COMMISSION ROYALE SUR LES PEUPLES AUTOCHTONES

ROYAL COMMISSION ON ABORIGINAL PEOPLES

LOCATION/ENDROIT: **CITADEL INN, BALLROOM C, OTTAWA, ONTARIO**

DATE: **TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1993**

VOLUME: **2**

"for the record..."
STENOTRAN
1376 Kilborn Ave.
OTTAWA 521-0703

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Citadel Inn
Ottawa, Ontario

November 2, 1993

Ottawa, Ontario

--- Upon resuming at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1993

COPRÉSIDENT RENÉ DUSSAULT: Bonjour. Good morning.

I would like to welcome the representatives from the Inuit Women's Association that we are going to hear this morning. Before moving ahead, I would like to ask Elder Leah Idlout-Paulson to say the prayer.

(Opening Prayer)

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: First of all, I would like to introduce the Commissioners. On my left is Bertha Wilson, former judge with the Supreme Court of Canada, first woman appointed to the court; Peter Meekison, who joined us last June; Peter is a professor with the University of Alberta; Mary Sillett, formerly closely associated with the Inuit Women's Association, a well-known Inuk person; Viola Robinson, former head of the Native Council of Canada; Georges Erasmus, Co-Chair of the Commission; and myself, René Dussault; I am a judge

with the Court of Appeal for the province of Quebec.

This morning we are going to hear the presentation by the Inuit Women's Association. I understand that it is going to be done mostly in Inuktitut; so we have translation from Inuktitut to English and then French. I will ask the presenters to speak slowly in order to keep the pace with the translator.

I would like at this point to ask the Inuit Women's Association to introduce their representatives this morning, and you may proceed whenever you are ready. Thank you.

MARTHA FLAHERTY, President, Pauktuutit (Inuit Women's Association): (Inuktitut - English translation) First of all, I would like to thank you for being able to come here and present our views. First of all, I would like to say that my name is Martha Flaherty, and I am the President of Paukuutit. These people will introduce themselves to you.

MARTHA GREIG, Vice-President, Pauktuutit (Inuit Women's Association): (Inuktitut - English translation) Thank you. My name is Martha Greig. I am the Vice-President for Pauktuutit. Like Martha said -- so that the translators don't go through so much

strain -- as Inuit -- (no English translation available).

(English) That's why I want to do some of it in English, because I speak slower in English.

(Inuktitut - no English translation available).

SIMONA BARNES, Economic Development Officer, Pauktuutit (Inuit Women's Association): (Inuktitut - English translation) My name is Simona Hunuksiuk (PH) Barnes, Economic Development.

MARY CRNKOVICH, Legal Advisor, Pauktuutit (Inuit Women's Association): My name is Crnkovich.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: (Inuktitut - English translation) I would like to thank Leah for being able to come here too. I think we can resume with my presentation.

(English) I will speak in English first, but when there are questions, I will probably be speaking in Inuktitut. If I am too fast, let me know.

Pauktuutit was created in 1984 and it represents all Canadian Inuit women. Our mandate is to foster a greater awareness of the needs of Inuit women and to encourage their participation in community,

regional and national affairs. During the last nine years, issues such as violence against women and children, gender equality, economic development, the administration of justice, traditional midwifery, child care, AIDS education, and youth suicide have emerged as priority concerns among the Inuit women we represent. Pauktuutit also has a mandate to represent all Inuit -- women, men and children -- on issues in the health field.

Thirty years after the movement from traditional camps into permanent settlements, Inuit society is still in transition. Our elders lived through this transition -- they are our historians, our teachers, the caretakers of our culture. Most of the generation now between the ages of 35 and 50 grew up knowing two very different worlds: the Inuit world of our parents and grandparents as well as the English-speaking southern world we learned about in school. Many young people today are most familiar with the southern lifestyle that has overtaken our communities through television and the imposition of education, justice, health and social services systems.

The many social problems which tend to cluster around societies in transition are evident in our

communities. Inuit youth are committing suicide at rates far higher than the national average. Unemployment, family violence, alcohol and drug abuse, the high cost of living and the erosion of the traditional economic base add to the layers of stress on the Inuit family. Our children are growing up in families and communities dealing with unbelievably high levels of stress.

A survey of the views of Inuit women on contemporary issues carried out by Pauktuutit notes that "Parents are struggling to raise their children well in a world caught between two cultures, at a time when everything is still changing and the final outcome is unknown.", in a publication called "Arnait", from 1990. At this point in our history we are dealing with so many problems, and there is so much that needs to be accomplished, that we can be overwhelmed if we lose sight of our basic strengths.

What are our strengths? As Inuit, we have a rich, vibrant culture. We have a long history of survival under adverse conditions, a living, working language, and a value system which includes cherishing our children and respecting our elders. We know how to work co-operatively and we have a history of sharing even

in times of famine. These are our strengths. They should be the foundation of any long-term strategies to improve the health of our families and communities and engender pride and self-respect in our children.

As we move through this transitional period, our goal is to transform dependency into self-reliance, so that we are once again a healthy, productive people. We need to keep in touch with our past, not romanticize it, and build on our culture and traditions. We also need to use and adapt southern technologies which meet our current needs.

This brief examines some of the issues we are dealing with, outlines the action we have taken and makes recommendations for further action.

Inuit Women in Inuit Society.

In "Arnait: the Views of Inuit Women on Contemporary Issues", published by Pauktuutit in 1990, women speak about the traditional and contemporary roles of women in the family, the community and Inuit society. With regard to traditional roles, "... there is agreement that women were traditionally responsible for decisions regarding children, food preparation and the running of the camp." While clear divisions of labour along gender

lines existed, women's and men's work was equally valued. If a woman was a sloppy sewer, her husband might freeze; a man who was a poor hunter would have a hungry family. Everyone in the camp worked hard and everyone had a specific role based on their age, gender and capabilities.

There was one area, however, where gender had a negative impact on the status of Inuit women. This is the fact that boy children were traditionally more highly valued than girls. As the southern practice of devaluing women's unpaid work in the home penetrated the North, women began to lose status in Inuit society. Gender equality has thus become an important issue among Inuit women.

In addition to the shift in values from "different but equal" to "different and definitely not equal" is the reality of very high unemployment in the North. In many families, it is the woman who is able to find work, yet many men feel belittled staying at home with the children and doing housework. In most cases where only the wife is employed, she remains entirely responsible for the running of the home and for making child care arrangements. To complicate matters further, a study by Janet Mancini Billson indirectly links male unemployment

in the North to wife battering. Billson states:

"When Inuit families moved to the settlements, females seemed to adapt more easily to the new life. Today they are more likely than men to complete their high school educations, to obtain and hold jobs - and less likely to develop problems with alcohol, drugs and crime. Now the roles in a wage-employment, consumer economy are reversed, and the women, especially the younger women, are more likely to be the major providers for their families. This may constitute the central, underlying reason for the alarming rates of spousal assault that plague northern communities: men feel threatened by their loss of status and identity, by the increased power and identity of women -- to restore their sense of balance of power, men hit the

women."

It is true that Inuit women are working outside of the home in increasing numbers, and they are also actively involved in the myriad of committees and boards which have sprung up in most communities. But women have maintained their responsibilities in the home and for childrearing. Furthermore, women are unofficially filling the gaps in social services in the North. More and more women are taking on a care-giving role at the community level, counselling and supporting friends and family members in crisis.

Pauktuutit's role in publicly addressing such issues as family violence, child sexual abuse, sexual assault, AIDS and numerous other health and social issues has reinforced the perception that these things fall into the female sphere of influence. This is not bad in itself, but it means that there is incredible pressure on individual women and the organizations which represent them to right the wrongs and heal the wounds that three decades of change have brought to the North. Women cannot continue to shoulder this responsibility on our own.

Leadership Issues.

In 1992 Pauktuutit's Annual General Assembly passed a resolution calling on all Inuit organizations to develop and implement codes of conduct for their leadership. These codes are to be developed with the active participation of Inuit women. Pauktuutit is still in the process of developing its own code of conduct, and we hope that other organizations will either develop their own or adopt Pauktuutit's once it is completed. We understand that the Government of the Northwest Territories is also working on a code of conduct for members of the Legislative Assembly.

While we face a number of technical difficulties in terms of the behaviours and sanctions we can legally include in our code, Inuit women have been very clear about what they expect from their leadership. Good leaders have man of the following qualities: fairness, high moral standards, commitment, honesty, the respect of their communities, kindness, understanding and the willingness to listen. Characteristics and behaviours which are unacceptable in leaders include dishonesty, insensitivity, unfairness, abuse of alcohol or drugs, wife battering, child abuse, racism, prejudice and "ashamed to be an Inuk". In general, more Inuit women

believe that women make good leaders than believe in good male leadership.

In spite of this, Inuit women are still under-represented in leadership positions. This is particularly true in relation to issues which are seen as falling more naturally into the male sphere of influence -- that is, land claims, economic development, self-government, renewable resource management. Inuit women must be well represented on all decision-making bodies, including all boards and committees operating at the local, regional and national levels. Moreover, to be effective in areas where women have historically been excluded, some orientation or training must be available. The need for this is evident in the following example.

Pauktuutit wrote to a particular organization noting the need for women to be represented on their board and asking for a seat. After a few months of negotiations, it was agreed that one of Pauktuutit's board of directors would be invited to participate in this organization's meetings at their expense. Our board member attended two meetings and was just beginning to get a handle on the issues when a letter arrived saying that because she had not contributed to the discussions

her expenses would no longer be covered. Naturally, she was free to attend at Pauktuutit's expense. Unfortunately, Pauktuutit's limited budget did not allow for this.

In summary, mechanisms must be established to ensure the involvement of Inuit women in decision-making at all levels, and training and orientation should be available for all people -- men, women, elders and youth -- who wish to be involved in boards, committees and other decision-making bodies. We must open up our leadership to include under-represented groups such as women, youth and elders. In addition, we must develop ways of holding our leadership accountable for their behaviour. In the past, certain immoral and unacceptable behaviours have gone unchecked in our leaders because we were dependent on their expertise and skills. The solution to this dilemma is to open up our leadership by actively recruiting women, youth and elders and providing them with the appropriate orientation and training.

Family Violence and Violence Against Women.

At Pauktuutit, we have dealt so much and

so often with family violence that sometimes we think that there is nothing more to say on the issue. However, we are always brought back to reality by the painful, personal stories of individual women. In spite of all of the discussions which have taken place over the past few years, the conditions which allow violence to occur and reoccur remain unchanged. These conditions are numerous, and many are interconnected. They include gender inequality; cultural alienation; the combined impact of poverty, dependence and the erosion of traditional lifestyles and economies; alcohol and drug abuse; overcrowded and inadequate housing; lack of control over the governments and institutions which run the North; and a general lack of responsiveness by police and the courts. Some Inuit communities now have access to services such as women's shelters and support groups for victims of violence, but these services are necessarily focused on helping women in crisis rather than alleviating the problem.

Pauktuutit's Annual General Meetings have resulted in many resolutions calling for increased crisis intervention services such as shelters and safe homes and for treatment programs for men who batter and abuse. We have also published booklets and newsletters,

held workshops and conferences, and participated in the work of the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women. The Panel's report contains a section on Inuit women and the specific problems we face. Pauktuutit has served as a vehicle for increasing public awareness of issues of violence and abuse, and in this we have been very successful. But it is now time to move on.

Our work in the future must take place simultaneously on a variety of levels. We will continue to speak out against violence and abuse wherever it occurs. We are also encouraging men to become involved. In Kuujjuaq, at our 1992 Annual General Meeting, delegates passed a resolution encouraging "men to work with women in addressing family violence, child sexual abuse, and violence against women and children, and in developing and implementing solutions to these serious social problems." We believe that we cannot progress any further without the active participation of men.

We are also beginning to turn our attention to healing the deep psychological wounds caused by abuse -- wounds which, left to fester, can lead to self-abusive behaviour and emotional chaos. We held a healing workshop at this year's Annual General Meeting

in Goose Bay and we are planning a follow-up workshop n 1994. Pauktuutit is also publishing a booklet on basic counselling skills. This booklet is called "Tamainnut" -- meaning "for everyone" - and we hope it will assist the many Inuit women, and men, in our communities who are providing informal counselling and support services to friends and family members. It also promotes the concept that Inuit are very capable of helping ourselves and each other.

In order to deal effectively with the problems which family violence creates, there is a desperate need for emergency services, including shelters and safe homes in every community and prompt action on the part of police and the courts. We also require longer-term services such as counselling and support for victims of violence and abuse and for children who witness violent acts, and treatment programs for men who batter and abuse. These services must be designed and administered by Inuit so that they are culturally relevant; for example, healing circles have become a popular response, but these are rooted in other Aboriginal groups, not in Inuit culture.

Our real goal, however, is to end all

forms of violence and abuse in our communities. This will only happen when the conditions which exacerbate violence are dealt with -- alcohol and drug abuse, the devaluation of women and girls, poverty and dependence, overcrowded housing and economic instability. We also need our communities to be places which provide opportunities for personal healing and growth, and our lands, economies and institutions to be Inuit controlled.

Inuit Women and Justice.

Pauktuutit's work in the justice area evolved from our concerns over how the courts were responding in cases involving violence against women and children. These concerns centred around the treatment of victims of abuse and assault by police, lawyers and judges; the lack of support services for victims who must go to court; racial, cultural and gender prejudice and insensitivity at all levels of the justice system; and sentencing practices in cases of wife battering, sexual assault and child sexual abuse. These concerns, in turn, have led to our desire to see Inuit women more involved in initiatives aimed at reforming the existing system or designing alternative systems. In effect, Pauktuutit has become immersed in justice-related issues.

In 1992 Pauktuutit received funding from the federal Department of Justice to undertake a study on Inuit women and the justice system. Through this study we are hearing from many women about their encounters with the justice system and their concern that the system only victimizes them further. The following quote tells of one woman's feelings after appearing in court. She says: "... I felt that I was the accused ... it felt like, why did I even tell anyone anything happened. I should have kept my mouth shut because I don't think anyone in the courts heard me or even know how I was feeling. I'm tired of people walking all over me. This has got to end. ... Women have no say in what happens to them."

Feelings like this are not uncommon among women who have made a decision to report sexual assaults. We believe that the use of Victim Impact Statements by the courts can help create a better understanding of how violent crimes affect victims. Delegates to Pauktuutit's 1993 Annual General Meeting

passed the following resolution on the justice system and violence against women and children. This resolution reads:

"WHEREAS delegates to Pauktuutit's Annual General Meetings deal year after year with the long term and ongoing effects of child sexual abuse, sexual assault, and family violence in the lives of women, children, families, and communities;

AND WHEREAS, year after year, resolutions are passed condemning violence and abuse and calling for the development of community-based counselling and support services for victims of violence and abuse and counselling and treatment for offenders;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That Pauktuutit affirms its commitment to work towards the alleviation of all forms of violence and abuse in Inuit communities;

2. That all levels of the justice system, including

police, the courts, Crown lawyers, judges and Justices of the Peace be urged to make a clear statement that violence, sexual assault and child sexual abuse are serious crimes and that their actions and decisions will reflect the seriousness of the offense;

3. That the Crown and courts make use of Victim Impact Statements in all cases of family violence, child sexual abuse and sexual assault;

4. That governments be urged to focus resources on creating, supporting and improving community level services for victims of violence and abuse including special support services for victims, counselling, shelter and housing services."

That was carried unanimously.

Pauktuutit's Justice Project is ongoing and thus our findings are not complete. Starting this fall, regional consultations are being held throughout

the North. In each region, women will get together to discuss issues of particular concern to them. In Labrador, for example, topics will include policing and victim services; in Nunavik women will participate in an evaluation of the Inuit Justice Task Force report; and in the Baffin region work will focus on community-based justice initiatives and developing a victims advocacy network.

At this stage in our work, there is a strong sense that radical changes are required in the way justice is delivered in the North, but specific proposals have yet to be developed. We know that changes are required at a variety of levels and that Inuit women must be active and equal participants in the negotiations and processes which will determine how Inuit will administer our own systems of justice.

It is critical that these processes do not proceed without us. While cultural and historic differences exist in the way Inuit and southern society approach crime and punishment, gender differences also exist in both societies. Inuit and southern women have had similarly negative experiences with the existing system's inability to deal fairly with victims of violence

and abuse. Gender bias is inherent in the justice system the North has inherited, and it is so pervasive that even Inuit society, with its distinct set of traditions and values, sometimes views women as being responsible for the abuse they have suffered. For example, replacing southern male police officers with Inuit male police officers, but changing nothing in the way police services are delivered, will probably not lead to any further protection for Inuit women and children.

We must move towards change at as fast a pace as possible, but the inacceptability of the current justice system should not push us into moving so quickly that women and children are left behind. All Inuit justice initiatives must include Inuit women as full and equal partners from conception to implementation.

I will now ask Martha Greig, who has worked on midwifery intensively, to read the next section.

MARTHA GREIG: (Inuktitut - English translation) Thank you, Martha. I will try to slow my pace because the translator is having a hard time. I will be reading in English.

(English) I will speak on the traditional midwifery and child care, because I was a

researcher, I went to ten communities, and I will just read through -- usually I speak from the heart, but this is nicely prepared for me, so I have it easy this time around.

Traditional Midwifery and Childbirth.

The issue on traditional midwifery clearly illustrates the problems Inuit women face in our dealings with the health care system. Until very recently, Inuit women gave birth on the land, alone or with the assistance and support of husbands, mothers, sisters, or midwives. Over the past years, Inuit midwives developed a body of knowledge and a set of skills which were passed on through generations of women.

This began to change during the 1950s and 1960s when Inuit families moved from their traditional camps into permanent settlements. In the settlements births took place at the nursing station often with a nurse-midwife and Inuit midwives in attendance. By the 1970s the federal government had decided that all births should take place in hospitals; Inuit women living in communities without hospital services were evacuated by air to a regional centre or to southern Canada.

Today, almost all Inuit children are

born in a hospital often far away from home and family. Pregnant women are still flown out of their communities, sometimes many weeks before the birth. Left behind are husbands and children and all forms of family and community support.

The current debate about traditional midwifery is an interesting one because Inuit women are definitely not advocating a simple return to the old ways. Rather, we are seeking a combination of traditional Inuit midwifery and western medicine. We would like our culture, traditional practices and values to be respected; we want recognition of the fact that our traditional approaches to pregnancy and childbirth worked well for thousands of years, or we wouldn't all be sitting here -- the punch line; nobody was laughing, and I don't like serious stuff; have humour and you will live longer -- and we would like to find alternatives to the present system of removing pregnant women from their families at the time of birth. We seek alternatives which benefit the entire family and which do not expose women and newborn infants to unnecessary risk; alternatives which allow us to feel pride and respect in ourselves and our culture. To us, healthy children are born into their family and their

community: they are not born thousands of miles from home to an unhappy, frightened mother.

Unfortunately, the debate we often find ourselves engaged in is premised on a disrespect for our history and for the knowledge and skills which many of our elders still possess. We often find ourselves on the defensive, endlessly declaring that we, too, are concerned about maternal and infant mortality rates. We have not been allowed to engage in this debate as equals. Recognition of our traditional skills, knowledge, values and approaches to life is necessary, not just around issues of childbirth but in all spheres.

Pauktuutit strongly recommends that changes be made to the health care system to allow women to regain control of pregnancy and childbirth. In many areas, this may mean the development of regional birthing centres; in others, it might mean providing nursing stations, which are now health centres, with the necessary staff and equipment to safely accommodate childbirth. In all cases, it means utilizing the skills of Inuit elders as teachers and midwives and setting up training or apprenticeship programs so that younger Inuit women can develop midwifery skills without leaving their home

community.

That's my report for the midwifery, but, if there are questions, I can try to answer them later.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: Martha is done now. I am going to ask Simona, concerning economic development, to read that section because she deals with that section.

SIMONA BARNES: Community Economic Development and Child Care.

For Inuit women, economic development is community development. We do not see the point of a few individuals or families becoming rich if the rest of the community is experiencing unemployment and poverty. Most government economic development programs and strategies are designed to assist those few individuals who can manoeuvre the system; they are not designed with community development in mind.

Moreover, they are not designed with women in mind. For women to participate in the economic development of their communities, reliable, affordable child care services must be available. This is essential, yet child care is almost never included in any economic development programs. We recommend that all economic development initiatives have a child care component. The

availability of on-site daycare should also be considered in the development of any facilities to house new economic ventures.

Two projects currently under development in the North illustrate the holistic way Inuit women approach economic development. The first is in Arctic Bay. The women's group has been working for the past two years to establish a facility which would incorporate a sewing centre and a daycare centre. It is a community-driven initiative supported by Kakivak Association, which is the Baffin Region Inuit Economic Development Organization, or CEDO, in partnership with Pauktuutit. The women's group is currently in the process of developing a business plan, and an initial grant was secured from the Social Justice Fund of the Canadian Auto Workers Union to offset the costs of an architectural concept to accompany the business plan.

The second project is in Igloolik. The Nalluat Women's Group plans to develop a facility to make and sell traditional clothing and also offer peer counselling services for victims of family violence. Women in Igloolik are not artificially separating their needs in order to fit into existing programs and funding

guidelines: women can come to the centre to sew, to teach or learn traditional sewing, to sell their work, to deal with personal problems, or any combination of these things. Both the Igloolik and Arctic Bay projects still require funding and both will have to find a funding source without a conventionally narrow view of economic development.

It is more than coincidental that both of these projects are in the Baffin Region of the Northwest Territories and that the Baffin CEDO -- Kakivak -- is the only regional economic development organization which has hired someone to work specifically on women's economic development issues. Therefore, we recommend that all northern economic development programs, initiatives and organizations hire and train personnel to work directly with Inuit women. Ideally, these positions should be filled by bilingual Inuit women.

A further barrier to women's participation in community economic development is that we have difficulty accessing funds to start small businesses. Women are often interested in starting businesses which require very little capital, but most financial institutions and economic development programs are more interested in supporting large scale projects.

Women have a very difficult time getting their "small" projects taken seriously. The difficulty increases if the woman does not speak English or French, is an elder, or does not use or understand terms such as "feasibility study" and "cash flow projections". Inuit women require access to capital and financial services to support the development of small businesses and income generating activities. One way to meet this need is through the development of credit unions in the North.

In addition, Inuit women require training in the following areas: basic skill development including bookkeeping and record keeping; organizational development; and entrepreneurial skills, including developing a business plan, and financial planning. Because economic development activities and workshops often exclude women, Inuit women have difficulty accessing training even when it is available.

As noted earlier, the expertise of Inuit women in dealing with social issues is being recognized, but how can social issues be separated from economic issues? Where is unemployment, poverty and dependence separate from physical and emotional well-being or from the problems of youth suicide, alcohol and drug abuse,

and ill-nourished children? Economic development cannot be isolated in a category of its own; all policies and programs must be designed, or redesigned, to include a more holistic perspective.

What I would like to do now is clarify the part about economic development. I mentioned credit unions in the Northwest Territories. Inuit women, when they met their AGM in 1992 in Kuujjuaq, passed a resolution in support of the credit union development in the Inuit communities. Because there are no banking institutions, Inuit women saw that a banking institution that local people had a say and control over would stand to benefit all Inuit membership, meaning men, women, family members, especially if they were interested in starting their own small businesses where women have difficulty accessing funds. We supported it because a credit union would be under local ownership and local control of the Inuit community. Secondly, it will provide training of local banking staff where women would be able to participate.

It is up to the community members to decide how involved they wish to be in the credit union movements or the co-operative movements in general if we are talking about credit union development in the North.

It is up to the community to say how they want to be involved.

The other thing that we said is, we did not make any specific recommendations with respect to changing program guidelines or develop co-operative practices or corporation practices. Therefore, we would like to recommend that, for any developments, there needs to be local ownership and control over their own affairs.

Some of the changes that would make sense to us at the Inuit women's level are, when it comes to our program dollars and developmental dollars, that we recognize that northern Inuit communities are very remote and require special considerations, especially when it comes to national funding. For any economic development activity, before we even look at operational costs, in the North we have to consider the high cost of living, such as travel, transportation costs, education and information factors to be built into the proposal. In other words, when it comes to national economic or training initiatives, we need to take into account the high cost of living by way of equalization. This is so that the Northerners aren't getting short-changed with the development program dollars allocated across the national

boards. We need to address equalization so that we can benefit from the program developmental dollars.

Thank you.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: (Inuktitut - English translation) Thank you.

I am going to end the report -- (English) on education.

"People going through the education system are lost to their parents; parents no longer understand them. ... There is a lot of misunderstanding. Older people lost their voices as younger people told them they don't now..."

This is a translation of words spoken by Elder Rhoda Karetak to a symposium on "Art and Social Change" held last February at the Banff Centre for the Arts. Rhoda was speaking about the dramatic lifestyle changes she has personally experienced and the effect this had had on her relationship with her children. Although she supports education "if it has a use", she is concerned about its impact on Inuit culture and traditions. This is what she said:

"When the schools came, a lot of Inuit gave up their power to the education system and left their own people behind. Inuit are very influenced by other people, and there has been a loss of many of our traditions. ... We are living a lifestyle not really ours, many things have been destroyed."

We need a more flexible school system, one that is both culturally appropriate and academically sound. We must create an atmosphere which encourages and supports education and training at all levels, and we must find creative ways of incorporating Inuit values, history and language into the academic curriculum. High school drop-out rates are high among Inuit, yet many youth have to leave their homes and families to finish high school, just as their mothers had to leave home to give birth. We have a very good example of young people over there (pointing to the audience). (Inuktitut comment - no English translation available). Very few Inuit have university degrees, yet this should not be surprising considering here are no universities in northern Canada.

A resolution was passed at Pauktuutit's 1992 Annual General Meeting calling for the establishment of an Inuit Women's Studies Centre where young women could learn traditional skills, activities, values and traditions from their elders. This idea has since been expanded to include the establishment of an Inuit college open to Inuit women and men of all ages. A wide range of courses could be made available including Inuit history, Inuktitut language, traditional food preparation, sewing, clothing design, carving, print-making, trapping, tanning, traditional child rearing and child psychology, Arctic survival skills, Inuit myths and storytelling, drum dancing, fiddling, throat singing, arts and crafts, and so on, just to name a few. The possibilities are endless, as are the benefits. Initially, the college will be located in one community, but eventually it will have branches throughout the North. New technologies also allow for new possibilities, such as distance education.

Southern Canada has created institutions of higher learning which reflect the culture and the needs of southern society. In the Arctic we have a different culture and very different needs, thus it makes sense that our traditional institutions, once we have the

opportunity to design them ourselves, will be very different from those in the south.

We hope that the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples will further our dream for an Inuit College by including it in their recommendations. This idea is still in its infancy, and a great deal of work must be completed before we can develop a proposal and begin the search for funds. The idea will be further developed at our 1994 Annual General Meeting next year in Iqaluit. At this stage it is still a dream -- a dream which opens our minds to the future because it provides for an intimate knowledge of our roots. Terms like "cultural alienation", "acculturation", "assimilation" and "identity crisis" will recede into the past as young Inuit women and men are proudly reintegrated into Inuit society.

Community Development.

The World Health Organization defines health as the "physical, spiritual, mental, and social well-being of individuals and communities". Pauktuutit's publication "A Community Perspective on Health Promotion and Substance Abuse" states:

"... we accept the World Health Organization's definition

> of health ... Inuit communities are suffering from poor health. In addition to the serious social problems identified by respondents in this study, concrete indicators of health, such as life expectancy rates, point to poorer health among Inuit than the general Canadian population."

The "serious social problems" referred to in this study include alcohol, drug and solvent abuse, suicide, inadequate housing, unemployment, poverty, family violence, child sexual abuse, lack of recreational activities and high school drop-outs. The study notes: "The problem of inadequate housing or housing shortages

> is viewed as a serious problem by more people than any other single issue. This is particularly true in Labrador where 100% of the responses rate housing as a serious community problem. Unemployment is also viewed as a serious problem by a large proportion of the

respondents and not one person reports that unemployment is 'not a problem' in their community. Housing and unemployment are, overall, considered serious community problems by the greatest percentage of people responding to the questionnaire."

This report concluded that: "The best approach to addressing any one of these issues may, in fact, be one which has the potential of addressing them all." It proposes a co-ordinated approach amongst all organizations, boards, committees and agencies working at the community level. Unfortunately, governments develop mandates and funding criteria which separate issues rather than allow for integration and co-operation. A comprehensive, holistic, co-ordinated approach to community development is almost impossible within the existing government framework; therefore, we recommend that governments radically alter the way they do business.

Funding.

Pauktuutit's operations rely on a small

core budget from the Aboriginal Women's Program of the Department of the Secretary of State supplemented by project funding. Project funding is tied to government's shifting spending priorities and the specific mandates of the various departments and programs. The wide range of social and health issues Pauktuutit deals with each year must be artificially separated into categories such as alcohol and drug abuse, mental health, health promotion, economic development and so on. Often program dollars are available for public education when communities require training, or research when what is required is dollars to support a particular solution.

Moreover, project funding is usually tied to the government's fiscal year, and even if an application submitted at the beginning of the year does no receive approval until eight months later, the work has to be completed by the end of the fiscal year. This leads to a situation where long-term planning is impossible, projects are often rushed, and we are constantly stretching our brains to come up with project ideas that will concretely benefit our membership while fitting into the narrow mandate of the funding source.

In addition to the difficulties

encountered with project funds, Pauktuutit is always on edge wondering whether the core budget will be reduced or if the Aboriginal Women's Program will survive another round of federal cuts. The most anxious times are at the beginning of each fiscal year and during federal budget speeches. Organizations like Pauktuutit can only function at peak efficiency if adequate, stable, long-term funding was made available.

As a national organization, Pauktuutit has an advantage over community-based groups in that we have developed a expertise in preparing funding proposals in the English language. It is very difficult for people working at the community level to access federal, provincial and territorial programs. In addition to the problems faced by Pauktuutit, community groups often have difficulty working with English- or French-language forms and making their proposal look professional enough to be considered credible.

We believe that government funding structures for Aboriginal and women's organizations and community groups must be radically altered. The need for funds to carry out particular activities should not be determined in Ottawa, Yellowknife, St. John's or Quebec

City, but by the organization or community group applying for the funds. Accountability should be primarily to the people we represent and not to the government bureaucracies.

Moreover, governments should abandon, once and for all, the idea that society's problems can be separated, categorized and ordered. If a group requires funding to train community development workers or to establish an Inuit College, there should be a way for the project to be judged on its own merits and not on how well it fits the criteria of a certain program. In addition, organizations and community groups should have access to ongoing operating funds at reasonable levels and over a long enough time period that proper planning can take place.

(Inuktitut - English translation) I am almost finished.

(English) The many social, economic and health problems facing our communities today require both urgent and long-term solutions. And these solutions must draw from the best of Inuit and non-Inuit traditions, knowledge and technologies. We need everything, from crisis intervention strategies to stable, long-term

programs and services conceived and administered by Inuit.

The overall health and well-being of our people is intrinsically tied to the social, political and economic development of our communities. We can no longer afford to pay the price of dividing issues into manageable portfolios, programs and services. A holistic integrated approach is necessary at every level and in relation to every issue or problem.

We are seeking radical changes in the political, social and economic structures of the North; changes which will positively affect individuals and communities, as well as Inuit and Canadian society. The solutions we seek are based on the following principles.

Respect. Respect for our traditional knowledge, our culture, values, traditions and way of life. Canadian society in general, and particularly all of the bureaucrats, politicians, teachers, doctors, nurses, social working, lawyers and judges who work in the North, and all of the institutions which operate in the North or impact on Inuit life must accept that the "the Inuit way of doing things is just as valid as the western way". This principle relates to the first touchstone outlined by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples in its

publication "Focusing the Dialogue - Developing new relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people".

Control. Based on respect for the Inuit way, governments must legally and constitutionally recognize Inuit self-government rights and enter into negotiations to implement these rights. Unfortunately, the imposition of southern values, laws and institutions on Inuit society has resulted in social, political and economic chaos in our communities. Women have suffered doubly for we lost status in our own society and were subjected to the patriarchal institutions born in the south. Until a proper balance is achieved among Inuit men and women, mechanisms must be put into place to ensure that women are equally represented in all decision-making processes and on all decision-making bodies.

Resourcing -- my mouth is getting dry; I won't talk all day; it is almost finished. A serious and substantial financial commitment is necessary in order for Inuit to regain control and stabilize our society. We are not referring to program dollars or special project funding but, rather, to long-term, multi-year funding agreements which will allow us to develop our own programs

based on our own priorities and needs. Funding cannot be tied to existing federal departments or programs such as health, mental health, housing or economic development for Inuit governments will determine where and how the dollars are best spent. Again, Inuit women must be assured full and equal involvement in financial decision-making.

Pride. While efforts to right the wrongs of the past and heal the wounds that decades of social change have brought to the North must continue, we must move beyond seeing ourselves as victims and move towards rebuilding our pride and self-respect. We referred earlier to our strengths as a people -- our rich vibrant culture; our long history of survival under adverse conditions; a living, working language; our co-operative spirit; and a value system which includes cherishing our children and respecting our elders. This is our starting point.

Inuit women wish to work with men to regain control of Inuit society so that our children can grow up healthy, happy and proud. We also wish to be a part of Canadian society and we see Canada as a country with possibilities; Canada can be a diverse, exciting, productive, caring country; a country free of

officially-sanctioned racism and sexism; a country where every child has an equal opportunity to grow up full of hope and enthusiasm for the future.

As a people, Inuit are involved in a political struggle to regain control over our lives. As an organization, Pauktuutit sees strong links between political self-determination and our ability to solve community level problems. As women, we know that real social and political change cannot occur without us.

Thank you. I have almost lost my voice.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you. I think you deserve a break.

We are going to have a 15-minute break and then we will resume for questions, if you allow us to ask some questions.

Thank you.

--- Short Recess at 10:20 a.m.

--- Upon resuming at 10:45 a.m.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Again, I would like to thank you for your presentation. If you agree, Commissioners will have some questions to ask you. I would like to ask Commissioner Mary Sillett to start with some of her questions.

Mary.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Dussault.

I would like to begin by thanking the presenters. I know that you have done a lot of work and spent a lot of time. I would like to especially thank Martha Flaherty, Martha Greig, Simona Hunuksiuk (PH) Barnes and Mary Crnkovich. I would also like to thank Leah Idlout-Paulson for your opening prayer. I would like to recognize Leah Nikunuk (PH), who is providing the translation.

I would also like to recognize students from the TFN Training Program. I understand that most of them are from Nunavut. There is one person from Holman Island. It is an eight-month program. I understand that it is sort of Inuit studies plus pre-university course, and I would like to wish you well in the work that you are doing. I know that the idea behind the training program was to provide people with the skills necessary in order to return to their home communities and to assume the many responsibilities in self-government.

Having said that, I would like to begin with questions. On the issue of Inuit women and

leadership, I guess I have always recognized that the Inuit haven't done too badly compared to other Aboriginal political organizations. In this room alone you have a past president of a regional Inuit organization and the first woman president of the International Inuit Organization, Mary Simon. You have the first woman president of ITC, Rhoda Inukchuk (PH). You have the current woman President of ITC, Rosemary Kuptana, a past secretary-treasurer of ITC, Leah Idlout-Paulson, and the Chief Executive Officer of a very influential financial organization, Arctic Co-operatives, Simona Hunuksiuk (PH) Barnes, and of course leaders of one of the most well-respected Inuit organizations right now, Pauktuutit, with the two Marthas and the Rhoda here.

I think that right now in the Inuit homelands, which are defined as I guess northern Quebec, northern Labrador and NWT, we have five out of six land claims agreements which have been concluded. In those self-government schemes, it strikes me that Inuit women are either not represented or not well represented.

I am wondering how, in your view, is this representation to be achieved.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: (Inuktitut - English

translation) I am going to respond in Inuktitut. If anyone who is sitting with me wants to make an addition, they can make an addition. I will try to talk slowly.

In my opinion, in the Pauktuutit organization, I think we can be more involved in the community organizations and the things that Inuit women have to deal with, the negative things that women have to deal with. For example, Inuit women don't just stand up and go out and be nominated or voted for for a number of reasons. For example, concerning daycare centres or the need for daycare centres, a lot of communities don't have daycare centres. That is one of the reasons why women don't make themselves available for nomination for different boards, because they have to deal with the things that are in the community first.

There are different obstacles that we come across, and we can try to make the Inuit women more involved in politics. For example, regarding the justice system and the education system, we need to let the women be more aware of the potential for involvement in these different areas like education and justice. We have to let them know that they have a right to make themselves available to things which include the youth and women of

the community.

Do you understand?

MARTHA GREIG: (Inuktitut - English translation) I would like to add in English -- (English) I am moving home in a few days, I have to practice my Inuktitut and, as northern Quebeckers, we speak 100 miles a minute.

I just want to also acknowledge that sometimes the women are the sole providers and they would have to require to take some time off to do some campaigning or whatever. So that's also another thing.

What I really find lacking is the support system, which they don't have. I am one of the very lucky women because I have my husband who supports me and my children who support me, though they are older. Without their support and without my parents and brothers and sisters, without their support, I would not have achieved what I have achieved, though I feel, most of the time now, I am burnt out all the time.

That's just an area where I really find there has to be that support because too many times a woman -- because as mothers we are nurturers; we nurture people with problems or just to be a comforter. And too often

these women are not recognized, that they are human beings, they are not super bionic women. Sometimes they forget that they have feelings and they need a sounding board, especially in counselling.

I am only saying this as my experience, because I do not want another woman to have to go through what I have been going through. I am very lucky that I have the support of my family; I would have been six feet under. About two weeks ago, for the first time in my life, when I was doing a suicidal person, I wished he could do it for me too, because enough is enough.

That's the momentum that a lot of women in the North have. Especially, they are saying, "You are a woman" -- because the Inuit way and the Hallaunaut (PH) way are different. So you get a lot of flack from the elders and also you can't really have room to be who you want to be, how you want to be. There is always that pre-judgment on you.

I get judged when I am a parent and I am a grandmother and I am a wife, I am just romancing around the 52 communities that I oversee, as Pauktuutit oversees. But people forget, they think it is just fun and games. I do it because I value my people, and the youth

especially. Sometimes, when you get that flack from the elderly people -- because that's not the Inuit way -- it clearly makes me see I am on a very fine line, and I thank my grandmothers who did not say "no", because I have the best of two worlds.

That's why I really feel you need the self-respect and self-esteem. A lot of them feel because they don't speak English they can't do it, but they can, they really can. We have technologies that allow us to do things.

So that's just my bit, okay?

SIMONA BARNES: Just to address the leadership, for the Nunavut implementation, we went to the Baffin Region, where we were invited recently to participate in discussions where Kakivak, the CEDO, wants to be recognized as a designated Inuit organization under Baffin Region Inuit Association. We supported that because they said that in a seven-member board they needed to have presence of Inuit directors. So we agreed and supported them by saying that two women must come from the community, so that the CEDO itself is seen to be equally representing both men and women.

I say that because we were told by some

of the male leadership that when male leadership run for an office, they represent men, women, youth and elders. I said, "That's fine, but what is lacking is that we don't physically see the participation of women." So out of a seven-member board, we agreed that two women must sit on the board. That's how we are hoping that Nunavut implementation designated organizations across the board will look at their board make-up.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: (Inuktitut - English translation) What Simona just brought up, I was going to say; so it's okay.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Thank you very much.

My second question is this: Recently, the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women published its final report, and Aboriginal women were represented on this panel by way of a circle. From that experience, would you be able to share with us any ideas of initiatives that have worked well to address family violence issues in Aboriginal communities?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: (Inuktitut - English translation) Yes. I will respond in Inuktitut again.

The Panel on Violence Against Women, I

was one of the board members. There was an Aboriginal circle within that panel, and we had to travel to many different communities. What I noticed in that process was that we were able to go directly to the community, people in the community, and not tell them -- like, the whole community was able to participate in the proceedings. Whether they were men, women, elders, youth, we invited them to come to that meeting, and we did that before we went to the community. It is true that we do need some individual meetings with either men or women or youth, but we also need these meetings which include the whole community.

When we went to the Northwest Territories and Yukon Territory, the national panel was not prepared, did not inform the communities ahead of time that they were coming to hold meetings, but the communities did not like that. They were told to just go back to where they came from because they did not invite the rest of the community.

Does that answer part of your question?

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: I guess from your answer, what I got was, any sort of model which tries to deal with family violence effectively must include

the community, must include men, must include women. I know that in your circle you met with a lot of communities; you met with as many communities almost as we did, and you met with people who were expert on the issue of family violence or who have worked on the issue of family violence for a long time.

I guess I was wanting to know -- you know, we are always asking ourselves this question: Family violence is a big issue; what do we do about it? In your travels, did you come across anything, like something that was working really, really well in that community to deal with family violence? Was there a model, was there an agency, was there a circle, did you hear about anything like that that dealt with family violence very effectively?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: (Inuktitut - English translation) I am not sure I understand your question.

MARTHA GREIG: (Inuktitut - no English translation available for the first paragraph) It helps in a way but in another it doesn't. When I was dealing with HIV and AIDS in the communities, in travelling to different communities, with community members, we were able to come up with solutions because we had a subject

that we were able to talk about. There were different things, different answers that came up. There were a lot of different answers which did not have anything to do with AIDS and HIV that came up also, and it was only because we had a certain subject to give to the community.

For example, if Martha was in the circle with us, we were able to talk with each other about the things which troubled me. If I said, for example, to the person who abused someone, then he will ---

There was a healing circle in one of the communities, and it didn't help as much. But what helped was that ---

We have to go straight to the subject and we also have to consider exactly how they deal with their daily life. For example, alcoholism and addictions are not the only problems in the community. There are different things which cause that to be a problem. Only women cannot deal with this any more; men have to be involved, and the elders and young people from all walks of life and generations have to deal with these issues which trouble the communities. The whole community has to get involved.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Thank you.

In the report -- and I am referring to the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women Report again -- there is a special section dedicated to Inuit women. Could you tell us why and how this decision was made? Is the situation of Inuit women in violent situations different from other Aboriginal women, from non-Aboriginal women? If so, how and what are those differences? Are the solutions different?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I am trying to give the interpreter a little break. I will try this in English.

In our travel to the North we found that Inuit women or Inuit communities need different solutions because of culture, different beliefs and isolation, and there is hardly any programs or facilities in Inuit communities. That's why we decided to have different solutions, a different section for Inuit. But it was very hard for me to try to get the Inuit section, because I was lumped with other Aboriginal groups all the time. I fought and fought and fought. I kept saying, "I am not white, I am not like other Aboriginal people, I am not Inuit, I am not Indian -- I am not white, I am not Indian, but I am Inuk."

I had to tell them, it is like lumping Japanese and Chinese together, and you have to do a lot of educating to the non-Aboriginal people in Canada. I shed tears to tell them that this is what we need, because in our communities we have nothing. When people say other -- let's say I will use an example like minority groups outside Toronto, they live a five-hour drive from Toronto. I am not putting them down or I am not saying they have a lot, they need their services too, but I am just comparing a person living outside Toronto, miles away, or living in Toronto can just pick up a phone and ask for help and she can drive. But, in the North, we can't do that. If I live in Grace Fjord and I am repeatedly beaten up, I may have to raise money to get here to get help. That's why we needed different solutions, a different section, and it is also because of our culture -- I mean our language and lifestyles.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: As a Commission I guess we have had the experience of travelling to places that I would never ever have travelled to had I not been a Commissioner. I must admit when we were in northern parts of what we call Hallaunaut (PH) land, non-Inuit land -- for example, we were in Saskatchewan,

in the very far north. Mr. Dussault and I were there. I ended up actually with a major abscess and I had to go to the hospital. I couldn't believe what was involved in trying to get a doctor. I was X-rayed by someone in the school who said there was absolutely nothing wrong with me. Then I was X-rayed by someone else who said, "There is nothing wrong with you." There was something wrong with me, and it didn't take a genius to figure that out.

It occurred to me that in various -- especially in northern parts of Ontario, Saskatchewan, although we don't like to think about it, they do suffer from isolation, they suffer from transportation difficulties, from lack of services; in many of those communities they do not speak English.

So it gets harder to figure out what is exactly different from, say, for example, the Inuit in Nain -- we know what the differences are between the Inuit in Nain and the Inuit in Grace Fjord, but it becomes more and more difficult once you go there.

I guess I was wondering, are there actually different situations? For example, a woman who is being beaten up in that area, a woman who is being beaten

up in Rigglet (PH), they can't get out; both of them can't get out. The languages there -- they don't have any counselling services in their languages, neither of them. So what are the differences -- if you would be able to help me with that little bit.

MARTHA GREIG: Mary, I am a little bit surprised at this coming from you as an Inuk person, not that I want to put you down or anything, but I would have expected that from other people that are non-Inuk. But sometimes, for education purposes, we put in these trick question type of things, and I appreciate that.

I really feel that -- you know, this thing about me going home is too much in my heart right now, because that's what I am going to go home to. There is a lot of violence and stuff like that, and I really feel that the reason why we really wanted a separate component is like what happened with -- remember, because you were one of the founders too, why we removed ourselves from Inuak (PH). There were common problems, but for solutions it was just too much, the differences of language, the lifestyles and the struggles and the way of putting out solutions. And we would have a clearer voice not just being lumped and then we would come out

as we are a unit, because of our high cost of living, because all the communities have to be flown in.

So that is why we are stressing that we need services in the community because these women who have to be removed from their home town to a city or a bigger community, which only has the services, would be best serviced -- not just the person as a victim but also the family members and the abuser, so we could have overall one unit to fit everybody's needs. That's what we really want to see happening.

There are certain things in the Indian way which work for them, but then when they try to introduce it to the Inuit way -- the healing circle is just an example. So what works doesn't work for others. Even as Inuit people, what works in Iqaluit may not work in Clyde River (PH), and it is within Baffin Island -- different strokes for different folks type of thing. So it is really made up of the community.

The community then has to decide if there is to be zero tolerance. Not just the women have to be involved, but the people and of course the children, because monkey see monkey do; if children grow up in a violent home, they will think it is just a way of living

and they won't think it is wrong, they will do it. So we, as parents, have to be the role models for our children.

It starts at home, let's put it this way. It is a simple thing.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Thanks. But what is the issue here? The issue is, for example, everyone says that family violence in our community is so special that it warrants a special situation. With our mandate, we have a responsibility to look at all the issues affecting all of the Aboriginal peoples in Canada. Is it possible to recommend -- you know, everyone argues, "My situation is so unique, I need a special recommendation." So the question is, how do we resolve the issue? No personal stuff, just the issue.

MARY CRNKOVICH: I think an important point to also raise is, the Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women, the importance of having the Inuit circle was that there are many similarities, and the situations often look similar with women living in the North in isolated communities and with women living in the South that are in isolated communities. But because of those people who respond -- the panel talks about service workers in the justice system and other institutions that have

to respond to violence against women.

It is important to remind people that it is a different context. What is the concern amongst Inuit women is that, because often the causes look similar, the solutions also may appear to be similar. That is the concern, because as Martha and Martha have told you, it is a community response, and each community, even within Inuit regions, are different. So it was really important to have an Inuit circle not so much to say, "Our family violence or violence against women and children in the family is very different from the family violence in northern Saskatchewan", but it was important to say, "Yes, we have these problems", to articulate what those are and to remind people that the solutions have to be seen in the context of Inuit women and within Inuit communities. So often, because the recommendations made by the panel dealt specifically with institutional changes, there was a concern that they would see those solutions also being similar and would ignore the unique context of Inuit communities.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Thank you very much. I just have one comment and a final question.

There is a sentence in one of your

publications which was shared by many presenters as we crossed this country. The sentence was, "Women will be the ones to break the silence on violence, because for the most part men never ever talk about it." As we crossed this country I was disappointed to witness the truth of this. On the issue of family violence, women were the ones who raised it, and when they did, many of them raised it in camera because they were too afraid to raise it in public. I can count on one hand the male leaders in this country who addressed this issue head on; I think that's pretty sad.

I guess one thing that I want to hear from you specifically is, sometimes you look at family violence as a women's issue and you compartmentalize it, and the other organizations take on the Constitution or the politics. How do you combine the efforts successfully so that you address this issue as a community?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I will be first.

It is interesting that you ask this question. (Inuktitut - English translation) I am going to speak in Inuktitut, and you can make an addition if you would like.

I am surprised that the question comes

from you -- you, as Commissioner for Aboriginal Peoples, the Assembly of First Nations or the Métis Association or the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. We will be coming to you and we will say to you that we need to deal with family violence. I think this would be a good question to the different organizations. There are a lot of men in those organizations who are leaders in those organizations, and I think you should bring that question to them. That would be a good question to give to them.

Martha wants to make an addition.

MARTHA GREIG: Family violence, this is not just an Inuit problem, it is a universal problem, especially with the recession, which really brings out more violence, more frustration. So I think we really need to keep working on this head on and also working with the men as well. Like I said, it is everybody's responsibility.

Also, on this question too about the women being the ones that are breaking the silence, again, I would like to go back to motherhood. When we see our daughters being beaten up or our sons also being beaten up by their spouses or they are beating up their spouses or their partners, we as mothers naturally don't want that

happening. So that's why we come out in the forefront, and then the men soon follow afterwards. That has been going on.

When Pauktuutit first started to be born, we had a lot of somewhat flack from the men, and also the men are somewhat saying, "The women are getting too much power." If they think their powerness or their youthfulness is in jeopardy, let them hold our hands and get up from our feet, our knees, and like a little child learning to walk and run, let us go on until there is zero tolerance. Easier said than done, but that's our motto.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I will try it in English.

To give you a very short answer, on the question of who should be involved and how should we deal with this, I think it would be a perfect example, when you have other organizations sitting here, like tomorrow and the day after, to ask that question, to hear what they have to say about this.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: I just want to let you know that this is the question that we have asked many groups as we have gone across the country. I think Pauktuutit, we should recognize that you have been

successful in getting men actually involved in your organizations; I know that men are involved in your meetings. It is not much of an issue, but there have been different groups that we have talked to, and other groups will say, "You know, there is absolutely no working together", but in your case you have a better example.

My final question is this: In our public hearings we have often heard people say that self-government is necessary, but healing must occur first. We have heard others say that healing will never occur until self-government happens. Still, others say that both should occur at the same time.

What is your view on this?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: (Inuktitut - English translation) I will briefly answer that question.

This can have different meanings and it could be misunderstood. My view is that I ask if nobody is going to start this healing process, what kind of government are we going to have? The healing process and the self-government issues are related to each other.

Does someone want to answer that question more clearly?

MARTHA GREIG: I personally really feel

that the importance is to have healing and also at the same time, along with it, hand in hand comes the self-government, because without them two going at each other, and at the speed of negotiations that will soon I hope take place -- because we know about the referendum, what a lost cause that was, lost sleep and everything. But I don't like to think of it as just a lost cause because it really created a good orientation to the Canadian public, who and what Aboriginal peoples are and what their viewpoint is, because too often we are looked at by the Canadian public like we take too much for granted, we take dollar money into our pocket. But, as Inuit people, we are taxpayers, and I am very proud to be a taxpayer because at least if I want to say something I know I put my worth into it.

I just feel that they have to come hand in hand together.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

Other Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Mary wants to say something.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: I am sorry.

MARY CRNKOVICH: Martha has just asked me to raise with you that one aspect of self-government has been the discussion around community-based justice. There, what we have discovered is that certain Inuit regions moved towards a community-based justice initiative. There in particular, when issues around violence against women, cases involving sexual assault, abuse against intimate partners, wives and other cases of that sort are presented to a community-based justice alternative like Circle Sentencing, the issues or concerns that Inuit women have raised are that often the people involved in that circle may themselves be abusers or victims of abuse and, therefore, are not healed.

So, in certain circumstances, clearly, Inuit women have raised issues, when dealing on justice in particular, that before power is devolved to communities to create their own justice sentencing initiatives, that community has to be one that is healthy and also has adequate resources to respond to those kinds of needs.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

Bertha Wilson.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: This is really a follow-up question to some of the questions Mary

has asked in relation to violence against women and also to what has just been said about justice. As you know, violence against women is not confined to Aboriginal communities, it is widespread throughout the whole society. In fact, statistics show that it is increasing, both in the society generally and in the native communities.

I have been interested in the different approaches that are taken with respect to how to deal with this issue because, as you know, in society generally, these offences are dealt with by punishment being meted out to those who have broken rules and committed these offences, whereas we have heard, as we have gone across the country, that the native people do not believe that punishment is the answer to addressing this issue and that the answer is healing and reconciliation.

In society generally, now, there is quite an outcry for stiffer sentences. In western society people see this as a mounting offence and they tend to think that it is because the sentences that are being imposed on offenders are not stiff enough and they should be increased, longer jail terms and so on.

We have to come up with solutions and

recommendations on how to deal with this very current and very increasing problem. So my question is, I am interested in whether we have something in western society that we can learn from you in terms of how to address this issue, but I haven't seen any studies on whether this approach of healing and reconciliation works. We have simple ways of testing whether our system works, we can look and see how many repeat offenders there are, the same people coming back and offending again and again despite the fact that they have been subjected to these punishments.

I am wondering whether there are any studies that really establish that the approach that native people take to this issue of healing and reconciliation works. Are there studies that show that people don't repeat the offences if this method of dealing with them has been utilized? So really, I guess what I am asking is, are there any studies, is there anything that would help us to appreciate how successful this approach to family violence is? Does it work, in other words?

MARTHA GREIG: You are very right that there are no studies, but we have a lot of anecdotal stuff. We in the community know what we want, what works, but

the people who make the programs, who have the dollars for these programs don't listen. It is like this medical service attitude: they think they know it all and they come with a program without consulting the people. "Would this work? Do you want it? How can you fix it? Who can be the partners of this game?", they don't ask these very important, key issues. So they come with a program, and, sure enough, it doesn't work.

In their eyes, the people that live outside of the community have these preset ways of possibly -- they had analyzed it in their pretty little heads, or whatever, and tried to put it into the community. It don't work, because the communities had not been involved. That has to happen. The people who make the dollar signs available have to listen to the people, what they want, and implement it.

Also, these people who go to jail -- sometimes they do it to get attention. They have problems, and people are already pre-judging them as being troublemakers. Some of these people are not troublemakers at all, they are craving for attention. Then, they do one bad thing, maybe a punch in the head one time, and if nobody says "Boo!", then they do it, another beating

somewhere else, until a person gets to the hospital and, finally, maybe finally someone press charges, and this poor woman, she is scared shitless -- sorry. That's Inuit language -- I mean, Aboriginal. It is because I speak too much from the heart; that's why it comes out, it slips out.

These women don't have the courage to speak out because it may be okay the next few days, and what if tomorrow or the next week or the month after or a year after her partner gets out of jail, or his next drink she gets double the amount of pounding?

What doesn't work is that these people that go to jail -- yes, we want stiffer sentences, because what people forget is the victim, it ruins her life. A child who has been sexually abused, too often people think, "That child will forget." They don't forget. They never forget. Even a little smell, anything, any movement reminds them constantly. People forget too much of what -- that's why it is very important to have that impact statement.

When a person goes to jail, there is never enough time. As far as I am concerned, there has to be a component in there that they receive counselling,

why they do it, because they are there, they are just in a jail cell, it is a holiday for them: three good meals a day, a roof over their head, no rent to pay, when his wife and the children are really struggling. Too often the abuser gets a better end of the stick than the victim. Though the victim stays home with the children, maybe the father was the breadwinner of the family or whatever, and these kids are being ostracised or made fun of, that their parents did this and that. There are all kinds of psychological problems these people go through.

So we have to really look at the overall picture, and I really do not agree of just putting them into jail cells. They have to receive treatment, and when they go back to the community, there has to be -- and I can't emphasize it enough -- a support system. These poor people that have been in jail and had time to think, day in day out, what they have analyzed -- because we must not forget, a person is never on this earth who doesn't make a mistake. So never judge them by what they have done. Certain circumstances make a good, very saint person do weird things; it could be the full moon or it could have been a period, for instance; anything could be a factor. Too often people pre-judge or stereotype

people, and that has to be out of the system.

I know I am taking too much time, but I just want to clearly, clearly point out that there has to be counselling and there has to be a support network when that person goes home, because too often they want to stop drinking, and because they say -- some people may even make a bet of these repeaters. If that person comes home, they say, "Let's see how many hours it takes him to get into trouble again." You know, it is not funny, but people do make actual bets on these things.

So instead of us caring for these people, supporting them, make them feel part of the community -- don't make bets on them, that's part of the problem.

That's just my two sense worth.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: This is a good example of what we found during our travel with the Panel on Violence Against Women. What we heard from every community, Inuit communities or other Aboriginal communities, is that they are asking for permanent, culturally appropriate facilities and programs in the communities. They are asking for professional counselling, or to train Inuit to be counsellors. They would like to design the programs and facilities

themselves, not coming from the government.

The government keep saying they spend enough money, they have no money. No wonder. They are studying so much. Where does it go? They are the ones who are spending money, not us.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: When we visited a number of the penitentiaries, I was quite surprised and found it very ironic that a number of the Aboriginal prisoners said that during their period in the penitentiary, this was the first time that they had had an opportunity to find their own identity and learn who they were. They told us that the most important person who came to visit was the elder. We discovered that in many of the institutions now there were sweat lodges, healing circles and so on, and many of the native inmates who spoke to us said, "You know, for the first time we have learned who we are, where we come from, what we are all about". I thought to myself, isn't that ironic that you have to end up in a penitentiary in order to find out who you are.

The other thing I wanted to mention was that when we had our Symposium on Justice, that was the first time that I heard native women saying, "We don't

think that native men who have committed sexual assault should be walking around in the community." They were having second thoughts about whether healing and reconciliation was an adequate way to deal with people who had committed such a serious offence as sexual assault because these people were still walking around in the community. So they were telling us, "Perhaps they should be put in jail, provided all the appropriate kind of services are available to them in the institution."

I was wondering what you feel about that. Is it acceptable in your mind that people who have committed as serious an offence as sexual assault should be free to walk around in the community?

MARY CRNKOVICH: Pauktuutit has been engaged in a court challenge involving the exercise of judicial discretion when sentencing Inuit who have been found guilty and convicted of sexually assaulting Inuit women. One of the issues that have been raised is, in particular, specifically the issue around the concern of the type of sentences, the lenient sentences that have been given to Inuit men who are sexual assault offenders.

When Pauktuutit spoke out about this issue and undertook the court challenge, they realized

in doing that we walked a fine line, because we are opponents to the existing system, we see it failing all the time, we know this is existing in the communities. Unlike Indian men who are serving sentences in federal penitentiaries, we have many Inuit men who are sitting in Newfoundland or sitting in Montreal who do not have services made available to them in Inuktitut, although they might be unilingual speakers, they do not have access to country food. We have two women in P4W (PH) at this time. When we personally went down to visit them to take them some meat, when they finally received it it was green. They don't get access to country food, they don't get access to their cultural identity very often.

So we walk a fine line when we say that, yes the existing system is failing, but since we only have the existing system at this time, we would like to see it is practised in an equal way. For Inuit women who are the victims of sexual assault and other violent crimes, we have repeatedly spoken out that we want sentences that reflect the type of crime that has been committed. So when judges are determining sentence and they rely on cultural factors to lessen a sentence, to mitigate, what we are saying is, "Don't use culture as an excuse to give

this person a lenient sentence."

What we are calling for is that judges be more aware and call upon cultural experts -- there are people in organizations such as Pauktuutit and other organizations that can speak to cultural issues. They don't get an opportunity to hear that -- the judges; they rely on defence counsel presenting to them what is often considered cultural myth.

So those are concerns we have.

In response, what we are saying are the things that Martha has raised, and clearly are available in the Criminal Code or available to judges when exercising their discretion to sentence, things like mandatory treatment. A concern that we have is, we want longer sentences if there are services that are culturally appropriate and provide the necessary treatment.

You earlier said, are there examples or studies which we can point to that show that the healing method is a successful approach to dealing with these types of offences? There aren't any in Inuit communities because this is something very new that is being practised, and the concern that we again have raised is that we know that to incarcerate someone costs lots of money, and the

courts and the correction's people repeatedly tell us they don't have money for treatment.

The concern we have is, they are now telling us the problem of men who abuse is a community problem, we do agree, but they are telling the communities to fix it and they are telling the communities to fix it without having adequate resources, both financial and in terms of human resources, specialists who can counsel for treatment for men who abuse, specialists who can counsel women and children who are victims of abuse or men who are victims of abuse. Those kinds of facilities aren't there.

So there aren't any studies we can point to, and a concern is that when the studies do start to come out, they may show that these systems aren't working, but a lot of the time it is because there aren't the necessary facilities and infrastructure in the community to deliver that, especially when it deals with sexual assault; many Inuit women have said what you have said about what the other native women are saying when they see a man walking around the community that they know has been convicted of sexual assault. That has repeatedly been told to us during our justice project work. But they

want to see that man back in the community if he has access and is required to have treatment, and if he fails, he shouldn't be there. They want their men back in the community, but they want them healed; they want an opportunity to have the men have access to being healed.

These community-based initiatives, their credibility amongst Inuit women is being highly questioned because we don't have the adequate resources flowing to the community to deliver that community-based justice.

MARTHA GREIG: Just a quick addition.

With you going toward the people finding their identity only when they are in jail, with the counselling that I do, because I have 25 years of counselling around my belt sort of thing -- I am not bragging or anything, but it just so happens. You learn a lot from counselling. Because I am an Inuk woman I am speaking for my Inuit people.

What is so lacking in the penitentiaries is the culturally appropriate things, because there are more Indians than Inuit; so they have sweat lodges and healing circles. It is not Inuit way. So what is so lacking -- sometimes that is why we strongly want to

differentiate between the Inuit and Indian; we have different spiritual aspects and strategies and stuff like that. So what is somewhat being met in so-called sweat lodges and healing circles -- there are not as many as there should be -- it is not meeting all Aboriginal people.

What I have to also stress again is that if people are thinking they are adequately being met, they are not. They are not adequately meeting the Inuit views as well, in terms of food also.

In my personal view, having been a rape victim -- I was raped when I was 15 -- though this person is no longer alive, I still feel there is never a high enough price for them, there is no life sentence long enough for the damage that has been done to myself. I had to work very hard, and through my faith, I am who I am right now. If I hadn't had my faith, I would have been six feet under a long time ago.

Too many women are having second thoughts about pressing charges for sexual assault because not much is being done, especially if a judge can say, "A man sees a pair of hips and helps himself to a woman". This comment says that the degree of humiliation or the hurt caused to Inuit woman is lesser than to a Hallaunaut

(PH). Gee! What kind of comment is that? We are human beings, we have feelings. The difference of skin doesn't matter, because we all have feelings. Everybody hurts as much -- the degree -- though maybe if they have been drinking and, thank goodness, they didn't really notice what was going on; I think that at least they have that escape. But for us people that don't drink, or children who should not even know about sexuality who have been taken, these types of things, I really feel there is not much done for them except humiliation and they become the gossip of the town.

They thought they would come forward and press charges thinking the justice system would serve them the way it is supposed to. When it flips back the other way around, their self-esteem -- they blame themselves, other people blame them, and then we lose too many people to suicide because they trusted a system that they thought would help them when it doesn't; we have lost too many people already.

There is also a real pressure on the women and even young men whether to press charges or not, because they are scared of the humiliation, and family ties and influential people who are leaders; if happens

to be the leader or a relative of that leader, the questionability of the fairness of the incarceration has a lot of impact on it. So they toil with it and when they see a person walking free and they are not getting any help -- because we tend to pity people who are put into court; we pity them because they are being judged. Then we soon forget. Before that judgment we had a lot of love for the victim, but the court goes, "Oh, this poor abuser" and they forget the victim. People see that too much and they say, "Why go trough a monkey race? Why go through a circus when the system that should really help is not working? So why go through with it?" Maybe just be silent and hopefully do self-help, but it is destructive and you lose hope. We have to change that.

Also, the RCMP or the QPP, that system has to work too, because too often these people, the women don't want to say anything because of the possible outcome. They are already damaged in their way of mind and their self-worth and who they are and what they are; it is already damaged anyway. If they go into the circus, they have to salvage -- as an abused person you have to salvage and muster as much self-respect that you can move on to the next day.

We have to work on that. If the whole system, the society or the system that should help us build our self-esteem up -- if it doesn't work, we go further down, six feet under, sometimes, unfortunately. That is why I can't stress enough that to see a human person still walking around -- though you can forgive, you can't forget.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: Thank you for very helpful answers to my questions, and I would also like to thank you for a very excellent brief. I enjoyed reading it and hearing it today. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

Other questions? Viola.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: I just have one question.

First of all, I want to thank you as well for coming here today and presenting our brief. The question I have is, you talked about -- I guess it relates to self-government and about some of the problems that you have alluded to today, and you say there has to be a change in how governments do business and how they create policies; there has to be a big change.

With the creation of Nunavut, what was your involvement during this whole process when it was

coming in? This is an opportune time, I think, to think the role of leadership at a time when they are creating policies and they are creating a whole new regime. What is your role in that? This would be a good time now, I think. We could have a real good model here on what role women are playing. From my view, from my eyes, the opportunity is there to do some of these things that you want to do. Can you tell us what you are doing and what has been done?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I will make a small comment or an answer.

We have been struggling to be involved right from the beginning; we were never involved. For instance, Tungavik (PH), ITFN, one time we had one of the Pauktuutit board of directors going to the meeting twice, and we got a letter later on to tell us that she won't be involved enough because we don't have enough input. Right now, we are still struggling. I have tried to ask Tungavik (PH) if we could have a seat in their assembly. We have been told "no". And I have heard many comments from other men who are in leadership that women are getting too powerful; it is dangerous to have women in these organizations.

What do we do? Keep talking? Take over? We should take over.

MARY CRNKOVICH: At the time that Nunavut -- the legislation was to go before Parliament, Pauktuutit sent letters to the three parties engaged in the creation of Nunavut, the Tungavik (PH) Federation of Nunavut, which was representing Inuit, the Government of Canada and the Government of Northwest Territories. In that letter we requested that they consider, in making appointments to the Nunavut Implementation Commission, which is the body that is the transition body to oversee the creation, the actual administration of the Nunavut government -- we requested they consider appointing women to that commission.

The Tungavik (PH) failed to identify a woman to that Commission. However, we are hopeful that one of the representatives on behalf of the territorial government and the Government of Canada will be a woman, but we are not sure of that.

Also, in terms of the justice project, a specific issue -- while the justice project is dedicated to being a national initiative dealing with all of the regions, in particular in Nunavut our whole attempt is

to look at the administration of justice from a different perspective. We develop scenarios of problems, we are coming up with our own solutions to those problems, and then we are looking at different models that have come out of a number of inquiries into Aboriginal justice and what the existing NWT model has to offer in terms of administration of justice, and we compare that to the solutions that are being identified within our workshops.

It is our hope that through that initiative, not only will we be coming up with solutions that are workable within Nunavut, but the women have acquired significant information and knowledge and experience on these issues that they would be asked by the Tungavik (PH) and other bodies that will be negotiating on behalf of Inuit with the Nunavut government to participate in those negotiations. No longer will they be able to tell the Pauktuutit that, because they don't speak out, they are not contributing. We have now made it available, they will have that kind of information.

It is our only hope that, on issues of economic development and other aspects of the Nunavut government, we will also have the same opportunities to get women more involved because they have been excluded

in the past.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: I am just wondering, let's just take for example a meeting of the Nunavut board of directors, whatever you call it, TFN board of directors. Does family violence reach the agenda? Is it on the agenda?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I am glad you brought this up. Mrs. Robinson, I am glad you brought this up, because I feel very strongly that women should be involved in leadership, in boards -- the leadership. I see the social issues being dealt with very much slower if we are not included. Nobody wants to deal with them; men don't seem to want to deal with them.

Mary, like you said, family violence on the agenda for Tungavik (PH), I don't think it is possible. When I hear people at the table saying that with male leaders, it doesn't matter who you are, whether you are male, female, children, elder, you are represented anyways. To me, it is not true, because when we are sitting at the table they say they are supporting us; as soon as we turn around they are laughing at us. That's not representation. So we have to keep working on it.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Peter

Meekison.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you, René.

I would also like to thank you for your brief. You just mentioned the word "leadership". I would say that, from what I have heard this morning, all of you have given great demonstrations of leadership in a variety of ways, and I would like to commend you for what you have done, what you said in your brief and in response to the questions.

I really have a couple of questions. One is, in many of your responses the word "community" comes up and the importance of community. In your brief you talk about community development and you end by saying that you recommend that "governments radically alter the way they do business" in terms of I guess what I would call program delivery. You in effect talk about the holistic approach for solving problems, and I think there is a lot of merit and wisdom in what you suggest.

Have you developed any models for program delivery, or do you know of any that have been tried, either throughout Inuit territory or elsewhere in the world, and have you made any representations to

government to try to change the way they deliver their programs -- and if so, obviously, it has fallen on deaf ears because you wouldn't be recommending it.

Finally, do you have any suggestions for the Commissioners which we can take in consideration as we reflect on this?

MARTHA GREIG: That is why we are known as Marthas with big mouths, because we not only just speak for us personally, because Pauktuutit would not be there if it weren't for Inuit people in the North; some cannot forget the 52 communities that we are representing. What our mandate has really done is by the demands from the people, and we are just a small part of a mechanism that puts recommendations forth to the government agencies, appropriate ones that fund, whatever.

I will give you one example that if Inuit people want to do something it can be done, and it is that one in midwifery in Pangnirtung. People in northern Quebec got together, they were tired of having to go out of their home community; the people, the men and women together, decided when they were getting their regional hospital, they wanted to put wing so that there could be a birthing centre, and that happened. It was

first just a dream out of a kitchen table and it became a reality, and that's working very well.

It is a model that is now going to be happening for people in Rankin Inlet, because they are in the process of doing a birthing centre. If that works well, then the other two existing bigger communities, Arved (PH) and Baker Lake, may have it too. That's just a small example but it has a big impact on the well-being of who we are and what we are.

There are other things that are starting to happen. How we gauge success in the Inuit way and the Hallaunaut (PH) way is so different. To us, once people are beginning to talk about something and accepting it is happening, in my eyes, that's a successful step. Through the years and through the momentum it goes further and further. But in the government's eyes, that is nothing. To them, they don't classify that as a success. It is too anecdotal. It doesn't give figures -- and figures are so misleading. I don't like statistics; hogwash, it is, because if we can help one person that's enough for me. I used to wish I could help 10 a day or more, but I was fooling myself. If I can save one person, that's enough, and that should be a big number in the

government's eyes. That's the difference that we have.

That's why we have to have the respect and combine the two together and work hand in hand. If the government can really start listening to the people -- the people know what they want already, it is just that the dollars aren't there.

One little thing too is, sometimes we have just a one-year term funding, and it is hard to do long-term planning.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: I noticed that as well. In fact, my next question sort of flows --

MARTHA GREIG: I will just give you an example, because I was the past health co-ordinator. I was on 64,500 for health consultation, my salary included, and I have to do health consulting to the 52 communities and travel. Heck! That's peanuts! That even may be less than what you guys make in a year.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: The other question I had until you mentioned it this morning, and again it was mentioned in some of your responses, is the question of language and the fact that one of the reasons why your organization is successful is that you

can prepare and fill out forms in the English language. You say that community groups often have difficulty working with English- or French-language forms and making their proposals look professional, that this creates problems with respect to accessing federal programs and I suspect provincial programs.

Again, my question would be -- by the way, they are not alone in having difficulty figuring out forms; most Canadians have difficulty figuring out many other forms. But when they are printed in a different language and written in a different language, I can see the difficulty.

Do you have any suggestions or recommendations in this area that we should be considering?

MARTHA GREIG: I am so glad you are here, my buddy. I will take you fishing to northern Quebec!

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Done!

MARTHA GREIG: The people at the funding source, the people that screen these proposals, they have to change their outlook. They are too bureaucratic. There are two different kinds of people: paper-people, people-people; people that work with people and people that just write, write, write, write. They can have

degrees, degrees, degrees, yet, because they have not dealt with feelings and stuff, they can have as many degrees as they can but they are useless when it comes to dealing with people.

You need them two people to work together, and these people-people, they know what they are doing, they know what they want, but these academic people, paper-people-people, when they look at that -- no. Yes, I speak English, I am a high school drop-out, I am 41 years old and I thought I was quite bilingual, but there are certain days I can hardly speak English. It is there, but to get it out of my mouth, it is a struggle.

So these people in the communities know what they want, but to put it elaborately in a Hallaunaut (PH) way, the cake and the icing and all the things with it, that's to care to the agency who got nothing to do with curing the problems in the community. Come on! Let's be realistic!

That's what the problem is. The people have to start listening. Paper-people have to start listening to the people-people.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: George Erasmus.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I have quite a few questions I wouldn't mind asking. So we are not here all day, could I ask for shorter answers than some of your answers.

Earlier, in talking about how the justice system should deal with men that are involved in family violence, the suggestion was made that culture should not be used as a crutch and that the sentence should be the same for Inuit men as it would be for anyone else. When we consider other types of difficulties that the Inuit might be able to get into with the Canadian justice system, is that approach viable all the way across? For instance, whether it is shoplifting, whether it is a drunken brawl that ends up in an unfortunate killing of someone, should culture never be introduced in the courtroom?

MARY CRNKOVICH: What we were saying was that, yes, we think culture does have a place in the justice system, but when it is left to judges to interpret what Inuit culture is is the problem. Often what judges will hear is a defence counsel, in trying to mitigate sentence

for his or her client, will present a cultural defence in cases -- and I speak specifically to violence against women or in cases of child sexual abuse, whereby they will try to argue that this was traditionally an acceptable practice. People have spoken out very clearly and definitively that this is not the case.

What we are saying is, if judges are prepared to accept cultural factors to mitigate a sentence, that we would agree. However, that kind of evidence has to be delivered through experts and given a fair hearing, because what we are getting is not fair, we are getting a biased view.

You used the example of shoplifting. Inuit perspective on borrowing things is very different. We were speaking specifically to issues not around property but where there is a violent crime against women and children, where we have specific examples where, in trying to mitigate a sentence, a judge will argue -- will not argue; a judge will state that he will not accept it as a defence to the action but will turn around and accept it as a factor to lessen a sentence.

We have testimonies from many, many women saying that these kinds of practices are not

traditionally acceptable. When a women starts to menstruate doesn't mean you can help yourself to her, and those kinds of things have to be made very clear to the judiciary because they clearly still don't get that; it is not a cultural practice.

What we are saying is, sure, if you are going to use culture, let's have it delivered by people who are experts in culture, and not just elders, but there are a variety of groups; Pauktuutit is one example, Inuit Cultural Institute -- there are a number of examples. We don't want to exclude culture, we truly agree it is relevant, but it is how it is being used and how it is being interpreted by the judiciary that is a concern.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: What would be the best way that a sentence could be carried out then? Should Inuit somehow participate?

MARY CRNKOVICH: We have said that we think Inuit should participate. In the case of a circle sentence, we only have one example, unlike Yukon, where it is being used -- and I guess now they are going to start using it in the western Arctic. We only have one example in Inuit communities. There it was used, it involved a case of a spousal assault, and it was important that Inuit

be involved. Again, we are saying, yes, they should be involved, but the people who are involved have to be people who, if they have been abusers or are abused, have got over that, are healed; especially if women who are the victims of abuse are there, they have to have adequate support because they cannot speak for themselves.

So, yes, we are saying, have people there but make sure it is representative of the entire community and it is a healthy situation. Unfortunately, the first Circle Sentence we had was a wife assault case, and the people involved in the circle -- it was an unfortunate circumstance in our view, what happened.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I realize that your justice project is still very young and that you have a fair amount of work to do in that area, but maybe you could speculate for me and for us on what is your long-term vision. Are you trying to modify the Canadian justice system so that it is more sensitive to the Inuit or are you possibly working your way down to a point where you will actually have a parallel or separate or a number of separate Inuit justice systems which might be completely separated from the Canadian justice system? Where do you think you will end up with

this project?

MARY CRNKOVICH: With respect to the responses, we have only worked quite intensively in the communities of Labrador and now we are moving to Nunavik and we will be moving to Nunavik, but we haven't worked with as much detail in those latter communities and regions as we have in Labrador.

I don't think it is one or the other. I put that question to a lot of the women I was working with. One of the ideas was to find out, do we "Inuitize" the existing system, as the Inuit Justice Task Force in northern Quebec proposed, or do we create a new model? What we began with is problems, and women are creating solutions now. In those patterns, what you do see are similarities to the existing system. So where it looks like the existing system, I think it means modification. But in other places we clearly have differences.

So I think it is going to be, unfortunately, a mixture, and depending on which region you are speaking of, because the existing system is entrenched quite heavily in Nunavut, a lot of the women talk about using the existing system there, we don't hear about that many changes. But, like I said, I think it

is still very early on.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I just wanted to make a comment. Any services that we receive in the northern communities, one of the biggest ingredients that we cannot forget is respect to our culture, although we are talking about best of both worlds, but we must have respect of our culture.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I wonder if you could comment briefly on what used to occur prior to contact with the kabluna (PH), the non-Aboriginal people, in Aboriginal communities amongst the Inuit. Was there family violence like we see today, and if there was, how did the community deal with it?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: What I have heard so far is from elders that I dealt with or I consulted with through the Panel on Violence Against Women, and there was none. There was no family violence. But if there was a dispute or anything like that, the whole community used to get together and deal with it, and they have a certain way of punishing that person.

MARTHA GREIG: One way of punishment was ostracism and sometimes ridiculing, because in our harsh environment that we live in, ostracism and ridicule were

not the best ingredients to have in our lives. So we have to be included for survival skills.

That is what is starting to happen. Elders are starting to say they have to get the best of the two worlds, because there were good things with dealing with people that do petty crime, like break and entry or theft or adultery, whatever. So there were certain methods. Because we are Inuit people, we also have to put into that -- because they say, "Yes, thank you very much, you guys are governing us, but you can take a recess now and we can now take over, but hand in hand." That's what the people are saying now.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Good.

Mary.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: I would like to try to answer that. Could I just...?

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Yes, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: I would just like to add to what Martha and Martha were saying because I think that in different regions the practices were different. I grew up in Labrador with my grandparents; my grandfather was a chief elder, and I

remember as a young child, if there was a crime, for example, elders would get together and they would discuss what had to be done. These were considered to be very, very serious meetings, and when elders said something, that was considered to be very, very serious.

In terms of family violence too, I have heard many people say that family violence did exist many, many years ago; the only difference between now and then is that now people talk about it very openly.

I think in addition to the other kinds of punishment that Inuit practised was banishment. For example, if there was someone who murdered someone or someone who had committed a very, very bad crime, they would be banished to another community where there were no people.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Thank you.

Could I ask about the kind of role that women played in the way of leadership traditionally. You talk in your proposal about how women and men were different but they were equal, and now they are not so much so because of values and views that have come from elsewhere, and the wage employment has changed things to some degree and so forth.

Without making it too long, could you just give me some idea about the kind of leadership role that women might have played in the past.

MARTHA GREIG: I am sorry, I am the one that likes to give long answers, but you are asking the question, so don't say "brief" all the time, or you will get half-answers or pictures.

Anyway, to get the point across really well and clear and short and sweet, yes, the men and women had a clear role, and even the children had a clear role; everybody had a clear role. But because women are the nurturers of the children, we were more or less in the community when our men were out looking for game, and they would be gone months at a time. So the women really had the key role of the structure of the community with the elders. So they were our teachers, our nurses and social workers and what have you, and it was not a departmentalized thing like nowadays it is.

The men also had a clear role, but when we were put into communities, it started to change, because the women had an easier time finding jobs as cleaners or dishwashers, whatever, and though our men were still hunting -- but then, when the Green Peace came in, that

really did a number to our identity, our self-worth of men, because that's all they really knew. But, as women, we can do a few things; we are good with our hands and we are good in other things. We are child-bearers too, and that makes life -- so there was always that respect for women, but when we started changing, the men, it was like a rug was pulled from under their feet. That's when the shift started to happen of the inequality of gender.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I guess what I am trying to get at is, if there was in the past, prior to contact, some kind of community crisis that a major decision needed to be made, say, in the community, let's say for instance you couldn't find any wildlife or something, you were in the middle of the winter, and the community or the family or the extended family had to make a decision as to what they were going to do, what role did women play in the decision-making in the past?

MARTHA GREIG: I was not there, so I can't answer that. Like I said, I am 41 years old --

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: But you have an oral culture that is passed on.

MARTHA GREIG: -- but everybody saw to it that everybody stayed together and lived to the next

meal. As much as possible they shared everything, everybody would see to it. But there came a time -- it doesn't happen all the time, but there has to come a time that an elderly person thought it was best that she be left behind so that another person, a younger person could have that nourishment. That, to me, is like suicide in a way, but it was part of survival skills.

What things happened back then were based primarily on survival skills, but if we did these things today, we could be put in jail. But that was our time, that was our rules, that was our land, that was our way to live; it was just primarily survival skills. So that's where it is slightly changed -- or a handicapped person, or whatever. Though, as Inuit people, we looked after one another very well, in very rare cases that happened. That eventuality, any people -- it is not just the Inuit way, it is a survival mechanism.

(Inuktitut - no English translation available)

ELDER LEAH IDLOUT-PAULSON: If I make it too short, you might understand.

From what I heard, I was born with the two grandmothers and I lived out in a camp for 16 years

of my age. At the time they didn't tell as much what was done, but later on, when I was editor of "Renew Today" magazine, I had a chance to talk to so many elders.

From what I heard, they had a different way of doing things. We have about six regions, and in certain places, like where I came from, they had elders who were practitioners to find who the animals were, and there was help of a shaman as well. There were two types of shamans; one was for seeking out the animals and one was seeking out for the sick people; their spirit travels. When they began to have starvation, the most important, it seems like it was supposed to be -- the most important northern Quebec areas for man to take a little bit of food to go on hunt, because if you are starving, you can't hunt.

Then, in homes, they would do anything, depending on what time of the year starvation it was, what season. The wintertime was the hardest time, and then, if you were lucky enough, there would be some other travellers who would meet those people who were in need, and they would help the others in the camp right away.

There was only one big true story -- I have heard so much when I was a child, how we are not supposed to be fussy about the food, whatever we get,

because one time there was a woman who was found left alone years ago, and how she survived is by her husband's flesh. The only thing left that was there was the guts, and she survived and she has generations today.

The other stories on what was going on, it was help not right away, almost half a month or less than a week or -- then that action happened.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Thank you.

In your proposal, in the brief, you talk about family violence and violence against women. On page 9 you cite many, many reasons; I would say you probably did a great job of zeroing in on what the reasons are, combinations of things like poverty and dependence, erosion of traditional lifestyles, economies, alcohol abuse, drug abuse, overcrowding, inadequate housing, et cetera. Then you cited "lack of control over governments and institutions which run the North."

i found that somewhat curious because in all the Inuit communities in the Northwest Territories, for instance, you have local councils which are run by the Inuit. In the Northwest Territories we have had an Aboriginal majority on the territorial council for over 20 years, you have had the Northern Quebec Land Settlement

which has given some degree of control in northern Quebec to the Inuit.

So I am just wondering what this means? That this style of government, the present form of government doesn't work? What are we talking about when we say, "lack of control over government and institutions which run the North?"

MARTHA GREIG: I will try to answer. As you know, there are some Inuit communities or regions that are still at the negotiating stage of land claims, which is Labrador, though northern Quebec and western Arctic are pretty well off considering the other regions, because they are somewhat Inuit-controlled now. But in the Nunavut area, it is now just at the makes of it, and there are different stages. So what we have to see is, though the people in Labrador won't have to suffer unnecessarily just because they don't have their land claim settlement, they go up to par -- because it is a Third World state area sort of thing.

So, though we have territorial Legislative Assembly, still, it is not meeting the needs of the demand to put us in a category where we are living well.

So it is just to make them realize --

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I understand. I have a supplementary question that follows on that and it is in relation to self-government.

What is it that the Inuit are after when they are trying to get an amendment to the Canadian Constitution in relation to self-government? On one of your pages you talk about control -- it is the summary. "Based on respect for the Inuit way, governments must

> legally and constitutionally recognize Inuit self-government rights and enter into negotiations to implement these rights."

Are we talking about Nunavut or are we talking about Nunavut plus something else? What is envisaged here? This was always a bit of a curiosity; I always wondered about that. It would be very, very helpful to find out -- I mean, when the other Aboriginal in the country talk about negotiating self-government agreements, we always envisage something different south of 60. But, in the North, we have always heard in relation to the Inuit that what is being considered is public government, and what is always held up as the example is

the Nunavut Settlement, as how the Inuit are different from other Aboriginal people.

So, when you say "Inuit self-government" and you want negotiations for that, what is envisaged there?

MARY CRNKOVICH: I am going to wear two hats, because I work with Pauktuutit but I also formerly worked with TFN in the negotiations of that, and it is something that Pauktuutit has discussed; although it was not invited to participate in that other organization, it was something discussed.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Are you going to give us the Inuit women's view or are you going to give us the view of --

MARY CRNKOVICH: I am not an Inuk woman, but I work on behalf of the Inuit Women's Organization, and this is an issue that we have researched. So I will raise the issues that have come up.

It was recognized -- and that's one of the reasons we are doing the justice project -- Nunavut as it exists today, division of the Northwest Territories, with a Nunavut Act that looks very similar to an NWT Act, with some of the older draconian sections removed, we are

saying that that's not Inuit self-government in completion. One of the reasons that we have undertaken to do a justice project is to try to negotiate over the next number of years, before Nunavut is up and running and while it is up and running -- to negotiate and create institutions that reflect what Inuit women and men in the communities want.

So Nunavut is the starting point, but certainly it has never been considered by Inuit women as the end point. When Nunavut is held up, it is held up by virtue of Inuit being a majority in those communities, they will have the ability to exercise some control over what. For example, justice programs or the justice system may look like there, and the attempt has always been, through organizations like ITC and other ones, that we will be able to negotiate further within the context of Nunavut, within the context of Nunavik, and when Labrador begins to negotiate, within their negotiations, specific issues and specific solutions that reflect Inuit culture.

Nunavut has been held up as an example, but it is because it is a means to achieving an end; but it has never been seen by the Inuit women we have been

working with in the justice project as an end in itself.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: As a general point that Nunavut is not enough and that the Inuit are going to want more, could you give us the beginnings of what that might look like? What are we talking about?

MARY CRNKOVICH: In terms of justice? I can only speak in terms of --

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Self-government.

MARY CRNKOVICH: -- self-government. Again, my work has been only with women on the justice issue; that's the only area we are funded in. There, it is looking at things -- for example, Manitoba has been working with a family violence court. Family violence is something that is very significant in the North. Should we be looking at using a court structure that incorporates Inuit expertise and culture and deals with family violence only? Is that something that women want to do? That's something that we are talking about; so those kinds of things.

Right now, the Nunavut Act gives power to a Nunavik government to determine what kind of court structure it has within its powers, and we are saying,

maybe there are some courts we would like to see, maybe the court structure is not acceptable, but right now, we are exploring certain things as they relate to Inuit women. For example, the Manitoba family violence court system is something that is intriguing, and we are exploring that and looking at it in terms of some of the solutions Inuit women have raised. So it is those kinds of things, but, again, I can't presume to say what the outcome will be because they are only beginning.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Martha, go ahead.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: Sure.

Because Nunavut land claim would be a great opportunity to make changes, such as our justice system, for us to be involved, I think this will be a great opportunity for you, Commissioners, when you have a Tungavik (PH) Federation or ITC, to pose this question to them, because they are the ones who usually make decisions on who is going to be involved. We have tried and tried, but we haven't really got an answer yet. I think this would be a really good question to them. Maybe they will start thinking about it, so it is not just coming from us.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Sure.

In relation to the economy of the North, the future economy of the North, you have presented I think very clearly here, when the old economy of the North got into trouble, with the fur industry having its problems and all the rest of it, how we now have many problems that can probably be rooted back in the destruction of the old economy.

What do you actually see as the economy of the North that we could actually ever have what resembles full employment in the North? What will be the economy? Will it be government? Will it be mining? Will it be based on renewable resources as it was in the past?

You talk about self-sufficiency here and doing business differently. First, you say that it is high costs already to do business in the North, but then you say that it has to be holistic, daycare needs to be taken into consideration. It seems to me you are adding on more costs for normal business than it already is, but, nevertheless, what do you really see as the economy of the North? What do you think is really going to be the future of the North in relation to the economy?

SIMONA BARNES: We talked about

additional costs. We are in fact talking about economic development in its true sense, taking into consideration both other social costs that have to be built in.

In Nunavut alone, the individual regional Inuit associations are ready to negotiate and are in fact negotiating non-renewable exploration and mining to come later. What is different, though, is that it is Inuit who are negotiating with the mining industry so that they have Inuit impact benefits and rules and regulations and guidelines that they will be able to enforce.

But, having seen what is happening in your homelands, and out of those explorations, when it comes to our non-renewable resource development, loyalties can be shared between the existing governments and the Inuit organizations.

Renewable resources, the Inuit communities have been looking at tapping into other natural industries, like fisheries, and they are continuing to look at some ways where they can use the wildlife without forcing the wildlife to go into extinction, to be controlled. So there is conservation being addressed of the wildlife. Also, heavily regulated non-renewable

resource development is to take place within our homelands.

So, in that context, people have more say than ever before, and they can negotiate directly with the interested parties.

The high costs, again, that's the price of sure economic development.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: When you say businesses doing work in the North should take in consideration a holistic approach and things like daycare should be taken in consideration, are you suggesting that every business that comes to the North needs to have a daycare centre attached to it, or are you saying that the communities' needs in relation to daycare should be taken care of? Which is it? Or is it both?

SIMONA BARNES: We talked about two initiatives that we are supporting, and those are women's groups initiatives, where it is basically a small industry where they are going to address their needs in order to go and work in that sewing centre.

Again, if you look at Nanisivik (?) Mines in the Northwest Territories in the Nunavut area, daycare has always been recognized because, in the mining town, they have realized that, again, a holistic approach had

to be taken. If miners were to bring their families, their wives also would want to get involved in the employment industries, and the mine itself supports a daycare centre, which enables the whole family to enjoy life in Nanisivik (PH).

Those are the initiatives that we were talking about, initiatives coming from the community.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Yes, go ahead, Martha.

MARTHA GREIG: I really am quite appalled to hear your comment saying we are proposing another higher cost for daycare. As a parent, my potential to make money is zero if I think my child is going to be in jeopardy. So I hope you are a parent and I want you to think about that, because -- it makes me a little bit angry, because children are priceless, and there should be no ceiling put on daycare for their care. There are some women that are breast-feeding, and there should be a place for them close by that they can continue to work and meet their motherly needs too.

That's where the difference between men and women is: we are more closely bond to our children than the men are. They can be at a distance somewhat.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I have another comment, a small comment. This is another example; when you were asking about the role of women and men, I wanted to make this comment.

Yes, we had strong roles for women and men. I just wanted to make this clear because a lot of men did not understand what we were talking about in the North; they thought we were trying to take their rights away. But we are talking about opportunities that we would like to have. This is just an example, daycare, that will give us access to have opportunities like men have. They could just get up and go and look for a job, run for election. We can't do that.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I was just trying to get a handle on -- if you could try not to get too emotional, I am just trying to find out what you are proposing. You say:

"We recommend that all economic development initiatives have a daycare component"

and I am trying to figure out what that means.

I presume, from reading the English, that it means that every time there is a new business, it has a daycare component, and you gave two examples of

two programs that Inuit women are in support of.

I understood very clearly the need for daycare to be resolved for women to be liberated like men to get to the job sites, because, as you say, men just naturally assume that when they get up in the morning and they leave the house, someone is taking care of the children. Women can't do that. That's a given.

So all I was trying to figure out is if you were saying that every time a new business is going to be created, there has to be a daycare components -- that's what it says, "We recommend that all the economic development initiatives have a daycare component" -- or are you saying that the needs of every community for daycare need to somehow be taken care of?

So try not to get off on some side track; just answer the question.

MARTHA GREIG: We are trying to answer honestly, but I think being too honest can be bad sometimes, and I have to yet work on my dishonesty aspect a little bit maybe to agree to the so-called roles or expectations -- anyway.

This is a two-pronged thing. Most of the time we have individual houses to take care of our

kids but once that person gets sick, that person is stuck. So what we want is a daycare. That's a guarantee that at least somebody will be there, at least 8:00 to 5:00 or whatever, that we will have somebody there.

People can make choices of who they want, and sometimes their family members baby-sit, but, because there are so many people with grandchildren and great-grandchildren, and we also want to give these elderly women a break, that is why we want to make sure that there would be a proper daycare, so that we will be at ease, as protected as we can be, instead of worrying.

So that's a two-pronged thing, that there are options for the women.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: One of the ways I think you might have been suggesting here -- you didn't say it, but I thought you might have been suggesting it -- is that many of the economic activities in the North are large; for instance, mines, Nanisivik (PH). I thought you were leading up to saying that if the economic project is big enough, it should have its own daycare facility. If you were saying that, then I was going to ask, "How big is big?" If you are starting a small little shop and you only have one or two people you are going to be able

to hire, is it reasonable to expect a little operation like that to have a daycare component? I could easily see the argument for bigger enterprises.

SIMONA BARNES: I would like to say that in the proposal or in the document that you are referring to, what we should clarify is that whenever women are missing on an opportunity because daycare services aren't available, daycare should be taken into consideration. Talking about daycare, some of the things that prevent people, women, from even small cottage industry activities right now is that we are dealing with some of the concerns which are very basic in the Northwest Territories. A group of women have been interested in informal sewing circles, cottage industries. Because they live in public housing, they are not allowed to conduct their activities in their own homes.

So we are not only talking about daycare, but other restrictions that prevent women from even small cottage industry activities.

MARY CRNKOVICH: The other point, to be brief, was that in the Nunavit Land Claims Agreement, Inuit were able to negotiate Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreements which required, when a proponent came on to Inuit-owned

land, where Inuit owned the surface but the government owned the subsurface, the minerals, they would negotiate with the Inuit an Inuit Impact and Benefit Agreement.

It is these kinds of initiatives where we are concerned. They are enumerated in the land claim, many items for negotiation, things from housing, recreation, job rotation, labour management relations, a variety of those things. They deal with specific large projects of the kind, mega-projects such as a mining undertaking or a renewable resource major project. Those are the kinds of things where we think there is an opportunity to negotiate other matters, and it was our view that other matters should include things like daycare, because, in the past, even though not many Inuit man have had the benefit of working, they certainly have had more benefit of working in those industries than women because of the inability of daycare services.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Could I go to housing for a minute. Simona just brought up public housing and the problems connected to it if you want to start a small business at home.

What do you think is the solution to the housing shortage? You have cited that virtually 100 per

cent of the people in Labrador for instance, thought housing was a serious community problem, and I guess throughout your work you keep hearing that housing shortages are viewed as a very serious problem, but what is the solution?

MARTHA GREIG: I don't have all the solutions, but I really feel, because there are so many dollars assigned for public housing and it is getting harder and harder to get them, what I really see as a key issue is home ownership. That is starting to happen in the communities, and I am now a proud owner of one.

Home ownership, I think, has to be an area where they will be given that ability. People will be waiting years and years to get the proper housing because the demand is not being met, so the home ownership really has to be in place, and affordability can be met, so that certain payments -- there is the thing with NWT, if you are in it for five years, then it is yours type of thing. There could be that style, because, in the long run it is going to be cheaper for the community, and also having their own self-worth is also good for their self-esteem.

It is costly, but that's just one small area, because the demands for housing have not been met

for a long, long time.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Is there any way that the cost of housing could be reduced by using material from the North?

MARTHA GREIG: Rocks?

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Yes. It will last longer.

MARTHA GREIG: It is mighty cold. There could be ways, I guess; that's an area that could be ventured into.

MARY CRNKOVICH: They are actually experimenting in places like Iqaluit with new environmentally friendly ways of building houses using immediate services. We have the example of a building in Iqaluit that looks like a huge igloo made of concrete slabs. It is not the local rock, but it is styrofoam and concrete slabs, which is cheaper in terms of heating but it also is easier to construct than the wood housing. But that was undertaken by an Inuit development organization, and, again, it was all done on speculation, and the funding was very limited. So it is questionable as to whether they will be able to pursue further work in that area.

So it turns on the availability, again, of funds to do that because it was very different from the housing standards that were in the legislation regarding construction of homes, residential units and business units in that community.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: Can I make a small comment on what I saw yesterday while we are on economic development? I came here yesterday listening to Pat Baxter making a presentation on behalf of economic development for Canadian Aboriginal women. EDCAW represents all Aboriginal women across Canada, but, when I was sitting here, there was very little said about Inuit women in terms of economic development. There was no comparison, because there is nothing to compare with, first of all.

You didn't see the true picture yesterday, and there were no real questions about the comparison between the opportunities between Aboriginal Inuit women and other Aboriginal women.

I am making that comment because, in the North, we have a lot less information and understanding of the opportunities of economic development. This is just an example. I was telling you about how I was lumped,

when I was on the Canadian Panel on Violence against Women. This also goes to how the federal government allocates money, that is, one part for Inuit and other Aboriginal people; Inuit people hardly ever see that lump sum. If I had it my way, I wish I could change it.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I am just going to shift to the last area I have two questions on.

In the part on education you talked about how the education system has had a tremendous impact on the Inuit culture and how you hope in the future that, by reasserting control over the education system, the Inuit would once again be able to have their culture and be proud of who they are. You didn't mention anywhere the impact of television on the Inuit. I was wondering about that, because the reality is that American television is affecting the whole world. There was an individual here last night at one of the universities who gave a speech. His speech was how Mickey Mouse and Arnold Schwarzanegger were affecting the whole world, and that American television is so powerful that it probably had something to do with bringing down the Berlin Wall.

Certainly, Canadians in southern Canada are always worried about their culture in relation to the

United States. They have schools in their language, and presumably their culture is being taught and all the rest of it. I was just kind of surprised that there was no mention or no consideration, it seemed that in fact even if you do get control of your education system, unless you destroy the television box, you will still have an invasion on your culture.

So I was wondering how you thought you might be able to deal with that, cope with that.

SIMONA BARNES: Talking about television, we accept that it is here and it is here to stay with us. There are some things that are beyond our control. One of the concerns that we have is pornography. I don't know whether people raise it as a concern in your hearings, but it is a concern to us. But, accepting the fact that television is here with us, we have seen the potential of how we can use it in education.

I was involved in a distance education program in management studies through TVNC. It is an education outreach that we were never able to do before in the North, again, when we look at the high cost of living. We were able to work with satellite classrooms in Nunavik, Labrador, Northwest Territories, and some of the Innu

communities in Labrador. It is expensive, but it has a lot of potential to do education to the remote locations. Not only education, but I see it as a way of being able to facilitate grassroots economic development in a lot of our communities.

So with that I would like to say that, yes, there are negative impacts, but again, there are also the positive possibilities that we can use with television media.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: In relation to your dream of an Inuit College, in the Northwest Territories, Arctic College has different campuses that they are starting in different parts of the North. Would the taking over of one of those satellite campuses and converting it to the Inuit College be what you are after, or are you talking about something completely different?

That's my final question.

SIMONA BARNES: We are talking about television as an interactive teaching tool, but when you are working with textiles, such as the course that we are talking about, a women's centre, very often touch, feel and visual, on hand, is more powerful than turning on your television. We are automatically accustomed to turning

on our television and expecting to get entertainment. So in some ways, yes, you can use television for some topics, but some of the other topics that we are talking about where we are working with textiles, touch, feel, smell, you still need to have learning centres in a central location.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: My question was about your Inuit College idea. In the Northwest Territories we have Arctic College that has different campuses. I think, if they are not in Rankin Inlet, they are going to be very soon or something like that. Would taking over one of those satellite campuses be the beginning of your Inuit College, or do you want to start from scratch?

MARTHA GREIG: We want to start from scratch, because it will be us that planned it, and we will bear it for nine months, as an unborn child, then we will be there at the birthing, and then see it to adulthood and being involved, and also with men as well; although it is women's studies, it will also deal with men.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Thank you for your answers.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

Martha.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: If you don't have any more questions, I have a question.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Maybe just before that, I was going to say that my colleagues covered most of the ground. I will have just a small, specific question.

When you spoke in your presentation about the necessity for women to access capital and financial services, you mentioned that the development of credit unions in the North would be very welcome. So my question is, in northern Quebec, has there been contact, through the Nunavik or the Kativik with the caisses populaires? The caisses populaires structure within Quebec enables branches to be owned and controlled by the community. This is used in Kahnawake, for example, as a financial institution within the reserve.

As we are going to have a presentation by the caisses populaires in Montreal later this month, I just wanted to know if you were aware of contacts that had been made with the organization towards establishing a local unit.

SIMONA BARNES: You are talking about caisses populaires in Quebec and Nunavik. We don't know. We know that there have been discussions before, but we don't know what is happening.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

Martha, you have a question?

MARTHA FLAHERTY: Yes.

I was a member of the Panel on Violence Against Women. We worked very hard to deal with the recommendations that respond to many issues raised by the people -- I am mainly talking about Aboriginal people across the North. These recommendations have not been implemented yet. I don't know if they will be implemented ever.

My question is, you too will come up with recommendations. How will you ensure the recommendations are implemented?

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: This is always a genuine and real concern for everybody, and of course for Commissioners. As you know, we plan and we hope to be able to come up with an interim report on family violence, putting together what we heard publicly and in private in three or four rounds of hearings. During the

course of our work, we are examining very carefully the recommendations made by the Panel on Family Violence, in particular the Aboriginal people, Métis, Inuit and Indian segments.

Again, we hope to be able to come up with a report that will not only speak about the problems but will, in an intermediate fashion, bring some recommendations for helping to ease the situation, and we are going to come back to this in the final report. So it will give us some room to adjust between the two, having in mind the implementation.

We are aware that governments are concerned, but also, as your presentation this morning shows, Aboriginal communities and leadership too.

There is no magic, but everybody has to be concerned about implementation. I think the public hearings that the Commission held have raised a public awareness to push for not only speaking out but doing something about it.

That's about what I could say at this point.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: There are no guarantees. No commission of inquiry can guarantee

anything because they are not involved in implementation. You are asked by government to give your best opinions as to what should be done on a particular issue and then they take it from there.

We have been trying in our work to make sure that we do high quality work, that we consult, we ask people's opinions, to involve both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people and governments. So we hope that, in the end -- we have not finished our work yet, we have a little over a year before we hope to have our report in. We hope that we have been able to gauge both what is appropriate for Aboriginal people and for the non-Aboriginal people, and we are trying to assess why other inquiries are not successful and make sure that all of the possible excuses that government typically use no to put something through is taken into consideration by the time we finish our final recommendations. So if one inquiry failed because there was not a clear blueprint, we want to make sure that the blueprint is very, very clear. If one failed because the steps that were necessary were not covered, we will talk about Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3 and so forth. If it is because a long-term vision and an interim vision is not put in place, we are going to

try to cover both, those kinds of things.

We are going to try to look at the world from a number of different world perspectives at the same time, and yet try not to put ourselves in a situation where we are looking at the lowest common denominator, because that is not going to work for anybody. Just moving the status quo a tiny bit so that you are safe is not going to work.

So we know we have a very tough challenge, but there is no way we can tell people with any assurance that our recommendations are going to be carried out. But we have been aware from the start that implementation is just as important, if not the most important thing that we should be concentrating on, and it is an area which, particularly in the next 14 months, we will be spending a fair amount of time on.

MARTHA FLAHERTY: I just want a "yes" or "no" answer; I hope you are going to say "yes" or "no". Are we going to have a different section for Inuit?

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Yes.

Is that it?

Yes, Peter.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: When

the report comes out, as Georges has said, we can only recommend, and governments have to implement. This is a reality. On the other hand, I would certainly hope that the report will be widely read, that those who are affected by the recommendations, those who see wisdom in the recommendations or value in the recommendations, will say, "We think those are good ideas", and they in turn pressure governments and others to act on them. The work doesn't stop once the report is released. It seems to me it is really the beginning of another whole process.

I think this is critical. I think it is an excellent question that you have raised. This is something, certainly, that we have to discuss amongst ourselves as well.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Martha.

MARTHA GREIG: Just to put not a rubber-stamp but a real sledgehammer into your recommendations, you should really stress -- government is always saying, "Watch your dollars, where you put your money." You guys used up a lot of money. So if you want the government to really practise what they preach, say to them, "Okay, we spent so much money. Let's assure that there will be no further waste, let's make sure these are

implemented." I plead.

Also, this is just in closing from me -- because I know you guys have to eat too, we are way over time. What we were talking about is a lot of issues that deal with a person, social issues that deal with self-worth and self-esteem and what a human being can be as a protective Canadian person. You will be hearing from other people from your travels, and I know from my experience from the counselling I do this little poem helps me; it is called "The Power of Optimism", and I want to read it to you so that you will not forget us little Inuit women.

"When all seems to have gone wrong, we must stay optimistic.

This does not mean we foolishly blind our eyes to facts.

Mature optimism recognizes things as they are.
It does not diminish the difficulties we confront, but
it refuses to succumb to them or
to see any reason to give up or give in.
Nelson lost an eye, Pete Roven (PH) turned deaf, and Robert Louis Stevenson contracted

tuberculosis, but none of them gave up the fight.

Misfortune never touched their hearts. They never thought of saying, "I've had it." In fact, their greatest achievements were yet to come.

The past is for wisdom, the present is for action, the future for joy.

And God bless you always.

Martha Greig and Pauktuutit Office."

I will give you this, so you will really make sure they don't just rubber-stamp but sledgehammer it. And I am so glad Jack is here -- the federal party. He is here to witness it. I will pass it on to you, and that's from me.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you very much. On behalf of my colleagues I would like to thank you for providing us with an opportunity of such a frank, direct and effective discussion with your association. It is certainly going to have an impact on our thoughts and our report. Thank you.

We will resume the hearings at 2:15 with the Canadian Wildlife Federation.

--- Luncheon Recess at 1:22 p.m.

--- Upon resuming at 2:20 p.m.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Good afternoon. We are sorry for the delay. We have tried to reach you with no avail; it was too late when we realized that we would be delayed for an hour.

Maybe you could introduce yourself for the sake of the record, and you may proceed when you are ready, please.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER, Manager - Communications/Programs, Canadian Wildlife Federation: Thank you, and it's fine, I don't mind the wait at all. I had a chance to review my notes and read some of your documentation I hadn't seen yet.

First of all, I would just like to thank you, the Commission, for once again allowing the Canadian Wildlife Federation to make a presentation to this Commission. I had the opportunity of presenting to two of you before in Saskatoon earlier this year, and I thank you for that opportunity.

Before I begin, I would like to offer my apologies for Colin Maxwell, who is our Executive Vice-President, and unfortunately was called away suddenly

and is unable to attend here today. I only may remember that it happened to me in Saskatoon too; so I am getting used to being alone on this one.

My name is Sandy Baumgartner, and I am the Manager of Communications and Programs for the Canadian Wildlife Federation. I see that you have some background information and our brief in front of you. I will just try to outline a bit about our organization.

The Canadian Wildlife Federation is Canada's largest non-government, non-profit conservation organization. We have been in existence for over 30 years now and we are dedicated to ensuring the wise use of our natural resources. Some of our activities include -- and you will see that in your packages -- advocacy; one of our main and strongest endeavours is conservation, education and information, not only for the public but for school children; and we also are involved in funding research and facilitating research in wildlife and wildlife habitat rehabilitation.

My hope today is that we, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, can contribute to your works through recommending positive solutions to the issues that have been brought forward to you in the past few years. I

realize that you have probably heard many presentations about the unfortunate plight of our native peoples, and I would like to congratulate all of you for the hard work and the positive strides that you have made in this direction.

I am here today to talk to you about conservation and conservation of natural resources, particularly wildlife, and about how we, the Canadian Wildlife Federation, hope to contribute to building of new relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people. I believe that we have made steps in this direction in building trust and building new working arrangements with Aboriginal people, and I hope that we can build on that.

You have our brief in front of you. So I won't go over it in great detail, but what I will do is I will summarize our position, our recommendations, and then hopefully we can discuss with you how I can help to achieve our mutual goals.

As you have seen in our brief, our recommendations are based on the following principles.

We, the Federation, recognize the legal and constitutional rights of Aboriginal people must be

recognized and respected. We recognize that in many regions of Canada the use of wildlife by Aboriginal peoples is crucial for their economic, social and cultural well-being. We also note that in some regions of Canada non-Aboriginal people also depend on wildlife for similar purposes. Aboriginal peoples have not traditionally been consulted about land and resource use management plans. It is the collective responsibility of all Canadians, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, to ensure the wise use of natural resources for the enjoyment of all present and future generations.

We believe that wildlife should not be used as a bargaining tool, however, in any land claim negotiations. Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples have compatible goals of wildlife conservation, and that is to preserve and protect our environment. Keeping that in mind, then, we recognize that our first priority must always be to wildlife conservation. The final point is that wildlife knows no boundaries, does not recognize jurisdictions and belongs to no one.

As I have already mentioned, earlier this year I presented to two of you Commissioners the CWF position paper on native use of wildlife. Our policy has

provided us the basis for making recommendations and it has been our road map for developing and working towards co-management agreements for wildlife management in Canada.

Our first recommendation you will find in our brief is that the Federation recommends that governments -- federal, provincial and territorial -- must maintain authority over wildlife management. However, the development of the legislation, the setting of harvest limits, harvesting methods, the conservation of wildlife and the protection of wildlife habitat must be done in co-operation with all Canadians, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, government and non-government. We believe that the development of co-operative wildlife and land use management plans will lead to more efficient and more effective wildlife programs in Canada. Our goal, like Aboriginal peoples', is to ensure healthy and abundant wildlife populations for today and tomorrow.

The Federation strongly believes that by working together we can achieve sound policies for wildlife management, but the key is that we must work together. I don't believe that government should allow the division between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal

peoples. We must continue to find better ways of bringing people together instead of dividing them.

We recognize that many Aboriginal peoples have outstanding land claims, for example. Therefore, one of our recommendations is that we urge the federal government to resolve the comprehensive land claims as quickly as possible, as our former government had committed them to do. In those negotiations, where the interest of wildlife and environment are under discussion, we, however, would like to play a role in the negotiating process. We, as a non-government organization, would like to be at the same table as Aboriginal peoples, so that you can see firsthand that non-Aboriginal people truly have the same objectives and that our main concern is wildlife.

I have previously discussed with two of your Commissioners a landmark wildlife agreement that I think is very significant in that we have used it as a model and will be using as a model, and it is the Saskatchewan Memorandum of Understanding that was signed in May of this year with the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation, the Canadian Wildlife Federation and the provincial

government. It outlines the willingness of all those parties to work together in good faith to protect wildlife populations in that province. I am just going to refer to some of the significant principles that were outlined in that document.

The document reads that:

"* In addition to existing governmental activity in wildlife management, a common, practical, development approach is desirable in respect to wildlife and habitat development and management;

* a common approach to wildlife and wildlife habitat development and management may need to be developed and pursued which respect the Constitutional and Treaty rights of Indian people while at the same time satisfying the long-term interest of all people in Saskatchewan;

* the Parties have a common interest in protection, preserving, conserving and developing wildlife and their

habitats;

* the 'FSIN Wildlife Development Conservation Strategy', as it pertains to wildlife, contains practical avenues for both Indian developments and co-management systems;
* the Parties respect the traditional Indian viewpoint that the earth is the foundation which provides nourishment, shelter, medicine and comfort for people, and that man must harmonize his actions with nature; and,
* there is a mutual understanding of the current threats confronting wildlife and their habitats. Furthermore, the Parties acknowledge that more information is required in order to determine effective responses and monitoring systems in respect of such threats; and in order to address these issues there is a need for long-term planning; close cooperation, and the coordination

of some wildlife and wildlife habitat management activities by the Parties;"

The Federation strongly urges that similar memorandums of understanding on wildlife management be developed by all First Nations in co-operation with the Assembly of First Nations, provincial, territorial and federal governments, the Canadian Wildlife Federation and its appropriate provincial affiliate. I realize that this may not be an easy task, but the Canadian Wildlife Federation is committed to working with all the parties mentioned to bring this goal to a reality.

We believe that it is working. For example, in British Columbia, we discussed, when I met with two Commissioners earlier this year, the difficulties with some of the wildlife management issues in that province, but I had been informed that the results are beginning to be seen. I guess what it took was to remove the government from the centre. What is happening in British Columbia is, the B.C. Wildlife Federation is currently organizing discussions between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples to discuss the government's

proposed guidelines on Aboriginal use of fish and wildlife. The hope amongst the two groups is to bring together collective consensus recommendations to the government on that policy, and I believe that will be another step to another co-management agreement.

I believe the successes and failures speak for themselves in cases where the governments have not been included and environmental organizations and wildlife organizations have been included in discussions with Aboriginal people. I have outlined in the brief several examples, positive examples and failures as well. You need only to look at Ontario and the unfortunate situation that has been occurring because of non-discussions between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, and unfortunately I think that the government has driven a wedge between those two groups. We believe that that could have been avoided.

Another recommendation that the Canadian Wildlife Federation has is that on lands not owned by Aboriginal peoples, co-management committees should be organized to co-operatively develop and recommend wildlife and natural resource management plans in that region. As outlined in the brief, we recommend that all

peoples be recognized and represented on those committees. I will just point you to page 6 of our brief, where that is outlined.

Finally, I would like to address the need for Aboriginal involvement in all conservation programs and initiatives. Traditionally, many wildlife-related programs have been developed without due consideration of Aboriginal rights and/or without any participation by Aboriginal peoples. We believe we need to provide more opportunities to work together so we can build trust between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples.

The Canadian Wildlife Federation recommends, for example, that opportunities be developed for Aboriginal people to receive training in wildlife management practices as well as to be provided the opportunity for employment in these fields. We also recommend that joint initiatives between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples be developed in all sectors of wildlife. For example, workshops and seminars on wildlife conservation should be developed jointly. I will give you one example of a program we have just recently been involved in. We organized a workshop on fisheries habitat initiatives and how people can work towards better

fisheries habitat. We ensured that there was an Aboriginal speaker as well as Aboriginal participation in that workshop.

Education and public awareness programs should also include Aboriginal participation, not only in the programs themselves but in the program development; not after the fact, but as the program is being designed. For example, we are currently working on an educational program that is modelled after our project "WILD School Program". The program is on responsible stewardship. The initial development of the terms of reference for this program has included Aboriginals at the table in the discussion, so that their concerns can be addressed along with everyone else's at the time of development of the program, not after the fact.

There are many other examples of initiatives that have worked, and they are outlined in the brief.

I encourage governments to work together with all people. We often see governments developing parallel processes to address Aboriginal peoples in program initiatives, and I believe that this does not work. I think we should work together, to bring people together

initially instead of dividing them from the start.

There has been a long history of mistrust, mistruths and misunderstanding between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. It is critical for all peoples to gain trust and understanding as we move through this period in Canadian history. The Canadian Wildlife Federation firmly believes that open dialogue between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples must be a formal part of the negotiating process with First Nations.

To date the federal and provincial governments have acted as the go-between for much of the current negotiations with Aboriginal peoples. This has often led to conflict, confrontation and often misrepresentation of third party concerns as well as Aboriginal concerns. We recognize the role of government in developing agreements; however, by allowing for direct communication between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, we believe that negotiations can be conducted in good faith and good will.

So what can the Canadian Wildlife Federation do to affect this change and provide the constructive solutions that you are looking for? We believe that the Canadian Wildlife Federation remains

middle-of-the-road on many issues. We like to believe that we have provided a balanced view in the many initiatives that we have undertaken with Aboriginal peoples, and we believe that we can play an important role in facilitating co-operation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. We would like to facilitate and/or participate in discussions with Aboriginal peoples so we may work towards co-operative management of natural resources in Canada.

The Canadian Wildlife Federation will continue to work with Aboriginal peoples and we will continue to build trust and improve working relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples. I ask you, the Royal Commission, to support us through your recommendations at the end of your hearings.

Thank you, and I will take any questions.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

At this point I would like to ask Commissioners if there are some questions.

Peter Meekison.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you, and thank you for your brief, which I found very, very informative. I really just have a couple of

questions.

At the beginning of the brief, on page 2, you state:

"The Federation recommends that Canadian governments -- federal, provincial or territorial - should maintain control over wildlife management in Canada. They must maintain the authority to regulate and restrict harvest and harvesting methods. Any splintering of this authority would be detrimental to the health of wildlife resources."

One of the questions I have which arises from this is that there is no reference to Aboriginal government or self-government. Clearly, the possibility exists -- and certainly, this is one of the recommendations that we are examining; we have published on this the book "Partners in Confederation", which gets right into the whole question of Aboriginal self-government. The brief doesn't seem to take that into consideration. Do you have any thoughts on that?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Sure. Some of the

thoughts probably will be my own personal thoughts, because it isn't addressed in our current policy. However, if this Commission were to recommend it and it were to become reality that there was native self-government, I think that we would be dealing with that government as we do with provincial, territorial and federal governments. I think that we would still encourage, though, the co-operation amongst all those people.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: That's fine. I just wanted to get that clear.

My principal interest is in the agreement that was reached with Saskatchewan which you highlight as a model. In reading the brief I note that the thing starts with preliminary negotiations that did not involve government representatives between the FSIN and the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation.

Could you perhaps tell us how that started, what brought the two groups together, without really going into it --

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes. What happened to bring the groups together was maybe out of a sense of frustration in getting second hand through the government what the other party was saying. I wasn't a

party to those discussions, but my understanding from both sides is that it wasn't easy in the beginning. They approached each other and they said, "Let's talk." The Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation brought their people and the FSIN brought their people.

I guess some of the initial discussions were tense, but it was just the two groups which sat down and they had a series of meetings until they could build a trusting relationship with each other. When they were able to do that and overcome that, then they began the negotiations for the development of some type of an agreement, and then after they brought in the government in a more formal sense. But it was simply just the two sides agreeing, "We don't want to hear what somebody is saying about us. Let's sit down and talk, and you tell me what you think and I will tell you what I think." It was just a matter of a round table type of discussion between the two groups.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Do you have any idea over what length of time these discussions took place?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: It was over several years. Until the agreement was finally signed, I believe

it was three or four years.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: What would be some of the principal differences between the Indian Federation and the Wildlife Federation in Saskatchewan? What were either the perceptions of each other or the points of difference?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: The points of difference, actually, as they began to discuss it, they realized that -- quite frankly, the major point of discrepancy was a mistrust of government. Both groups felt very strongly that the government wasn't representing their interests. I think that's why, once they removed that element from the discussions initially, they were able to realize that they had a lot more in common than they thought and they realized that their main interest was the protection of wildlife and wildlife habitat, and that was something that was never very clear to either party until they actually sat down and discussed it.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Then they came up with, obviously, some common understanding. Did they jointly approach government or did one of them go to the government?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: I would believe

that they jointly approached government, and government then became a very formal part. I would hate to criticize that, because now the working relationship between the three parties -- the government, the Indian nation and the Wildlife Federation -- is a very good relationship.

They are not without problems still today, but they have come up with some practical solutions, some that I have outlined in the brief. For example, the native liaison officer, who is actually a government employee but is a native person and he deals with the native bands, in a particular area that they are having some management problems, works as the negotiator between those two parties. So now that the two groups -- the native group and the wildlife group -- have recognized that their goals are the same, it was very much easier for them to bring in government to work together.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Approximately how long did it take, from the time that the Aboriginal peoples and the Wildlife Federation came to some kind of understanding, to get the final agreement?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: That was probably the hard part, because we had to get all the government's

and everybody's lawyers to agree. So that was probably two years, and that was just a series of going through the legal process.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Who did the initial draft of the agreement -- which I have read, by the way.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: The initial draft, my understanding is it would have been between the FSIN, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation and the government, and it was a joint thing that they all worked on to develop the initial agreement. At that point, that's when the Canadian Wildlife Federation was asked to be a signatory as well as the federal government.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: At what point did your involvement begin? At the time of the drafting of the agreement?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Actually, we were on the easier side of it, because we were asked to be a signatory after they had sort of hammered out the negotiations. I guess our role came in more in dealing with the federal government and ensuring that all parties came to some agreement on the final details of the wording and whatnot.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: I see the agreement is about six months old. What kind of monitoring are you doing to see that both the spirit and letter and intent of the agreement is in fact carried out?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: From our perspective, it is more on an informal basis with discussions and working relationships with the FSIN and with the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation. We have developed, I would like to think, a very good working relationship. Chief Crowe, from the FSIN, has met with us on several occasions and would like to help us break the barriers now with the Assembly of First Nations, and he will be working with us to bring us to the Assembly and helping making those contacts with other native groups across the country.

As far as monitoring the agreement, that will be a role of the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: You mentioned some other examples in here. Are there other provinces or groups within provinces who have come to you, saying, "This worked out pretty well. Can we use your good offices?" or things like that?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes. We have had

other provinces on maybe a smaller scale. For example, British Columbia has basically taken our example, and that's why they have initiated the discussions on the proposed guidelines in British Columbia. There hasn't been a role for the Canadian Wildlife Federation as of yet, but should that time come, we would be certainly more than willing to help. We have had interests from some of the Atlantic Provinces as well that don't have the staff perhaps in their wildlife organizations to help facilitate negotiations and discussions, as well as interest from various government agencies. In Ontario, for example, the government officials asked for our comments and our views on that particular agreement and how they might be able to use it as a model in this province.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: That's very, very helpful, because I note that your caution in your brief is that, because third party interests weren't involved, some of them got derailed. But this one seems to have been a success story.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes, and I think we have seen it on a smaller basis in other areas. I have outlined some examples in Ontario where co-management committees have been developed. Given that Ontario is

a unique situation and there is a lot of mistrust and misunderstandings and whatnot, I think it is a first step. And, by involving all the people with a concern and putting them at the same table, I think those barriers break down a lot easier.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Based on your experience -- this will be my last question on it -- you really see the benefit to an actual written agreement that people can point to?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you. Viola Robinson.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: Thank you. We have met before in Saskatoon.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: I think one of your recommendations is that any time there are agreements being negotiated between provinces and Aboriginal people, wildlife federations should be included in those agreements. What about those agreements that have been reached where they haven't been included? Are

you still trying to get the support of the province and the Aboriginal group to be a part of that process?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes. Wherever possible, I think it is important to have all the interests, whether it be a formal involvement or even an informal involvement, where agreements may already exist and are in place, perhaps bringing in other interests that haven't traditionally been involved to keep them involved in the process or let them know what is going on. I think it is really important to develop a dialogue, even where there might be an agreement where a third party interest hasn't been -- I know for example we discussed before in Nova Scotia that the wildlife interests are not a part of that agreement. I think though it is important for them at least to be consulted. Whether or not they are a formal party to the agreement, I think that when a decision is being made, they should be given the opportunity to express their concerns directly to either the government or the Aboriginal peoples involved.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: Your role in these agreements, would that assist in promoting the agreement with the public?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Certainly. If

that's a role that we could take, yes, we would like to do that; and we have, through our own membership publications, for example, with the Saskatchewan Agreement. We think that it is important for public awareness to know that these things are going on, and we have a publication with a circulation of over 100,000 in Canada in both languages.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: I guess the other question I have has to do with the recognition that you have given to hunting and fishing and wildlife rights, I guess. You have recognized the inherent right to hunting and fishing in the Constitution, and you also refer to it as a part of -- I guess for traditional purposes or cultural purposes or for sustenance or something.

What about for economy? If an Aboriginal group wanted to get into fishing as an economy or hunting as an industry, what would be the position then?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: I believe -- I have outlined it in this, and it is outlined in our policy -- that after the other allocations have been allotted, as long as the wildlife populations could support a commercial initiative, we would certainly support that. But that is only if all the other considerations -- I think we have

outlined them in here; for example, commercial use is sort of the last allocation, if the other interests have been addressed.

I think the point of where it gets a bit tricky, for example, is, the commercial fishery has been able to address or is attempting to address the Aboriginal fishery for commercial uses. Where -- it is not addressed in our paper -- I think that us and any Aboriginal people I might add would have difficulty is the commercialization of other wildlife species, other than fish. It is something that we don't support, and I don't believe that many Aboriginal people would either. So that's where we sort of have that difference. When I am saying "wildlife species", I am referring to deer and elk and that sort of thing. We do recognize the practice of trapping and we certainly wouldn't oppose that.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: Are you involved with government in fisheries at all or anything? You are?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: As a lobby group, yes.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: As a lobby group. So you either lobby against or for, depending

on the conservation --

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes, but keeping in mind that our number one concern is the conservation of that species. For example, the Atlantic fishery would be a good example. We are not in favour of any -- any -- fishing in that area and we hadn't been for several years because of the declining populations. If a population was in decline at the rate that the cod fishery was in Atlantic Canada, we certainly would be expressing our concerns to government for no use amongst any people.

COMMISSIONER VIOLA ROBINSON: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you. Georges Erasmus.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Thank you. I read your brief yesterday with some interest and I looked at the agreements that were signed in Saskatchewan. What is it that you want to do in relation to comprehensive claims when they are actually going on? Do you actually want to be a party at the table, is that it, a signatory?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: No, we don't want to be a signatory to it. As far as comprehensive land

claims, we recognize that there are outstanding land claims, and I think before we can go anywhere further with co-management agreements of wildlife, those agreements have to be settled. The only place that we would want to be involved and maybe included would be on discussions where wildlife and the environment were being discussed. For example, we have been asked by the chief negotiator on the Golden Lake Band to comment on that land claim process and we have informed them that we would only when wildlife and the environment was being discussed. So not necessarily do we want to be a signatory, but we may want to provide comment or be consulted if certain decisions were going to affect wildlife.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: On the point of self-government and the authority of the existing governments, I find a little bit of contradiction in what you were saying. You were suggesting that the existing federal government, ten provinces and the two territories continue to be able to legislate. Then I look at this example of the legislation that the FSIN, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations put forth.

If you read their legislation it is very clear that what is going on is that the Indian Nations

coming together in Saskatchewan are very clearly saying that they used to have and they continue to have and they will have in the future the ability to make laws in the area of hunting, fishing, trapping and gaming. What the body of chiefs is doing in this convention with this particular legislation is, they are authorizing each of their individual nations to go out and make their own laws.

So if in fact you are using this as an example, I don't understand how that jives or fits into saying that only the provinces, the federal government and the territories should legislate, and you are using this as an example of how you are working co-operatively.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: I think there were three documents that were in your package, and the one document that you are referring to is in fact the Wildlife Act for the FSIN in Saskatchewan. Yes, on their lands, they will be regulating their own people for hunting, fishing and trapping. However, the Memorandum of Understanding brings that legislation and links it with the provincial legislation.

I think that what isn't written there is that they are very much so consistent with each other. For example, the FSIN has agreed not to night-hunt, as

an example. It wasn't something that was very popular with their people initially, I understand, but they recognize that if we don't protect wildlife, there won't be any left for anybody to use. So we have to have some kind of regulation.

So, yes, on their lands, I recognize that they will be administering that Act, and I think that that Act is fairly consistent with the provincial legislation. I guess it is not very clear, but we recognize that on treaty lands native people will be regulating themselves, and the co-management agreements, I think, link those types of things together.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: What treaty lands?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Sorry, lands that have been given say on a reservation, or lands that have been agreed as lands that will be used by native people. So through a land claim settlement, for example, if a band is given a certain area of land, I think that, yes, in fact they will be managing those lands and the wildlife on that land, but I think they have to do it in co-operation with the people around them.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: You cited a

couple of examples, British Columbia being one and Ontario being another, where consultation was not properly handled. If the proposal that you are suggesting is followed, what would have happened in British Columbia in relation to the fisheries?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: I think we could have avoided some of the adverse publicity that we saw as far as protest and whatnot. In my understanding, as it is turning out -- and I was just informed of this last week -- all fishermen in British Columbia, in that particular example, seeing that now the Aboriginal people are monitoring the fish population, they are informing me that the numbers are more accurate and more reliable. I think, though, if they were involved in the discussions earlier on and knew exactly how that fishery was to be managed, they probably would have been supportive of that, and we wouldn't have seen them all picketing on the front steps of the parliament buildings in Victoria.

So I think, just by involving people and keeping people more informed on the process instead of telling them after the fact would have alleviated all that adverse publicity that the DFO had received as a result.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: What does

that mean? Does that mean no meetings by the Aboriginal people and the government alone ever, that if you are going to be dealing with fishery, the commercial fishermen have to be sitting there and have to agree? Is that what that means? Or does it mean that before the agreements are concluded at some point there has to be involvement of the other interests?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: I think it sort of means all of what you said. I would hate to say that there is a rule and we should follow any rule; I think that you have to almost look on a case-by-case example. I certainly would say that, no, no agreement should be signed until all parties are consulted at some process. There probably will be a need still to continue to have Aboriginal people meeting independently with government, similarly as there probably is very many meetings with government and groups like ourselves, independent of Aboriginal peoples. That has happened in history -- I mean, in an ideal world, I think eventually that maybe will all come together, but I think there should be some rule for consultation throughout before an agreement is signed, and I think there should also probably be a rule, maybe in certain circumstances, again, like I have mentioned earlier, for

Aboriginal and groups like ours to work together excluding government. Sometimes you break down those barriers.

So I don't think there is any hard and fast rule, but I think you can look at it on a individual case basis, as long as all interests at some point are addressed is what we are looking for.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Your desire to arrive at agreements with other Aboriginal people like the FSIN -- you are thinking of going to AFN and encourage them to open the doors to you across the country -- what is driving this? You seem to be wanting to sign memorandums of understanding with First Nation people to get them to agree that they will conserve wildlife. Is this being driven by a belief that Aboriginal people will not conserve wildlife unless they sign an agreement with an organization like yours?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: No, I think that's not really what I was driving at at all. I think, on our part, it is just a real desire to bring all parties together and ensure that we are working in the same direction.

I believe personally that we all are working in the same direction, but if it takes an agreement for us to say, "Let's work together", I think Aboriginal

people probably more than any other people's main concern and biggest concern is conservation of wildlife. These types of agreements, I think, are just agreements to -- "Let's work together to achieve our common goals." I guess that's what is driving it, is to bring those interests together and to show Aboriginal peoples that we are not opposed to their rights or, for example, we are not doubting that the concern of Aboriginal peoples is wildlife and wildlife conservation. I think it is just a statement of good faith to work together.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Bertha Wilson.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: This is just a question for clarification. You indicate on page 3 that you don't support management agreements solely between Aboriginal peoples and Canadian governments and that all interested parties should be included in such agreements. Since there doesn't seem to be in the Saskatchewan Agreement any reference to non-Aboriginal interested parties, in your view, are they represented then by the government as a party to the agreement? Does your organization have any responsibility with respect to non-Aboriginal interested parties, or is your interest

solely in conservation?

I am just puzzled, because you are giving us this Saskatchewan Agreement as being sort of an example of what it is desirable to have; yet, it is contrary to what you have said earlier that all interested parties should be parties to any management agreement.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes. If you look at the Memorandum of Understanding, that brings all the parties together. Where you are not seeing the non-Aboriginal inclusion is the agreement that is the Wildlife Act for the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations for their own people. They don't mention other groups as such, but when they sign the Memorandum of Understanding with the other groups, that brings them all in. I think you have to look at all the agreements together.

To answer your other question, our main concern is conservation of wildlife. I am not sure exactly what you were referring to as far as other groups are --

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: My concern was, it seems to me, from what I have heard as we have gone through the communities, that the difficulty or the dispute is between the Aboriginal people asserting their

Aboriginal rights and non-Aboriginal groups who want recourse to wildlife, to fish and so on. It seems to be where the tension traditionally exists.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: Therefore, when I read you saying here that all interested parties should be parties to these agreements if they were going to be effective, then I looked and I didn't see that there was anyone representing one of the classic adversaries on this issue.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: I guess if you were to look at the Saskatchewan situation as the example, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation would be what you were looking for as that non-Aboriginal group that could potentially be, and probably at some time in a very recent past was, exactly as you are saying, opposed to that use. That's why they decided to discuss and work together towards that agreement.

The Canadian Wildlife Federation is a national body. We sort of came into the middle, and what we would like to do is facilitate that type of discussions, bring these non-Aboriginal peoples that are very much opposed in some areas to the Aboriginal rights and take

the Aboriginal peoples and bring them to the same table and discuss, because when you look at the Saskatchewan situation, when those two groups did come together, they realized that they did have one common goal, and that was wildlife and to ensure healthy and abundant populations of wildlife.

So where, in many provinces, there is very much so that division, we would like to see that division broken down. That sometimes is where our role can come in, by bring those two parties together.

Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: Yes. My concern was simply that everybody says their concern is conservation and protection of wildlife, but it is after that that you get into the disputes with respect to priorities or who has the claim to be next on the list to have access. This is where the adversarial element enters in, and I wondered how that was addressed by these agreements.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes, and you are exactly right in that the interest is, yes, who is next. I think, by bringing the parties together to discuss that, many people in Saskatchewan, which I used as an example,

realized that. There was a lot of dispute and there probably continues to be dispute as to who takes that next animal, but they have certainly come to more agreement as to working together. I think that's the basis of our presentation: we think that, by bringing the two sides together, we can try to avoid some of that confrontation. There will still be arguments, I suppose, back and forth as to the allocation, but I think slowly, over time, people are recognizing that there are these rights, and we have to recognize them, as non-Aboriginal people, but we have to work together to find some even ground and some common ground.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: But this is where, if I am reading you right, the Saskatchewan Wildlife Federation is more closely identified with the non-Aboriginal groups who wish to assert their rights to the wildlife than you organization.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: That's right.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: I would like to have a clarification on what you are saying about traditional land. On page 3 you recognize "the exclusive right to harvest and manage wildlife on lands that have

been recognized as traditional lands or other lands owned exclusively by" -- so that includes traditional lands, and when there is a land claim settlement it is owned exclusively by Aboriginal peoples.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: That's correct.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Then you recognize their right to manage.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: That's right.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: But you still want to be part of the discussion.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Yes. I guess where we struggled with this was what exactly is traditional land. That's why we included "recognized as traditional lands". When a land claim is settled and the area is determined, you know, agreement has been reached that that will be a traditional land, yes, we believe that the Aboriginals have a right to manage that land, but keeping in mind what I stated earlier, that wildlife knows no boundaries, we have to work together and somehow co-ordinate -- we have to share the information between all the people.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: My point of clarification flows from -- if we move to page 9, the second

paragraph, you say that your federation recommends that, in lands not owned by Aboriginal people, co-management committees should be organized with equal representation from all sectors.

What is the status of traditional land where the land claims have not been settled?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: I guess that's where we will have a grey area and that's why it is important, if the land claim hasn't been settled -- for example, the Algonquin claim -- I think there is a strong need for this type of committee to work together as to have that wildlife -- the negotiations will carry on and they can take many years, but we still have to manage that land and that wildlife.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: So in such a situation you want to be part of a co-management committee.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Not necessarily us, but a representative from a wildlife sector, yes. There should be some mechanism for all parties to discuss and determine, for example, harvest limits, methods, that sort of thing, similar to what is going on currently in the Algonquin Park area.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Getting back

to page 3, if the land claim has been settled on the traditional land, then what you are looking for is a participation in the agreement that will be reached between governments and Aboriginal governments.

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: That's correct, yes.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Not a co-management --

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: That's right. That's correct. When there was a land that has been recognized and has been settled in a land claim, there still needs to be some mechanism in place to co-ordinate the management activities between the Aboriginal people and the non-Aboriginal people. That's where a co-management agreement would come into effect.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

Are there other questions? I don't think so.

So thank you very much for presenting us with your brief.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Maybe I could ask just one.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: All right.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: You said earlier that if in fact Aboriginal People are going to have self-government, then I guess that we would deal with them like we deal with other governments. How do you deal with the provincial governments, the federal government and the territorial governments? What is your relationship with them?

SANDY BAUMGARTNER: Our relationship is as a non-government organization, and, if we had a concern about any issue relating to wildlife, we would go to that government, whether it be provincial or federal, and discuss with them our concerns and try to come to a mutual agreement on how to proceed in a certain direction. Similarly, we participate on many committee that are developed by particularly the federal government, because we are a national organization. We, for example, participate on a committee that establishes the status of endangered wildlife in Canada, which has government representation as well as non-government. So we work together.

I would like to think it works relatively effectively. Recognizing that a government of some sort has to have the ultimate authority, we, I guess, work as

a watchdog and work with governments.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you very much.

I would now like to call the representatives of the Canada Safety Council, M. Emile Therien and Ethel Archard.

Bonjour. Good afternoon.

EMILE J. THERIEN, President, Canada Safety Council: Good afternoon to all of you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: We are sorry for the delay.

EMILE J. THERIEN: No, it is no delay. It poses no problem whatsoever.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Please proceed when you are ready.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Distinguished Commissioners, my name is Emile Therien, and this is Ethel Archard, as Mr. Dussault just rightly pointed out. Ethel is our Manager of Marketing and Promotion, and I am the President of Canada Safety Council.

Just one note, I would really like to commend and thank your staff members who were so supportive

and so co-operative in facilitating our participation and attendance here today. Some of them are still in the room, so I want to thank you very much.

First of all, I would like to thank you for inviting us to make this presentation. We are very pleased to be here and we would like to address the issue of accidental death and injuries. This will be a co-presentation; Ethel will be also involved.

In some age groups, the injury fatality rate among native populations is four times higher than that of the total Canadian population. This is obviously a very big health concern and problem. I would like to refer to the Report on Health Status of Canadian Indians and Inuit published in 1990 by Health and Welfare Canada. I am sure you are all familiar with this report.

The report points out that the number one cause of deaths per registered Indian is injury and poisoning, accounting for 31 per cent of deaths during the period 1986 to 1988. In contrast, only 7.5 per cent of total Canadian deaths were due to injury and poisoning in that same time frame. Motor vehicle accidents were the leading cause of accidental death for the registered Indian population.

We see an urgent need for Aboriginal groups to address injury prevention and we would like to develop partnerships with these groups to help deal with the major problem areas and concerns.

Ethel and I will review the work and mandate of the Canada Safety Council and identify some programs we think offer potential for native peoples. We hope to establish a channel for collaboration and co-operation. A possible starting point would be the secondment of a native person to assess Canada Safety Council programs with a view to possible adaptation and implementation in native communities across this country.

Starting in the area of traffic safety, the Canada Safety Council is Canada's leading source of driver improvement courses and traffic safety awareness programs. However, their availability to native people is very, very limited.

We therefore encourage this Royal Commission to recommend the adaptation and delivery of some of these traffic safety programs through Aboriginal people and we offer our expertise to help develop suitable resources for Aboriginal people to help reduce the high number of motor vehicle deaths and injuries.

We are currently in the process of adapting aggression control workshops for use in Canada and we think they could be of interest. These aggression control programs have been extensively tested and are successfully used in many parts of the United States. However, they are not yet widely available in this country. They are leading edge approaches for attitude and behaviour modification, and they offer potential to address issues related to aggressive behaviour and violence in Aboriginal communities.

We would like to work with native groups and the court system to assess the potential for these programs and to assist in their adaptation and instructor development.

In addition, we have a number of annual public awareness campaigns which focus on a range of key safety issues which impact all Canadians. They provide a resource which could be used by local native groups to draw attention to safety concerns.

I would like to say a few words about the value of preventive safety programs. Their benefits can be and are immense. For example, each teenager who does not suffer a serious spinal chord injury in a car

crash saves Canada's health care system at least $5 million over his or her life span and is able to contribute much more to the community. Above all, what has been prevented is a terrible human tragedy that also affects family, friends and community.

In the Canadian population at large the rate of accidental deaths and injuries have dropped dramatically over the past 20 years. However, Indian and Inuit rates remain much higher than the Canadian rate or average. Without increased intervention, we are concerned that accidents will continue to rob native communities of much human potential.

ETHEL ARCHARD, Manager, Marketing and Promotion, Canada Safety Council: Now, I am going to give you some background on the Canada Safety Council and some of its programs.

First of all, the Canada Safety Council is a national, not-for-profit organization. Our mission is to prevent death injury and economic loss caused by accidents, and our programs cover traffic, home, recreation and job safety. The Council is a well-recognized authority in public safety and training and is often consulted for information and input on safety

concerns.

Some of our programs -- I am just going to sort of list them off: Public Awareness and Public Education programs and campaigns; we also have a variety of driver improvement programs. We have an All-Terrain Vehicle Rider's course which may be of particular interest. We have Motorcycle Training programs. We have a Baby-Sitter Training course, the Aggression Control workshops, which Emile has just mentioned, and many publications, including "Living Safety", which is the only Canadian-produced family safety magazine. We brought samples of some of these materials in your packages which you will receive.

Next, I would like to review our current public education priorities: reducing alcohol and prescription drug use leading to accidents, injuries and developmental disabilities in children is one of them; promoting the use of proper personal protection -- this includes seat belts and child restraints, on-the-job protective equipment, and also protective equipment for sports; awareness of fire hazards and fire precautions; and encouraging safe community initiatives which involve participation of citizens with the police service, social

agencies and other groups.

Our expertise is very well respected, and we have a long-standing national presence in safety. We think this could provide the basis for working with native peoples to develop more effective approaches to prevent accidental deaths and injuries.

I would like to mention some areas which we think could be of interest to the Commission. We have a lot of expertise in the development and delivery of safety training and awareness programs. We developed and maintain a network of volunteer, Safety Instructors, which does not at present include many native instructors. We have a strong track record for collaboration and development of partnerships, and we think this kind of collaboration with native groups would be very timely and beneficial. Also, our extensive linkages with private and public sector organizations and other non-governmental organizations could be useful in part of such a collaboration.

EMILE J. THERIEN: I would like to discuss some of the work in our earlier traffic safety and training. Motor vehicle accidents, as you may be aware, are the leading cause of accidental death and injury

in Canada as a whole. However, since a high of what were 6,700 motor vehicle fatalities nationally in 1973, they have declined by almost 50 per cent under 3,500 in 1992, despite seven million more licensed Canadian drivers.

This demonstrates that preventive programs have been very effective. They include enforcement education and, of course, engineering. Two major factors in this drop were the decrease in drinking and driving and the increased use of seat belts and other occupant restraints. However, unfortunately, the drop has not been as dramatic in the native population, and especially the registered Indian population.

Canada Safety Council offers courses to improve driver safety, awareness and behaviour, both training materials and instructor development. These courses are delivered by a network of 4,000 volunteer instructors in all the provinces and territories. We have a number of Driver Improvement programs such as Defensive Driving courses, Professional Drivers' courses for large trucks, buses and whatnot, and a Mature Drivers' course. We also ave an All-Terrain Vehicle Riders' course and Motorcycle Training programs.

I would like to emphasize that these

programs, in our opinion, are effective. They really do reduce deaths and injuries from motor vehicle accidents. For instance, our training program for beginning motorcyclists was initiated to reduce the high number of collisions, deaths and injuries involving motorcyclists. It has helped the number of motorcyclist fatalities in Canada drop from about 900 in 1983 to 176 in 1992.

I would like to emphasize that the availability of these traffic safety programs to native people is currently very limited.

In addition, much of our public awareness programming is in the area of traffic safety. For example, this December, National Safe Driving Week deals with impaired driving, which accounts for 17 per cent of all charges laid under the Criminal Code in this country -- over 124,000 impaired driving charges in 1992 in Canada. If we could eliminate alcohol-related deaths on our Canadian roads, there would be 48 per cent fewer fatalities, which would mean almost 1,800 lives saved.

We mentioned earlier that aggression control is an important area of concern in order to prevent injuries. We did mention that the Canada Safety Council is in the process of adapting a workshop from the U.S.

for use in Canada. It is designed for repeat traffic offenders and is under consideration as a court diversion program in various provinces. The workshop has now been piloted successfully. The Crown was so satisfied with the pilot results that charges have been withdrawn for those who successfully completed the workshop.

Other related programs and workshops address such issues as family violence. The programs focus on development of positive personal values and a commitment to change. All of these programs are designed to get people to take responsibility for their actions.

We recommend these programs be examined for possible adaptation to the needs of native Canadians.

ETHEL ARCHARD: Now, I am going to deal with the Annual Public Awareness programs of the Canada Safety Council. I am just going to tell you a bit about a few of them that may be of particular interest.

There is National Summer Safety Week in May. This year it targeted children in grades 4 to 6, with an activity book on bicycle safety which is in your materials. National Road Safety Week is also in May. It is the public awareness component of the National Occupant Restraint Program, of which the acronym is NORP.

The goal of NORP is 95 per cent seat belt use by 1995. Canada is currently leading the western world in seat belt use by adults. The Assembly of First Nations is among the endorsers of NORP.

Shift Shuffle is a workplace fitness campaign for blue collar workers and it is at the end of May. National Farm Safety Week is in June. This year it dealt with preventing injuries to children on the farm. National School Safety Week is an October campaign for elementary school children. This fall, this past October, it was an activity book for children at home on their own. I would encourage you to look at that book. That book received an overwhelming response because so many children are at home on their own for certain periods of time. Last year the activity book was on home fire safety. It was later adapted for northern native communities with sponsorship from CMHC. That is also in your materials.

This week is National Community Safety and Crime Prevention Week, which is a new campaign of the Canada Safety Council. Its goal is to encourage communities to work together to prevent crime and improve safety. The approach incudes social development as well as opportunity reduction.

National Seniors Safety Week takes place later this month. It can cover issues such as safe driving, preventing falls in the home and safe prescription drug use. This year it deals with safety in the home; again, the pamphlet is in your kit.

National Home Fire Safety Week at the end of November will promote the use and maintenance of smoke alarms. Last year we had a refrigerator card, and again this year it is also a refrigerator card, on preventing kitchen grease fires, and it was distributed to a list provided by the Assembly of First Nations. Fire deaths i Canada have gone down from about 1,000 a year in the early and mid-seventies to around 400 in 1992, of which 90 occurred in native communities -- a very high percentage.

National Safe Driving Week is Canada's oldest safety campaign, the first week of December. It is now in its 38th year. This year, as Emile mentioned, it focuses on impaired driving.

EMILE J. THERIEN: In summary, I hope the Commission will recommend strong action be taken to reduce accidental deaths and injuries in Canada's native population. This is a tremendous and very preventable

problem, and the Canada Safety Council would like to assist.

We wish you continued success in your hearings and deliberations, and thank you very much for having us.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you. You wouldn't mind if we asked some questions?

EMILE J. THERIEN: Sure.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Mary Sillett.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Thank you very much. I have just two questions.

With respect to foetal alcohol syndrome and foetal alcoholic facts, we have heard some of that, particularly in many of the northern communities; and you are saying that your campaign has worked with the beverage alcohol industry in addressing that. I am wondering what actually have you done.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Actually, Mary, let me tell you, we were involved with a national symposium which was held in Vancouver in September of last year, which was, I think, convened by the Minister of National Health and by the Canada Safety Council, probably because of our excellent public information and public education.

Subsequent to that, one of the recommendations coming out of the ministerial report was a public awareness and public education program, and we were invited by certain people to submit a proposal that we would do this.

It is my understanding that we were not successful. I think the substance abuse organization who were on here yesterday -- I think they will carry that program out with the co-operation of the Association of Canadian Distillers, I think. So that's my understanding.

So our interest in it at the moment is on hold until we are officially notified by Health and Welfare as to the status of our proposal.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: Does the kind of work that you do in areas like this depend upon funds that you get from somewhere else?

EMILE J. THERIEN: Yes. Let me help you understand. We are a non-government body; 2 per cent of our funding comes from government, and they are in the form of sustaining grants from Health and Welfare which we, as an organization, qualify for. Most of our funding is through the sale of programs, through driver training programs, which we mentioned, and through the sale of our magazine "Living Safety". So we are really basically,

I think in all the true sense of the word -- non-government, private. We have a national board of directors, but we are a registered federal charity.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: What has been your contact with especially Inuit communities?

EMILE J. THERIEN: I think Ethel mentioned that one of the endorsers of this national Occupant Restraint Program -- are you aware what that program is?

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: The what?

EMILE J. THERIEN: The National Occupant Restraint Program. It is the aim at Transport Canada, and all the provincial Ministers of Transportation and the territorial Ministers of Transportation -- by the year 1995 we would achieve 95 per cent seat belt usage in this country -- 95 by 95. So we are really the delivery agent for that program. We are the public awareness element. We do a campaign in May, which is National Road Safety Week.

One of the things we do when we go ahead with a campaign is, we go and get the endorsement from national organizations, because it makes them aware and I think it also gives our campaigns a lot of credibility.

We did approach the Assembly of First Nations, and they endorsed that program. I think we did approach other native groups and organizations, and I don't think we received responses, even to our original letters.

What we are really trying to do is, through those organizations, make sure the information that we are disseminating nationally and provincially and locally would find its way into the native communities.

How successful that is, I don't think it has been very successful at this point, but we would like to use their organizations as the delivery mechanism, because they are certainly the ones who know their own communities, they are the experts in their own communities and they are the ones -- we are really an organization in Ottawa; for a lot of Canadians we are far off.

COMMISSIONER MARY SILLETT: I guess I was thinking about your contact with those communities that don't have seat belts, more or less of the smaller Inuit communities, but you have answered my question.

Thank you very much.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Peter

Meekison.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you very much for your presentation.

The question I have relates to the idea of adaptation and delivery to Aboriginal people, particularly the idea of adaptation. You mentioned a couple of examples, but I was wondering if you had more ideas which could help us in taking these rather alarming statistics and seeing if we can't reverse them; but we are not the expert in adaptation, you are.

Do you have any ideas that you would care to share with us?

EMILE J. THERIEN: We would not even think of adapting them to what we think fits. We would certainly want to work with the national organizations representing the native communities in this country to see -- I think we were correct in stating in the presentation, looking at our programs and seeing, is there a fit there and adapting them to the local customer or whatever. That's what we are talking about. We don't want to be condescending or patronizing, but we think maybe they adapt the way they are -- maybe -- but at least we will want an analysis and an interpretation from people,

from native people themselves and others: Do they fit? If they do fit -- in this area we might have to put a different spin on the bottle.

But I think there is room at least for discussion here to see what fits.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Are there other examples of adaptations that you can think of which might be illustrative for us?

EMILE J. THERIEN: I don't know.

ETHEL ARCHARD: I think overall we haven't really had what we feel is enough contact directly with the native communities and groups. There are a couple of U.S. programs that we have adapted to the Canadian market, and the Seniors Driving Program and Mature Driving Program is the most recent example of that. There was a program, it was proven, it was highly respected and used on the other side of the border, but it wasn't suitable as a package for Canada.

So, over a three-year period, we worked with Canadian groups and our own staff as well, to adapt the English version and also to translate into French a version of that program. I think that's really what we are looking at. We do have the core of some programs that

we know work, but whether they could just be used as is or not, I think that's the reason why we have suggested in our brief the secondment of a native person to assess that, because we don't feel that we can do that. We would need to have the involvement from the native community.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Have you approach any of the Aboriginal organizations or governments to see whether or not such a secondment would be possible?

EMILE J. THERIEN: I would like to think that our presence here today may be he first initiative down that road.

Let me also emphasize that the programs that we mentioned, like our Defensive Driving program, they are really developed under best principles of adult education. They are not developed by people to save their own office. We really spend a lo of money, a lot of resources and a lot of effort in developing these programs, and they are field-tested before we even think of -- I think a classic case of this is, there are 55 Alive Program for Mature Drivers. I notice when I turned 50 last year, all of a sudden they were calling them 50 Alive. I think maybe staff members -- it was a message to me, but that's

the way we did it; we involved seniors we involved adult educators, and the final product now is a product that fits and that seniors feel comfortable with, that really was adapted to their needs.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you. I would certainly like to congratulate you on the significant decline of motor vehicle fatalities.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Yes, it is very encouraging; and if you look at health costs, you know ---

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: It really is.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Another thing is, we are doing extremely well in these areas. We see our southern neighbours are a long way.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: But these data do show that there are ways that, if you can get the message out, and it is really just a question of how to do that.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Yes. I should also tell you that there is another program that's called "Graduated Licensing". You probably heard of it. Ontario had hearings in Ottawa not long ago on it. I think it is a matter of time before graduated licensing is a

way of life in this province. I think what happens in this province is, if it is successful, it will slowly spread across the provinces. You are really putting restrictions on that higher risk group from 16 to 24 years old, and I think most people, the experts, where these programs are in place, seem to have concluded that they are successful. So it will be another reduction, we hope.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Thank you.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT:

George -- sorry.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: I was going to ask what your experience was with the aggression control programs in relation to motor vehicle traffic accidents. The exposure I have had to those programs has been the use in relation to inmates in penitentiaries, where I think they have been very helpful and very effective.

I am wondering, is there any experience to show how effective they are with respect to traffic?

ETHEL ARCHARD: The programs that I mentioned here have been extensively tested. There are

American statistics on them, and we have, as Emile mentioned, had a Canadian pilot. The results of that pilot -- it was a small group; I think it was 10 or 12 -- the participants who successfully completed it, it was felt that it was so successful that they could have the charges dropped; the attitude change was successful.

We feel that there is more work to do in Canada. There are various levels of these programs, and I think that, if the Commission is interested in pursuing this, it would be worthy of a separate presentation and meeting with our staff members who are dealing with the programs.

There is a Court Diversion program -- and a lot of the traffic offences are aggressive drivers. Aggression is a major factor in traffic, as well as other types of injuries. It is a reality therapy approach, a personal responsibility approach.

There is a second level program which is intended in the way that you were mentioning, once charged, to rehabilitate. Then there are other programs that have very specific targets, everything from, as we mentioned, domestic violence to shoplifting, you name it. There is quite a variety. They are all based on the same

attitude and behaviour modification principles and reality therapy.

We are just right at the tip of the iceberg. We feel that these are leading edge approaches that really have not -- their potential hasn't been realized, and there is a tremendous amount that can be done there to get to the root causes of traffic and other offences that are related to aggression.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: Is there any Canadian experience with this particular type of program in relation to family violence?_ For example, we have been hearing this morning a great deal about the problem of family violence, and everybody is looking for answers. I am just wondering, there is probably American experience --

ETHEL ARCHARD: There is, yes. All we have on this one is American experience. The programs like we said, are leading edge, they are fairly new. We feel that Canada could use these kinds of programs. We are at the starting point with these programs. We feel that the potential is really quite exciting, but we are just at the very beginning, and we know it is going to be a long route. But we certainly think that they are

worthy of consideration for Aboriginal people specifically and for the Canadian people at large. This isn't just an Aboriginal problem, it is a very widespread problem.

EMILE J. THERIEN: As a selling feature and trying to convince people to pilot these things, they are based on the user pay principle; so the offender is the one who pays. So that, to a great extent, relieves the pressure off the Crown attorney or others; it is not another cost to the criminal justice system. So that in itself is attractive, at least to pilot these, as I just said.

COMMISSIONER BERTHA WILSON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: What does it cost?

EMILE J. THERIEN: It varies. We have a program now in Newfoundland through the Newfoundland Safety Council and I think the Ministry of Justice or the Attorney General I think are in there, and they came in quite high. I think they are talking about $200 for a Saturday, and I think it includes two Saturdays. So that's $400.

They get them through us, and we are the

ones charging that. But, when they went into this program, they had a waiting list in the thousand people to get in on them, when the government approved them. It is a lot of people in Newfoundland. But, in our opinion, it sure beats jail, and we think they are much more effective.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Georges Erasmus.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: It looks like your prevention programs really work. Unfortunately, it sounds like the preventions somehow have not reached Aboriginal communities. Is there any particular reason why?

EMILE J. THERIEN: That's a very good question. Probably, I think, we got to fault ourselves. Maybe we didn't really attempt to get into those communities.

You have to realize, Mr. Erasmus, that the programs are really delivered but through this network of 4,000 volunteers that we have.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: That was my next question. How many of these are Aboriginal?

EMILE J. THERIEN: I would say very few. That's a costly system for the Canada Safety Council.

We register these people and we update them on a yearly basis, if you can imagine. So we are not going to ask who is an Aboriginal and who is not. Maybe we should and maybe that would be the answer to your question, but we would certainly welcome more, because we have instructor development courses going on all the time.

I think Ethel has a point on this which is very interesting.

ETHEL ARCHARD: Our distributing agencies are provincial safety council, for example, so if they don't reach the Aboriginal communities in their province, then we don't have a direct link. It may be very worthy of consideration for us to establish a direct link with the Aboriginal organizations, so that we don't have to count on going through other distributing agencies and be the third level rather than the immediate recipient. That might be something to consider, a direct link, rather than the indirect link that we have now that doesn't seem to be working very well.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Just another point which Ethel just brought to my attention before this presentation, the native community in Maniwaki have made inquiries to our Manager of Public Safety, who administers

our All-Terrain Vehicle Riders' course, that they could come together with a group of aid and he would deliver an instructor program to them.

Let me tell you, all-terrain vehicles, most people use them for non-recreational purposes. They are utility vehicles. They are used by native people as a way to earn their living, they are used by logging companies, by the rail companies. So the majority are used for utility or commercial purposes.

That form of training -- I should tell you, I met the Workmen Compensation Boards of all the provinces, and they now compel companies that use these, that have workers who use these, to take a Canada Safety Council course.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: My other comments were in the same area it seems, in relation to Aboriginal people. You say you are willing to work with native groups to evaluate the potential for these programs, including the aggression control programs. I would encourage you to take the next step, because I think that it is obvious that the system as it is right now hasn't been working, and it seems to me that there must be a great opportunity here to prevent death that is just passing

us by, and we already know how it seems it is effective; if the programs can reach Aboriginal people, with or without modification, I suspect that it would be useful.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Certainly, our priority, if they require modification and there is an interest in our program, we are certainly willing to do the modifications or adaptations. So we are really there at their disposal. As Canadians, I think it is not a nice situation. We know certain programs work and we think they should work for all Canadians.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: On the aggression control, and particularly how it might be useful in relation to the curbing of violence in the community, in addition to all the other prevention programs, this one I think would be extremely useful, in addition to the campaigns to have safe driving and also fire prevention.

I remember one presentation we had in British Columbia. There was an effort made either in one community or some communities or something, and when they took this issue of prevention education seriously, the accidental fires and the deaths really dropped very, very quickly. They were encouraging us to suggest a similar program across the country.

EMILE J. THERIEN: I was the former executive director of the Canadian Association of Fire Chiefs, so my experience is in fire reduction. I remember in 1975, when there was a commitment in this country to address the fire problem, the provincial fire marshals got on board and other organizations -- it was incredible -- through public education and public awareness, smoke detectors and building codes, and I think our performance in reducing the number of fires has been phenomenal. I think as Canadians we should congratulate ourselves.

Again, among Aboriginal people, it is disproportionately high, and I think inroads could be made there.

CO-CHAIR GEORGES ERASMUS: I encourage you to take the next step.

EMILE J. THERIEN: All right. We certainly will.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Peter.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: On this aggression control, just what is involved in the training of the people? You mentioned, for example, that 1,000 people in Newfoundland wanted to sign up for this,

but what kind of person or persons or individuals or groups do the actual training?

EMILE J. THERIEN: As part of these programs, they come with what we call a network of instructors, facilitators, people who are actually in these group sessions. Actually, we thought there would be a lot of questions on some of this, and actually the person who administers these programs for the Canada Safety Council is not here today. He would be the best person to discuss these things with you, but it is a network of qualified, certified instructors; it is not just John -- public off the street pulling in.

Again, we don't want to sound like a control organization, but these people are certified, their certification is upgraded every year, and they make sure that they comply with the minimum requirements to stay in our certification program.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: What does it take to become certified?

ETHEL ARCHARD: That course is an intensive five-day course, as I understand it. You would have to get clarification from our Manager. It is very intensive. It is my understanding that some kind of a

social work or psychology type of background is required, but we would have to get back to you on that.

EMILE J. THERIEN: I think I have a partial answer to that. We needed somebody in Ottawa who had -- I think she came from the Ontario --

ETHEL ARCHARD: Correctional services.

EMILE J. THERIEN: -- correctional services, and we spent a considerable amount of money to send her I think to the University of Oregon to get this training. I think she was there for seven days of very, very intensive training. So she came back, and the cost was quite expensive, especially in light of the fact that we had no revenue coming in at that point. But she had experience, so she knew what to look for. She came highly recommended by the Crown attorney here and by others. Now she is doing the program here in Ottawa.

But it is that type of intensive training, and there are minimum educational requirements.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Anything you have on the program, it would be quite helpful if you could send it to us.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Yes, we will, sir. Again, we apologize --

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Not at all. Not at all.

EMILE J. THERIEN: -- our person should be here. But we will certainly make that information available to you.

COMMISSIONER J. PETER MEEKISON: Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Thank you.

The data you are using showing that there are four times more Aboriginal people as opposed to non-Aboriginal people of death through injury and poisoning comes from the Health Status Report.

EMILE J. THERIEN: Yes.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Are you aware if a comparison was made within the North, because many Aboriginal people live in northern areas of the country in the provinces and the territories. Are you aware if there could be a northern factor in a comparison between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people living in the North for injuries, for example? Do you have any clue that there could be an additional risk with the kind of life they have up North?

EMILE J. THERIEN: I don't have the

answer to that question, but I think I understand your question. I don't know. Maybe it is something we could look into and get back to you on -- the fact that people lie in the North, is it a high risk factor in terms of injuries and accidents, or vice versa, accidents and injuries.

You see, I think in answer to your question, getting back to the incidence of fires in this country, although it has been down, don't forget we are a northern climate; we do heat in the winter, and, without question, heating systems, if they are not properly maintain, contribute to fires. If we look at the reduction of overall fires, both from the number of buildings and also the number of people who died, I think when we look into efficient heating systems and making sure that those systems were properly maintained, even in the very cold winter, that certainly was a factor in bringing down fire losses in general; there is no question about it.

So that could be, the fact that we live in a cold climate. We will try to do something on that and get back to you.

Do you have any idea where we might get that information?

ETHEL ARCHARD: We have an injury statistics, or, rather, accidental death statistics, and that's broken down. For example, we could take the Territories and look at that.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: If you had information about the North -- and we know the North, there is no easy division -- it would be interesting for us.

ETHEL ARCHARD: You see, our statistics would be for population of the North, and that would be skewed by the fact that it doesn't separate Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: No, but still, if it showed that, as opposed to a southern population, there is a difference --

EMILE J. THERIEN: If you look at accidents, yesterday was our first snowfall. Probably the busiest people in Ottawa today, tomorrow and the next day will be insurance adjustors. That's what snow does. There is no question about that. In today's drive there will be very few traffic accidents compared to what happened yesterday. So that might be part of the answer; I think you will agree with that.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: Other

questions? No?

I would like to thank you very much for a very interesting presentation and a feel that we feel is promising. We encourage you to pursue in that direction and we certainly would like to keep in touch with your organization to share additional data if there are some coming up during the coming year.

Thank you.

EMILE J. THERIEN: We thank you very much and good luck.

CO-CHAIR RENÉ DUSSAULT: So we are adjourned till tomorrow morning at a quarter to nine.

We will have the closing prayer now.

(Closing Prayer)

--- Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 4:50 p.m.,
to resume at 8:45 a.m. on Wednesday,
November 3, 1993