincial governments, in the process of the reform of the constitution ... I want to reaffirm tonight that you will continue to be involved in the discussion of constitutional changes which directly affect you."

Moreover, for the reasons indicated in this brief, the Québec referendum on sovereignty-association cannot be recognized by us as a legitimate forum for Inuit to vote on our future aspirations.

Therefore, we would recommend that Inuit abstain from voting in the Québec referendum and at the same time hold a separate Inuit referendum. The purpose of the Inuit referendum is to demonstrate Inuit solidarity and to reaffirm Makivik's mandate to represent Inuit in constitutional discussions with the federal and provincial governments.

Although there are compelling reasons to vote "NO", we recommend abstaining from participation in the Parti Québécois referendum process since even a unanimous "NO" vote by Inuit would imply a recognition that we would be bound by a possible overall "YES" majority vote. Our participation may only serve to weaken our position in any future constitutional forum.

Unlike other minorities in Québec who have no other option and for whom an abstention may be a meaningless exercise, the Inuit, along with the Indians and Métis, will represent themselves at future constitutional talks which will take place regardless of the outcome of the Québec referendum. Both the federal and provincial governments have already begun to recognize Native peoples as valid participants in their own right in federal-provincial discussions on constitutional reform.

It is Makivik's position that we, as Inuit, need to participate directly in any such constitutional

discussions, whether they relate to some form of federalism or to sovereignty-association, or to other options. In this regard, Inuit have a right to know their future status, rights, institutions and interests under each possible constitutional option.

It is for this reason that an appropriate question\* was formulated for a separate Inuit referendum in the territory and the text of such question was approved by the Inuit of northern Québec at the annual general meeting of Makivik.

#### 8.2 Effect of Inuit Referendum Results on Northern Québec Inuit

A majority "Yes" vote by Inuit in the Inuit referendum would reaffirm Makivik's mandate to determine through negotiations possible constitutional agreements with Canada and Québec with respect to the future status, institutions, rights and interests of the Inuit of northern Québec for any of the constitutional options proposed by governments. However, any negotiated agreements regarding such options shall not be binding on Inuit unless ratified by them.

In other words, Makivik's role in the event of a majority "Yes" vote in the Inuit referendum would be to clarify for Inuit the nature and scope of future benefits to Inuit under the various constitutional options.

---

\* See Annex VI of this Brief for text of Inuit referendum question

IX. FUTURE PROTECTIONS TO BE SOUGHT BY MAKIVIK

The rights and protections to be sought by Makivik on behalf of the Inuit of northern Québec may differ to some extent according to the context of constitutional negotiations.

In any case, such rights and protections would include but not be limited to the following:

1. Legal recognition of the concept of aboriginal rights in the Constitution;
2. Special status of Inuit to be entrenched in the Constitution and to be defined and clarified;
3. Adequate jurisdiction for regional and local governments in the territory;
4. Protection in the Constitution of regional and local government powers against undue interference by the Province;
5. Guarantee that relations with Inuit in other areas of Canada, Alaska (U.S.), and Greenland would remain unencumbered and uninterfered with by Canada or Québec, subject to foreign policy considerations;
6. Adequate cultural powers for all matters affecting Inuit interests, including language;
7. Adequate participation of Inuit in matters on the international level affecting our interests;

8. Adequate participation of Inuit in the development and management of renewable and non-renewable resources in the territory;

9. Participation in environmental management in territory and its surrounding areas, including but not limited to Inuit involvement in coastal zone management.

X. INUIT TUNGAIVINGAT NUNAMINI (I.T.N.)

It is common knowledge among Inuit and governments that a main reason for I.T.N.'s existence is its opposition to the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. However, the constitutional discussions with both Québec and Canada present an excellent opportunity to reexamine and perhaps improve upon the rights and benefits in such Agreement since the nature and scope of such discussions go well beyond the matters contained in the Agreement.

As we have indicated above, the mandate which Makivik seeks for the purpose of future constitutional talks is a limited one and any results or agreements arising from such talks are subject to ratification by all Inuit of northern Québec. It is Makivik's firm belief that it is vital for Inuit to demonstrate our unity and common will by collectively participating in the constitutional talks.

If there is any point in the history of the Inuit of northern Québec that Inuit must act together, it is surely now. For Inuit to disregard such constitutional talks, for whatever reason, and not seek adequate participation in them can only result in our rights and

interests being adversely affected. History has repeatedly shown that it is only Inuit who can effectively promote and protect Inuit rights and interests.

Makivik welcomes members of I.T.N. to participate in these purposes and is prepared to include their fundamental concerns wherever possible. Some of our mutual concerns have already been indicated in this brief and they include:

- (a) legal recognition and entrenchment in the Constitution of the concept of aboriginal rights;
- (b) adequate jurisdiction for regional and local governments in the territory to ensure their autonomy;
- (c) adequate participation of Inuit in the development and management of renewable and non-renewable resources in the territory; and
- (d) the establishment of the measures necessary to ensure adequate revenue-sharing on a regional basis.

Makivik is not prepared to relinquish benefits already secured under the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement unless and until such rights and benefits are replaced or reinforced with more substantial ones.

## XI. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As indigenous peoples, Inuit should continue to participate directly and represent ourselves in

any constitutional talks with Canada and Québec with respect to matters particularly affecting us.

2. Inuit of Québec should abstain from voting in Québec's referendum on sovereignty-association for the reasons described in this Brief.

3. Before Québec proceeds any further on its proposal of sovereignty-association, the future status, institutions, rights and powers of Inuit as indigenous people in a sovereign Québec, particularly as beneficiaries of the trust responsibility under section 91(24) of the B.N.A. Act, 1867, must be clearly established.

4. Before Québec proceeds any further on its proposal of sovereignty-association, the incompatibility and uncertainties of the proposal, insofar as all federal and provincial obligations in favour of Inuit in the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement are concerned, must be resolved.

5. Any future constitutional discussions with government should place appropriate emphasis upon recognition of the special significance of the 1912 territory.

6. Inuit right to self-determination as described in this brief should receive clear recognition to the extent and in a manner appropriate to the nature of the constitutional proposals ultimately adopted.

7. Inuit of Québec should reaffirm Makivik's constitutional mandate for the above purposes by a "YES" vote in the Inuit referendum.

A N N E X I

April 18, 1980

MAKIVIK CORPORATION  
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING  
GEORGE RIVER, QUEBEC

RESOLUTION RE SEPARATE INUIT REFERENDUM

WHEREAS proposals for constitutional reform are presently being tabled in Québec and in the rest of Canada;

WHEREAS such proposals give little or no consideration to native rights, status, institutions or powers;

WHEREAS constitutional rights and guarantees for Inuit will only be obtained if we represent ourselves and participate directly in negotiations;

WHEREAS the status of Inuit as indigenous peoples gives us the right to represent ourselves in any negotiations on constitutional reform;

WHEREAS the P.Q. government is requesting, by way of referendum on May 20, 1980, to negotiate Sovereignty-Association;

WHEREAS there can be no question of Inuit giving a mandate to any government to negotiate on our behalf our future rights, status, institutions and powers;

WHEREAS it is both timely and necessary for Inuit to demonstrate our solidarity as a people;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

THAT the Inuit of Northern Québec should abstain from voting in the Québec referendum;

THAT, instead, a separate referendum be held in northern Québec in order to reaffirm Makivik's mandate to represent Inuit in constitutional discussions with federal and provincial Governments;

THAT the Inuit referendum be held on May 14, 1980.

MOVED BY : Zebedee Nungak

SECONDED BY : Joseph Padlayat

ALL IN FAVOUR

A N N E X    II

EXCERPT ON NATIVE RIGHTS FROM QUEBEC LIBERAL PARTY'S  
CONSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL (BEIGE PAPER)

(Pages 83-84) "It is somewhat unusual to consider a group of individuals as a specific jurisdiction to be attributed to a level of government. But this is precisely the way the B.N.A. Act dealt with the first inhabitants of this country. The constitution of 1867 contained very little with respect to their status, merely placing them under federal jurisdiction. In the process of constitutional reform, a more explicit and more generous position is needed. The new Constitution should ensure the native peoples a better status in Canada, and guarantee them respect for their historical rights and their cultural traditions.

There is no question of our proposing a transfer of legislative jurisdiction over the native peoples, as any such transfer should only occur with their consent. We would certainly hope that the native peoples would integrate and participate more in the life of Québec. However, any forced transfer of authority could only serve to further alienate them from Québec and from the Francophone community of Québec. The constitution should rather be concerned with assuring respect to the rights of native peoples which have already been recognized, by treaty or otherwise. It should also affirm our willingness to respect and protect their cultural and linguistic traditions. Their participation in Québec and Canadian life will be a matter for future discussion and negotiation with

them. In any constitutional reform, the native peoples must become the authors of their own destiny, and not mere subjects of jurisdiction.

We believe, however, that constitutional reform should recognize the existence of these groups. It should also recognize specific rights in linguistic, cultural and educational matters, as we have outlined in the chapter on fundamental rights. A revised constitution should provide that treaties negotiated with the native peoples take precedence over legislation. Finally, it should respect their special hunting and fishing rights.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The constitution should make explicit the status of the native peoples.
2. The constitution should guarantee respect for their rights and their cultural inheritance.
3. In the course of negotiations on the adoption of a new constitution, the native peoples should be represented and consulted."

A N N E X    I I I

QUEBEC'S REFERENDUM QUESTION ON SOVEREIGNTY-ASSOCIATION

The Government of Québec has made public its proposal to negotiate a new agreement with the rest of Canada, based on the equality of nations; this agreement would enable Québec to acquire the exclusive power to make its laws, levy its taxes and establish relations abroad - in other words, sovereignty - and at the same time, to maintain with Canada an economic association including a common currency.

No change in political status resulting from these negotiations will be effected without the approval by the people through another referendum; on these terms, do you give the Government of Québec the mandate to negotiate the proposed agreement between Québec and Canada?

Y E S / N O

ANNEX IV

FEDERAL FUNDING OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE JAMES BAY AND NORTHERN QUEBEC AGREEMENT

Section or Subsection	Description	Time Period	Comments
2.12	Continuation of federal programs and funding	continuing indefinitely	
6.4	Possible relocation of Inuit of Great Whale River to Richmond Gulf	to be negotiated	
15 Schedule 1 (Paragraph 4)	Improvement of health and social services for certain existing as well as all new communities	to begin immediately and to continue	joint obligation with Québec
17.0.84	Maintain adequate funding for educational services and programs to the population of the territory	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec
17.0.85	Contribution to the annual budget of the Kativik School Board	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec to be reviewed every five years
24.3.24	Assist in establishment of trappers' association and trapping industry	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec
24.10.2	Training programs for Inuit conservation officer	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec
25.1.5	Compensation payments	over 10 years from March 31, 1976	joint obligation with Québec

Section or Subsection	Description	Time Period	Comments
29.0.2	Federal programs, funding and technical assistance for Inuit economic and social development	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec. The administration of the federal programs are to be assumed by the Regional Government or the municipalities as appropriate
29.0.25	Vocational training programs and facilities for present and future jobs in the territory	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec
29.0.29 29.0.30	Training and employment of Inuit staff within bureaucracy of the Territory	continuing indefinitely	-joint obligation with Québec -in consultation with Regional Government
29.0.36	Undertake studies respecting establishment of seaplane bases, public wharfs, airstrips, navigational aids and docking facilities, including access roads and streets in each community	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec
29.0.39	Support of Inuit entrepreneurs by providing them with technical and professional advice and financial assistance	continuing indefinitely	joint obligation with Québec

A N N E X V

DECLARATION OF 1970 (excerpt)  
UNITED NATIONS

The principle of Equal Rights and Self-Determination of peoples

By virtue of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, all peoples have the right freely to determine, without external interference, their political status and to pursue their economic, social and cultural development, and every State has the duty to respect this right in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

Every State has the duty to promote, through joint and separate action, realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, and to render assistance to the United Nations in carrying out the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter regarding the implementation of the principles, in order:

(a) To promote friendly relations and co-operation among States; and

(b) To bring a speedy end to colonialism, having due regard to the freely expressed will of the peoples concerned;

and bearing in mind that subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation

constitutes a violation of the principle, as well as a denial of fundamental human rights, and is contrary to the Charter.

Every State has the duty to promote through joint and separate action universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms in accordance with the Charter.

The establishment of a sovereign and independent State, the free association or integration with an independent State or the emergence into any other political status freely determined by a people constitute modes of implementing the right of self-determination by that people.

Every State has the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples referred to above in the elaboration of the present principle of their right to self-determination and freedom and independence. In their actions against, and resistance to, such forcible action in pursuit of the exercise of their right to self-determination, such peoples are entitled to seek and to receive support in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

The Territory of a colony or other Non-Self-Governing Territory has, under the Charter, a status separate and distinct from the territory of the State administering it; and such separate and distinct states under the Charter shall exist until the people of the colony or Non-Self-Governing Territory have exercised their right of self-determination in accordance with the Charter, and particularly its purposes and principles.

Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs shall be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States conducting themselves in compliance with the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples as described above and thus possessed of a government representing the whole people belonging to the territory without distinction as to race, creed or colour.

Every state shall refrain from any action aimed at the partial, or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of any other State or country.

A N N E X VI

INUIT REFERENDUM QUESTION

The Government of Québec is requesting a mandate from the people of Québec to negotiate sovereignty-association which would fundamentally alter, without Inuit consent, the status and relationships which the Inuit of northern Québec have with the governments of Canada and Québec.

Do you give Makivik Corporation the mandate to negotiate constitutional agreements with Canada and Québec with respect to the status, institutions, rights and interests of the Inuit of northern Québec? Any such agreements would be binding only if ratified by the Inuit of northern Québec.

YES

NO

ΔCPLC

ΩH°NPPΔCPN° ΔΘΩΔΩσ° ΔΚΔ°  
C9°ΣσΓΔσ° βελCησΓ° ΔLΩ  
Λ°δ4°κΔ° ΛεηΔ°CΔσ°Σ°

ΔLΩ

NC4DLσ°Σ° ΣΔPPΔCJηΔησ  
Λ°δ4°κΔ°Cησ°Σ°C LPA° ΔΔ>ηΔ°

LPA° ΔΔ>ηη  
LΔ, 1980









**TERRITOIRE DE L'ENTENTE  
AGREEMENT TERRITORY**

-  Extension des frontières (1898)  
Boundary extension (1898)
-  Extension des frontières (1912)  
Boundary extension (1912)
-  Territoire de la S.D.B.J.  
J.B.D.C. territory

1912

1898

1898

TERRE DE LOT

BAIE HUDSON

DISTRICT JUDICIAIRE DE L'ARCTIC

CHASSE DE SAINT-LAURENT

NOUVEAU BRUNSWICK

ILE DU PRINCE EDOUARD

OCEAN ATLANTIQUE

QUEBEC

FREDERICTON

OTTAWA

HALIFAX

MONTREAL

OTTAWA

SHARONVILLE

CHATEAUGUAY

SHARONVILLE





























Δεῦτε ἄνθρωποι τῆς γῆς ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ὅτι ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν· ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

4.4 βίβλος ματθαίου

· Ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὁ οὐρανὸς ἔστιν ἔμπροσθέντων ὑμῶν ὡς ἴδωσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵνα ἴδωσθε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.



























































ΔΕΛΤΑΝ ΠΡΩΤΟ I

ΛΡΑΒ ΔΑΓΡΗ  
Δ'ΓΥΛΛ'ΝΔΝ ΒΗΛΟΛΛ  
Β'Υ'Λ'Α'Α'Γ, ΔΚΔ'Γ

ΔΡΑΝ ΔΟΔΔΔ' ΔΓ'Υ'Α'Γ' ΔΡ'Δ'Ν'Δ'Δ'  
ΔΡ'Δ'Ν'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Α'Γ' Γ'Υ'Δ'

ΔΛΔΛ': Δ'Ρ'Υ'Λ'Δ'Ν'Δ'Υ'Λ'Λ' Λ'Υ'Δ'Υ'Δ' Δ'Λ'Δ'Υ'Α'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Υ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
ΔΚΔ'Γ Β'Ε'Ε'Δ'Γ'Δ;

ΔΛΔΛ': Δ'Λ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Ρ'Υ'Λ'Δ'Ν'Δ'Υ'Λ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Λ'Υ'Δ'Δ'  
Υ'Λ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ', Δ'Ρ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ', Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Ρ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ';

ΔΛΔΛ': Λ'Υ'Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'  
Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Υ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ';

ΔΛΔΛ': Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'  
Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Λ'Υ'Δ'Υ'Δ' Δ'Λ'Δ'Υ'Α'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ';

ΔΛΔΛ': Δ'Υ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'  
1980 Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Υ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Υ'Δ'  
Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ' Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'Δ'  
Δ'Δ'Δ';

ΔΛΔΛ: ΔΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔΔΔ

ΔΛΔΛ: ΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔΔΔΔ

ΔΛΔΛ ΔΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔΔ:

ΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ

ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ

ΔΔΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ  
ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ ΔΔ ΔΔ 14, 1980-Γ

ΔΔΔΔΔ: ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ

ΔΔΔΔ: ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ

ΔΔΔΔΔ: ΔΔΔ ΔΔΔ









<p>40006000 40006000 40006000</p>	<p>Պատճառ</p>	<p>Վճարումների համարներ</p>	<p>Վճարումների համարներ</p>
<p>29.0.2.</p>	<p>Երկրորդ կարգի, բաշխվող և օգտագործվող ձեռնարկների մաս մատչելի և մատչելի չափով</p>	<p>Երկրորդ և Վճարումներ</p>	<p>Վճար Երկրորդ բաշխվողների մատչելի և կարգի մատչելի մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և</p>
<p>29.0.25.</p>	<p>Վճարումների մաս մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և</p>	<p>Երկրորդ և Վճարումներ</p>	<p>Վճար Երկրորդ բաշխվողների</p>
<p>29.0.29 29.0.30</p>	<p>Վճարումների և մատչելիների մաս մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և</p>	<p>Երկրորդ և Վճարումներ</p>	<p>Վճար Երկրորդ բաշխվողների</p>
<p>29.0.36</p>	<p>Վճարումների մաս մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և</p>	<p>Երկրորդ և Վճարումներ</p>	<p>Վճար Երկրորդ բաշխվողների</p>
<p>29.0.39</p>	<p>Վճարումների մաս մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և մատչելի և</p>	<p>Երկրորդ</p>	<p>Վճար Երկրորդ բաշխվողների</p>

ΔΕΛΤΑ ΠΝ V

ΛΥΠΕΛΑΡΔ'6J° CΩ ΔΕΛΤΑ ΠΝ°  
ΩΡΥΡΓΥΝ°ΗΔΝΘ CΩΣ V-Γ C°6CΔJ°°  
ΔΘ°ΝJ°C°ΝJ°ΕΝCΔ°ΡL°. ΡΥΔΘC CΩ  
ΥC°ΥΔΓ ΔC°ΘΝΡΥΔΡ°° ΔΘΘ° JH°CΔ-  
JLJΕΔL° CΛΩ ΘΚΔ°Γ ΘΞLΘ° ΛΘΝΔ°C°6  
ΔΗLΡΗJ ΘΚΔ°Γ ΔΓJ° ΘΩ°69ΗΔΘ ΔC C-  
ΡΥΔΘ°6Θ°°.

CΔLΔL° LΡΔ° JH°ΝΥΔ9ΗΔC°J°°  
ΡΩΔCΛJ° CΘΔ ΥC°ΥΔΓ ΔC°ΘΝ°  
96-Θ°° ΩΡ°6ΝΔ9JΘ°L°6C LΔ,14,1980  
ΝΡΔΝCΔ°ΝΩJ ΕCΔΝJ° Δ°6CΛJ°Ρ°.

