

**THE FEDERATION OF CANADIAN MUNICIPALITIES**  
**IN COOPERATION WITH**  
**THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION**  
**OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATORS**

**MUNICIPALITIES AND ABORIGINAL PEOPLES IN CANADA**

**SUBMISSION**

**TO**

**THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON ABORIGINAL PEOPLES**

**AUGUST 31, 1993**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	ii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT .....	6
ABORIGINAL SELF-GOVERNMENT .....	10
MUNICIPAL/ABORIGINAL RELATIONS.....	18
CONCLUSION.....	44
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	53
APPENDIX.....	54

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) wishes to thank the Intervenor Participation Program of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples for the financial assistance which made possible the background research and consultations necessary for this submission.

FCM expresses its appreciation to the more than 200 municipalities which responded to the survey on municipal/Aboriginal relations; their input forms an integral part of this submission. Many local government leaders attach a high priority to productive municipal/Aboriginal relations; thus they gave freely of their time and experience. In this context, FCM especially acknowledges the advice, guidance and support from members of its Task Force on Aboriginal Issues and the Canadian Association of Municipal Administrators.

FCM acknowledges the contributions and encouragements from individual Aboriginal people and representatives of the Native Council of Canada, the National Association of Friendship Centres, the Assembly of First Nations and other Aboriginal organizations.

Finally, FCM extends best wishes to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples for the successful completion of its task to help advance positive and rewarding relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in Canada.

Alderman Ron Hayter  
President of FCM

## INTRODUCTION

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities has set out to analyze municipal/Aboriginal relations from a local government perspective using the principle and practice of Aboriginal self-government as a focus. Generally, municipalities have not been consulted with respect to the potential effect on local responsibilities of negotiations and agreements between Aboriginal peoples and other orders of government. As a result, the Federation has pursued the opportunity to prepare and present a brief to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, thus creating an awareness of the issues municipalities face with respect to Aboriginal self-government. More than two hundred FCM member municipalities contributed information for this brief.

During consultations across the country, it became evident that both municipalities and Aboriginal peoples are frequently not knowledgeable of each other's difficulties and concerns. To some degree, the aspirations of both local governments and Aboriginal peoples have been marginalized and compromised by federal and provincial governments. As a result, the interface of municipal/Aboriginal interests, important to Aboriginal self-government, has been rendered all but completely invisible.

Aspirations toward Aboriginal self-government are the embodiment of the desire and need of Aboriginal peoples to bring government closer to their people. Municipal government in Canada is the order of government closest to the citizens, delivering services necessary to sustain a good quality of life in local communities. From our perspective, a useful form of Aboriginal self-government would resemble municipal government. Notwithstanding the cultural differences and jurisdictional complexities, the local aspect of municipal/Aboriginal relations presents a point of departure for dialogue and cooperation.

The experiences of municipalities in Canada provide a useful reference point for the Royal Commission as it carries out a wide-ranging mandate. Particularly through ameliorating the relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples at the community level and by sharing knowledge and capacity of service delivery, local governments can play a pivotal role in the evolution of Aboriginal self-government. Municipalities wish to make a constructive and practical contribution to the establishment of meaningful Aboriginal self-government, a process that has very real implications for them. Equally, FCM's members recognize that local governments must become more aware of the specific requirements of Aboriginal peoples and adjust their approaches accordingly.

The Federation's members understand the importance of dialogue between municipal and Aboriginal leaders in addressing the challenges faced by Aboriginal peoples. They know that obstacles to a productive life are myriad: the realities of poor health, unemployment, isolation, loss of identity, poverty and violence are greater than for non-Aboriginal people. Municipalities with a growing Aboriginal population are concerned about the impact on their administrations of the increasing need for housing, health care, education, social services, urban safety and other responsibilities, particularly at a time when the financial and jurisdictional parameters among governments are under revision. Municipalities facing the implications of land claims settlements are concerned both about their revenue base and future development opportunities.

Both Aboriginal peoples and local governments seek strong representation of their interests. However, municipalities have felt excluded from a process that has so far involved only Aboriginal leaders and the federal and provincial governments. This submission to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples hopes to provide a partial remedy by highlighting unique relationships evolving between local governments and Aboriginal Peoples. These relationships involve Aboriginal peoples on reserves adjacent to or near municipalities, Aboriginal peoples on reserves that are partially or wholly within municipal boundaries, and Aboriginal peoples who live off reserve within urban centres.

Our research has been organized in three main sections: municipal government, Aboriginal self-government and municipal/Aboriginal relations. To provide a context for our analysis of municipal/Aboriginal relations, we begin with a brief overview of the structure of local government and continue with an explanation of the principle of Aboriginal self-government as it relates to municipalities. We finish with an analysis of current municipal/Aboriginal relations based on our survey. Our observations and suggestions for action are contained in the conclusion and recommendations.

The locus of municipal/Aboriginal relations has gained new significance since the failure of the Charlottetown Accord and the demand of an explicit constitutional recognition of the right to Aboriginal self-government. Municipal leaders support the notion of Aboriginal self-government, but they believe it should evolve in cooperation with local government against a backdrop of vigorous community relations. The Federation's submission to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, though necessarily general in nature in light of the diverse situations across the country, hopes to clarify the perspective of local government in order to arrive at mutually beneficial solutions for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples.

In this spirit, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities recognizes the symbolism of the circle. It is an integral element of the logo of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. To Aboriginal peoples the circle is a symbol of Earth and representative of wholeness, harmony and life as a continuous journey. It is our hope that the circle of Aboriginal peoples and the circle of non-Aboriginal peoples meet to form a connection that brings unity and mutual strength.

Mayor John Les  
Chair, FCM Task Force  
on Aboriginal Issues



## MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT

Because the statutes which provide for the creation of municipal corporations emanate from provincial and territorial governments, there is much variety across Canada in the functions performed by local government. In the broadest sense, local governments provide two types of services: those to people and those to property. In doing so, municipalities are the fundamental public agent responsible for the quality of life in Canadian communities.

The council-manager form of government has been adopted generally by municipalities across Canada. A municipality establishes policy and exercises its corporate responsibility through an elected council. Within an agreed policy framework, the executive function of local government is performed by a chief administrative officer who in turn delegates to specific department heads. In other words, the council sets strategic priorities and adopts a budget while the chief administrative officer and his or her subordinates manage specific programs and services.

Municipalities are often responsible for the assessment of real property and the levying of property taxes. Other sources of revenue include grants from federal and provincial governments, and miscellaneous local revenues such as user fees, fines, licenses, etc. Even though all forms of municipal revenue must have provincial authorization, municipalities can exercise discretion with respect both to the level of taxation and to the quality of services they provide.

In some provinces and territories, local governments operate with greater autonomy than in others. Typically, provinces exercise more control over municipal operations where transfer payments, particularly conditional grants, constitute a large part of municipal revenues. Unconditional grants allow for much greater autonomy. In those provinces where there is a greater reliance on own source revenues, municipalities tend to operate with significant independence.

Municipalities contribute much to the physical fabric of civil society: the roads, the sidewalks, the water supply and sewage treatment connections, the bridges, and the transportation systems including urban transit. Urban planning, the use of land and the development process fall within the municipal mandate.

Municipalities do much to protect society through the provision of emergency services such as fire, police and ambulance. They may inspect construction sites to ensure the application of safety standards, or conduct health inspections of locally licensed establishments such as restaurants. Municipalities are involved with the licensing of everything from dogs to street vendors.

The provision of social services is in some parts of Canada purely a provincial function, but in other parts it is assigned or contracted to local governments. Municipal social services may include the administration of social assistance (welfare), social housing, daycare, facilities for battered women, children's aid and so on.

Recreation services constitute a major feature of municipal activities. Examples include the provision of parks and sports facilities, and cultural institutions such as performing art centres, museums and libraries.

Normally, services are delivered uniformly within the municipal boundary. For example, social services are administered equitably among all citizens. Regulatory powers are applied evenly across the defined territory.

The advent of Aboriginal self- government, the settlement of land claims, and the possibility of urban reserves on purchased land have all contributed to a heightened awareness of Aboriginal matters by municipal leaders. The prospect of autonomous territories within or adjacent to municipal boundaries, which may not share service standards, development priorities or regulatory objectives, and the potential need to supply unique services to particular groups within the municipal area, all could serve to compromise traditional municipal approaches. For example, the possibility of a different zoning regime within or near a residential area justifiably raises concerns of nearby residents. The access of non-residents to services paid for by taxpaying residents also causes unease.

While one can envisage solutions to these challenges, there is little apparent federal or provincial support, or indeed support from Aboriginal peoples themselves for consultative or negotiating mechanisms in respect of the priorities and requirements of local governments in the context of addressing the needs of Aboriginal peoples. For practical reasons, modes of municipal/Aboriginal coordination and cooperation have emerged spontaneously across Canada to fill this critical void.

## ABORIGINAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

The crux of the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and local governments is the concept and implementation of Aboriginal self-government. Municipalities believe their communities will be affected because Aboriginal self-government will necessarily be exercised at the local level. While supportive of the notion of Aboriginal self-government, municipalities insist that the context in which this can be realized must be discussed by all orders of government, including local government.

Most Aboriginal governments are defined by the Indian Act, which imposes a Band Council system of local government. The Chief and Council members are elected by the Band members to carry out administrative duties and to exercise control over the delivery of certain services. Aboriginal governments have a limited range of delegated powers since control over many programs and policies has not been transferred. The Indian Act was amended in 1985 to allow, among other things, more control by Bands over membership and residency on reserves. In 1988, the Act was again amended to allow the Band Council more financial control, to strengthen the ability to collect property taxes of leased land on reserves and to facilitate the management of development on reserves. In recent years, the federal government has acknowledged the need for more local control by Aboriginal governments so that their different requirements and cultural backgrounds can be more adequately reflected.

During the Charlottetown Accord negotiations, it became evident that the majority of Canadians agreed with the notion that Aboriginal peoples are distinct and should have control over matters such as culture, language, education, social services and health care. Most Canadians also supported the settlement of land claims. But many people and governments requested a clearer definition of self-government before it was carved in constitutional stone. Much apprehension arose from the notion of an inherent right to self-government. The implication appeared to be that self-government could be implemented any time since it requires no authorization from any government or court, and anywhere since it is not necessarily a function of land ownership. Whatever the justification, Aboriginal self-government cannot be developed in a vacuum.

### Aspects of Aboriginal Self-Government

Our research has indicated that most local governments are not familiar with the conceptual, historical and legal background of the Aboriginal right to self-government. Most matters central to Aboriginal rights have their foundation in international law through original occupation of the land. Further, a consistent thread of two fundamental principles can be recognized in all Aboriginal claims to self-government: the right to self-determination and a spiritual connection to the land.

The rights of Aboriginal peoples have been advocated in international law since the era of discovery itself. Despite the lack of explicit means of enforcement other than public opinion and moral suasion, international law provides an important set of principles to guide international relations. Within this context, Aboriginal peoples refute the label of ethnic minorities, properly the internal responsibility of states, and assert a sovereign right to determine their political future and to pursue freely their cultural and economic development.

The rights of ownership and property as defined by Western democracies are alien concepts. Aboriginal peoples view their unique relationship to the land as a stewardship, an obligation to take care of the physical environment for generations into the future. Hence, an harmonious relationship with nature is an essential element of Aboriginal identity.

Aboriginal peoples claim that with colonization their right to exercise sovereignty was unjustly abrogated. They are reasserting Aboriginal authority by advancing self-government as an exclusive legislative, executive and administrative jurisdiction over land, resources and people. Inherent sovereignty would define and formalize Aboriginal self-government as an order of government with powers similar to provincial governments<sup>1</sup>. Aboriginal peoples do not accept the federal government's attempt to view Aboriginal questions within a limited context and Aboriginal self-government as a municipal political system. Such approaches erode the sovereign nature of their status.

Against this backdrop, three basic routes to Aboriginal self-government can be discerned. Aboriginal self-government can be an expression of the inherent right of sovereign nations to self-determination; it can be a legislated devolution of power within the existing constitutional framework; or it can be a combination of both.

Ovide Mercredi, Grand Chief of the Assembly of First Nations, has repeatedly stated that self-government need not necessarily be pre-defined, but can be explained: it is to preserve a distinct society, another way of life in Canada. Aboriginal peoples are affirming their sovereign right to self-determination as reflected in international law. Nevertheless, they maintain the jurisdiction of Aboriginal governments will be exercised within the Canadian federal system. As a further compromise, Aboriginal peoples are willing to negotiate the implementation of an inherent right to self- government.

---

<sup>1</sup> FCM takes the view that de facto Canada currently has three orders of government: local, provincial/territorial and federal. Aboriginal self-government can be included as an order of government similar to local government.



### Implications of Aboriginal Self-Government

Whether authority will precede implementation or follow from it, the reality of Aboriginal self-government raises a number of questions for municipalities. Without a clear understanding of the principles and parameters, it is difficult for local governments to participate in a meaningful and substantial manner. Local government leaders realize that the federal government, wishing to project a commitment to Aboriginal self-government in the aftermath of the Charlottetown Accord, will continue to implement measures to expand the authority of Aboriginal people over their own affairs.

The current federal approach to Aboriginal rights has three basic components. Negotiations with Aboriginal peoples involve comprehensive land claims, specific land claims and community-based self-government. Comprehensive land claims confirm Aboriginal rights based on proclamations and precedents predating Confederation. They are negotiated in areas where treaties were never signed or not put into effect. Specific land claims refer for the most part to unfulfilled or disputed treaty obligations involving Crown land owed by the federal government to specific Indian Bands under treaties signed in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The process of community-based Aboriginal self-government intends to increase substantially local decision-making powers and accountability by Aboriginal governments to their own citizens.

In attempting to define and honour Aboriginal rights, the federal government has nevertheless indicated a commitment to respect the general public interest, as well as third party interests, and to deal equitably with potential conflicts. Maintaining appropriate and effective communication with third parties whose interests are related to the negotiations is part of the mandate. Municipalities understand that different circumstances will require different agreements of self-government. Whatever the form of Aboriginal self-government, however, municipalities maintain that any amendments to jurisdictions and systems of accountability must be addressed by all orders of government. Support for Aboriginal self-government and the corollary of certain distinct and inalienable rights may compromise municipal jurisdiction.

The breadth of contextual interpretations of Aboriginal self-government leads municipalities to ask how institutional harmony will be ensured when Aboriginal self-government is established. Whether Aboriginal governments will be able to adopt laws that contravene federal, provincial and municipal laws must be discussed in the context of legal transition. Furthermore, the potential for Aboriginal jurisdiction within municipal boundaries must be addressed conclusively. Will Aboriginal jurisdiction follow Aboriginal individuals regardless of where they reside? Similarly, if an Aboriginal government purchases land within a municipality as a proper act of self-government, will Aboriginal jurisdiction be established within municipal boundaries by declaring the land "Indian land" under Section 91(24) of the Constitution Act?

The federal government argues that Aboriginal governments need jurisdiction and authority first, and that negotiated agreements establishing Aboriginal self-government will likely contain many provisions to ensure institutional harmony among all affected governments. Still, a recognition of an inherent right to self-government, which is not contingent on negotiated agreements, could elevate Aboriginal government to an order of government similar to provincial/territorial government. Municipalities already dealing with a revision of jurisdictional parameters with provincial governments are understandably wary of these potential implications.

The development of Aboriginal self-government has typically proceeded through negotiations, a process from which local governments have been excluded for the most part. The federal government claims not to have the mandate to make commitments regarding the participation of municipal governments, but that municipal involvement is not expressly precluded on matters that affect them. Some provincial governments have shown a willingness to consider municipalities in the specific self-government negotiations that affect them.

At present, municipalities are included in the category of third party interests. During land claims negotiations in the Yukon, municipalities have been granted observer status for portions of the negotiations that are of direct concern to them. It is the intent of the Province of British Columbia to establish a similar policy. This is a positive beginning, but no guarantee that municipal voices will be heard. FCM and its members would welcome unequivocal recognition of local government as a key contributor in establishing Aboriginal self-government. It would signal an understanding of the unique relationships evolving between municipalities and Aboriginal peoples.

## MUNICIPAL / ABORIGINAL RELATIONS

Relations between municipalities and Aboriginal peoples are emerging in spite of legislative and constitutional limitations. Aboriginal governments are developing practical solutions when providing services and political representation in a context where their legal authority remains to be recognized. Similarly, municipalities are investing in the development of cooperative arrangements with Aboriginal governments to deliver services in a context where their legitimate participation in the evolution of Aboriginal self-government has yet to be acknowledged.

Both Aboriginal governments and local governments produce and deliver services to people and property. Basic services such as water, sewer, road maintenance, waste disposal, police and fire protection are common. Whereas the division of functional responsibilities among municipalities and between municipalities and provincial governments varies across the country, Aboriginal governments, no matter how small, generally face a broader range of responsibilities including culturally sensitive services such as education and social services. This distinction stems from the particular political status of Aboriginal governments claiming their jurisdiction over people and resources as an inherent right.

Aboriginal governments are similar to municipal governments in that they too exercise delegated powers at the local level. In addition, Aboriginal governments often have a mandate to ensure that certain cultural and behavioral traditions are maintained. The multifaceted nature of the interests they represent creates many organizational complexities for Aboriginal governments. Maintaining intergovernmental relations within a federal system while adhering to Aboriginal principles has made the practice of Aboriginal government a challenge.

While facing enhanced responsibilities, Aboriginal governments generally do not function within the same legal and historical parameters as local governments. Most Aboriginal governments do not have statutory corporate authority or an independent revenue base, both of which affect their ability to enter into agreements for the joint production and delivery of services (so as to avoid the compromise of quality and efficiency which may result from independent action). Further complications arise from the different cultural objectives and styles of service delivery between Aboriginal governments and local governments, precluding straightforward joint agreements in certain areas. And finally, the social conditions faced by Aboriginal governments are often more challenging, making it difficult to achieve the same standard of corresponding services and results as local governments.

Providing government services in a context where that government's authority is in question or nebulous, seriously undermines the effectiveness of Aboriginal governments. Increased authority of Aboriginal governments over their own affairs would allow the growth of political, social and economic self-sufficiency necessary for an improved quality of life and enhance their capacity to conduct affairs with local governments.

Since 1985, the federal government has implemented some major initiatives toward Aboriginal self-government. Chief among these are certain comprehensive land claims settlements and framework agreements. Perhaps one of the most significant initiatives in the context of Aboriginal self-government is the Sechelt Indian Band Government Act (1986) which enables the Sechelt Band of British Columbia to function as the first Aboriginal community with legislated self-government.

The Sechelt Act does not provide for constitutionally based self-government, but is enabling legislation providing authority over resources and people on Sechelt lands. On the basis of federal and provincial delegated powers, the Sechelt Band acts as an independent legal entity managing its natural resources and making laws relating to property (including taxation and zoning and planning regulations) and to people (including membership, education, health, public safety, welfare and social services). In essence, the Sechelt Band can pursue community planning and development as it operates with enhanced municipal powers within the federal/provincial system.

While the arrangement of Sechelt community self-government has been successful for the Sechelt Band, it has received considerable criticism as a possible model to be emulated by other Aboriginal governments. It has been argued that Sechelt resembles a municipal government as opposed to an order of government with an independent jurisdiction similar to provincial governments. In this manner, the argument continues, the legislated authority of Sechelt actually hinders the pursuit of constitutionally entrenched Aboriginal self-government. Furthermore, Sechelt sets a precedent for facilitating Aboriginal self-government independent of any comprehensive land claims settlements. Without the explicit recognition of land as essential to Aboriginal culture and with the imposition of a non-Aboriginal style of government, Sechelt is viewed as artificial and not a reflection of traditional Aboriginal government. And finally, Sechelt style municipal government (as opposed to a distinct order of government with exclusive jurisdiction) can be limited or eradicated by "senior" governments with impunity.

Alternatively, Sechelt can be viewed as a cumulation of the efforts of Aboriginal peoples giving credence to the practice of Aboriginal self-government. A pragmatic, incremental approach to Aboriginal self-government does not in and of itself mitigate the political advancement of Aboriginal rights; indeed, perhaps the opposite is true. Rather than asking whether delegated powers of self-government are strong enough, inspiration can be drawn from an analysis of the practical manner in which Aboriginal governments have proceeded to provide government services to their people without legislated self-government. Canadian municipalities have participated with Aboriginal governments in delivering basic services to Aboriginal communities.



The analysis of our research into municipal/Aboriginal relations is organized in four sections: service delivery agreements, successful aspects of current relationships, impediments to increased cooperation and urban Aboriginal peoples.

### Service Delivery Agreements

Many Aboriginal governments are responsible for a relatively small population. Lacking the "critical mass" necessary for self-sufficiency, various service delivery agreements with nearby municipalities, private sector companies or other, larger Aboriginal governments have been negotiated. From a municipal perspective, these agreements often fill a void in official mechanisms and institutional arrangements between federal, provincial and Aboriginal governments to ensure equal access to basic services for all citizens. In other words, practical necessity is the foundation for many service delivery agreements between municipalities and Aboriginal governments.

In general, municipalities responding to our survey report anywhere from one to sixteen adjacent or nearby reserves with the majority of these reports involving between one and three; some local governments have a reserve either wholly or partially within municipal boundaries. Service delivery agreements have been reported from across the country, but seem to be most prevalent in British Columbia where relatively more municipalities have nearby reserves. For the most part, service delivery agreements have been in place for a number of years and are stable. Occasionally, they are of a verbal or ad hoc nature. On the whole, this type of practical cooperation is a growing trend with municipalities reporting new agreements just recently implemented or still under negotiation.

The types of services contained in these agreements cover a wide range of responsibilities: taxation, education, housing, social services, environment (including animal control), land management, public works (including street lighting, road ploughing, building inspection and cemetery maintenance), water, sewer, police, transportation, fire protection, recreation (including library), health (including ambulance), justice, gaming and economic development. Most agreements contain arbitration clauses to facilitate the resolution of disputes. Not all service agreements are with municipalities: some are with the private sector or other Aboriginal governments. Not all service agreements are with just one municipality.

From the perspective of the municipalities involved, the core reason for joint service delivery agreements is to provide the full range of municipal services on a cost recovery basis. Local governments across the country offer the following explanations for service agreements:

- To provide adequate services to reserves;
- To establish a mutually acceptable solution with respect to the provision of services;
- To foster harmonious relationships between municipalities and First Nations and to share resources;
- To establish mutual cooperation to benefit the community as a whole;
- To create partnerships;
- To provide equal services at equal costs to all residents on or off reserves;
- To facilitate the compatible development of lands within municipal boundaries;
- To provide emergency back-up services upon request;
- To build understanding;
- To maintain an open and cooperative relationship;
- To ensure relative taxation equity, service equity and uniformity of regulations; and
- To assist the Aboriginal community to achieve their potential recognizing their authority and our collective need to develop mutually satisfactory solutions.

Agreements with local governments do not involve only the provision of services by the municipality to the Aboriginal community. In Thunder Bay, Ontario, negotiations are under way between the City and the nearby First Nation for renewal of a Lease Agreement for land located on the reserve which forms part of the watershed for one source of the City's water supply. For the past 35 years, Surrey, British Columbia, has leased approximately 20 acres of land from the Semiahmoo Indian Band. The land is leased for park purposes and includes a small Indian cemetery which Surrey maintains.

Where modes of self-government are in place and jurisdiction is unambiguous, Aboriginal peoples have successfully negotiated service agreements and generally have better relations with nearby municipalities. Stable relations also seem to encourage a willingness to consider joint economic development opportunities. Where functions such as taxation and uniformity of municipal regulations are contentious, especially when a reserve is located either partially or wholly within municipal boundaries, there seem to be less efficient or effective relations.

### Successful Aspects of Current Relationships

By and large, positive relations between municipalities and Aboriginal governments are rooted in pragmatic cooperation. Municipalities report mutual understanding and respect emerging from the provision of technical services such as building inspection and the use of conflict resolution mechanisms contained in service delivery agreements. Sometimes, good relations evolve from ad hoc cooperation as in the City of Port Coquitlam, British Columbia, where the City and the Band joined forces to resolve flood-proofing of a river that runs adjacent to the reserve.

Successful mechanisms in building or improving municipal/Aboriginal relations generally revolve around some method of communication, either informal or more formal. At the level of Council to Council communication, some municipalities report informal interaction through quarterly luncheon meetings or through an informal system of meetings, often upon request, between municipal and Band Councils to discuss areas of concern. In addition, representatives of the respective municipal and Aboriginal administrations tend to meet as required. In the Town of Fort Smith, Northwest Territories, regular communication takes place between the Mayor, the Band Chief, the President of the local Métis association and the Chamber of Commerce.

Other municipalities report more formal arrangements. In Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, City Council and the Muskeg Lake Indian Band Council have joint meetings. In Fort Frances, Ontario, the municipality and the Aboriginal government have biennial joint Council meetings. The Town of Norman Wells, Northwest Territories, reports that under a new Western Territorial Constitution, one seat on Council would be guaranteed by the Town for a representative of the local Métis association. Furthermore, some municipalities report more comprehensive understanding developing through third party involvement in land claims negotiations. Such is the case with the City of Whitehorse and the Yukon comprehensive land claim agreement, and the District of Stewart and the Nisga'a comprehensive land claim in British Columbia.

At yet another level, municipalities have established liaison committees or ad hoc committees to meet with representatives of Aboriginal governments to improve communication and to attempt to resolve disputes that may arise. In some municipalities, the Aboriginal community has guaranteed seats on a number of relevant municipal Boards and Committees. Many municipalities report at least one joint municipal/ Aboriginal committee with a mandate to address mutual interests and concerns. For example, The City of Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, has a Native Consultative Committee and the City of Nanaimo, British Columbia, has an Aboriginal Liaison Committee consisting of Band Council, City Council and staff members. Also at the committee level, single issue cooperation can stimulate wider understanding as in the District of Kitimat, British Columbia. The District participates in an estuary committee with the local Band and federal and provincial agencies to investigate the status of the local environment in the estuary, identify opportunities for development, and engage in risk assessment and cost/benefit analysis.

The importance of positive gestures in the establishment of a harmonious and productive relationship should not be underestimated. When a municipality is supportive of Aboriginal initiatives, the Aboriginal community tends to reciprocate with support for local business. In Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, the City used its operating budget to fund some Aboriginal programs, which enhanced the City's image among Aboriginal peoples, instilled a measure of trust and thus opened up dialogue. Good relations in Bathurst, New Brunswick, resulted in the full support from the Aboriginal community when the City approached them seeking cooperation for the construction of a new civic centre.

Municipalities across the country recognize that Aboriginal peoples are working toward a higher profile and are proud of their heritage. They know they have much to learn from Aboriginal peoples, especially where it concerns culture and environmental issues. Many local governments attach a high priority to the relationship with the Aboriginal community and strive to give Aboriginal residents on reserves the same access to municipal facilities on the same basis as municipal residents. An atmosphere of mutual respect gives rise to reciprocal consideration. The City of Port Coquitlam, British Columbia, was recently approached by the local Band to discuss issues such as access and impact on surroundings of development plans for the reserve. In the Town of Norman Wells, Northwest Territories, the selection of land within municipal boundaries was completed as part of land claims negotiations with the full support and approval of the Town Council.



Another practical and constructive area of cooperation lies in the pursuit of joint economic development opportunities. While response to this question was mixed, many municipalities are considering ideas as opportunities arise, while others are involved in discussions with the Aboriginal community. In some municipalities, a planning update will include Aboriginal plans and aspirations or the strategic plan will include the encouragement of Aboriginal economic development and partnerships or joint ventures between Aboriginal organizations and community business interests. Specific areas where joint development is being considered include sewage treatment, water supply, solid waste management and landfill sites, woodlot management and tourism.

Examples of cooperation for economic development include:

- The City of Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, has suggested that the municipality and the Aboriginal Development Corporations combine efforts and resources to develop a marina.
- The Town of Maple Creek, Saskatchewan, is considering the establishment of a healing lodge with the Aboriginal community.
- In Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, the Aboriginal leadership is involved in the Federal Industrial Adjustment Committee.
- In Fort Frances, Ontario, the municipality and the Aboriginal community are considering a casino.

- In Salmon Arm, British Columbia, preliminary discussions are under way with respect to servicing and developing light industry and tourism on reserve lands with the municipality supplying services.
- In Prince George, British Columbia, the Lheidli Nation has proposed a major tourist attraction in the form of the re-creation of a traditional Carrier Village before contact with Europeans. The site is in one of the City's parks.
- In High Level, Alberta, Aboriginal economic development is encouraged through the Community Futures Organization.
- The District of Stewart, British Columbia, reports that joint economic development will be incorporated in the settlement of the Nisga'a comprehensive land claim.

Tolerance and consideration have allowed cooperation to persist even in the face of jurisdictional complications. For example, the Squamish Nation has three reserves: one solely within the City of North Vancouver, one solely within the District of North Vancouver, and one which is split between West Vancouver and North Vancouver. The Regional District is also involved in this particular instance because of a sewage treatment plant. With the different agendas of each jurisdiction, it is as important to establish the protocol as it is to resolve the issue.

### Impediments to Increased Cooperation

Municipalities also report certain impediments to increased cooperation. Acknowledgment of impediments can give rise to a creative tension sometimes necessary to begin dialogue and come to a satisfactory resolution. Most concerns can be organized in three main categories: general comments, land claims and urban reserves.

Aboriginal people may feel they are treated with a lower standard. Non-Aboriginal people may feel that the Aboriginal community receives preferential treatment, especially in the area of taxation. In short, there can exist a mutual perception that the other community is treated better. Other, general impediments include prejudicial hiring practices among local industries, lack of communication, mistrust and wariness, unfair competition, cultural and philosophical differences, misunderstanding of self-government, lotteries, ignorance, stereotyping, social problems, misperceptions and racism.

Comments are made that land claims have taken so much time and effort from Aboriginal leaders that they have spent too little time planning for the future and have become reactionary. Other comments reflect the obstacles local governments confront in maintaining positive relations in the face of differences within the Aboriginal community, especially with respect to who has the authority to make binding agreements. There is also frustration over the indifference of federal and provincial governments to legislative impediments limiting the ability of municipal and Aboriginal parties to negotiate binding agreements.

In terms of land management, concern is raised over land access and a lack of zoning regulations on reserves, especially those located wholly or partially within municipal boundaries. The Sewell Commission in Ontario has recently recommended consultation with Aboriginal communities where a proposed land development abuts a reserve. There is, however, no allowance for reciprocal comments on Aboriginal developments.

Municipalities also report that financial disagreements can hamper good relations. Some local governments perceive Aboriginal communities not to be adequately aware of municipal costs. Also, the negotiation of service delivery agreements can be protracted making it expensive for municipalities in terms of legal fees and staff time.

Aboriginal governments sometimes perceive local governments to be unreasonable when they insist on cost-sharing as opposed to fee-for-service arrangements, for example, in the provision of fire protection. Some Aboriginal governments have not paid for services delivered by the municipality or are simply unprepared to pay at the same rate as municipal residents. Action must be taken by all orders of government to rectify situations in which municipalities are owed taxes. These outstanding issues can have a negative impact on future cooperation.

Finally, reaching suitable agreements for Indian self-taxation is a concern, especially in British Columbia where the provincial government has turned taxing authority for schools and municipal purposes over to Band Councils.

By far the majority of municipal concerns about Aboriginal issues stem from land claims issues. The concern is not the principle behind land claims settlements, but rather the process. Uncertainty over the outcome of comprehensive and specific land claims and treaty negotiations compromises political goodwill. In addition, the majority of municipalities that report to be affected by land claims also face the prospect of jurisdictional intricacies as land within their boundaries is determined part of the final settlement.

Land claims have caused concern as they delay land and economic development, or impair resource industries. The Cartwright Community in Labrador has seen its proposed wood industry put on hold pending the outcome of land claims. The initiative would have created employment. In Norman Wells, Northwest Territories, land claims have slowed oil and gas exploration. A final settlement will be welcomed by all parties involved. In Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, the slow pace of the settlement of land claims is particularly frustrating since all Crown land within the municipal boundary has been frozen for development purposes. Overall, unsettled land claims create an unfavourable climate for capital investments and hurt local economies.

Land claims carry costs and implications. In the District of Mackenzie, British Columbia, land claims involving mineral and lumber resources could impact on the viability of the community. In Dalhousie, New Brunswick, the industrial water supply is affected by land claims. The status of commercial fishing and lumber industries is a particular concern of some municipalities. In Prince Rupert, British Columbia, commercial fishermen and fish plant employees as well as loggers could be seriously affected by the Nisga'a comprehensive land claim. Much of the concern of municipalities centres around the potential damage of land claims to otherwise good relationships.

Land claims settlements can create impediments to future cooperation. In The Pas, Manitoba, a large residential subdivision is now Band land yet the Town still owns the streets and lanes. Municipalities in Saskatchewan may face some loss of revenue as a result of Treaty Land Entitlement agreements. In the Hamlet of Duffield, Alberta, the Aboriginal community surrendered title to the streets and lanes many years ago, but they were never designated public streets by the federal government. As a result, the Paul Indian Band now claims the streets and lanes where private property was bought by third parties who assumed that access would be possible via public roads.

Confusion arises where a municipality is within a land claim area even though it has no Aboriginal population or nearby reserves. Abruptly being made aware of a land claim without prior discussion does not create a climate conducive to positive relations. For example, in Saskatchewan some municipalities with no nearby reserves or Aboriginal populations but close to large segments of Crown land, feel unprepared facing the possibility of nearby reserves as part of the Treaty Land Entitlement process.

The most recent source of concern among municipalities is the potential of "urban reserves", involving land within urban corporate limits that is either part of a land claims settlement or purchased by an Aboriginal community. Both the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations and the Siksika Urban Association in Calgary have indicated a predisposition toward establishing urban reserves in Saskatoon, Regina and Calgary. The primary reason is to create better economic conditions for Aboriginal peoples.

Aboriginal leaders have argued that urban land awarded as part of a land claims settlement should not be subject to municipal taxation or municipal by-laws, because it would be "Indian land". It is not clear whether this distinction could also be applied to urban land purchased by an Aboriginal government as a proper act of self-government. Because the structure of municipal regulations and services depends heavily on territorial integrity, it is imperative that the legal and financial implications of urban land-based Aboriginal self-government be clarified with the participation of local governments.

When Aboriginal urban communities have the capacity to pass their own by-laws with respect to the provision of services and to carry out their own by-law enforcement, potential incompatibilities and discrepancies with municipal regulations such as zoning and with provincial legislation such as minimum wage or environmental standards become a concern. Further, the establishment of urban reserves may also result in less federal and provincial funding for existing Aboriginal controlled service organizations in urban settings, leaving the local government to deal with the effect of a potential shortfall.

The unease of municipalities regarding potential urban reserves results largely from a lack of guarantee with respect to standards of accountability and performance of Aboriginal urban land-based self-government. "Institutionalized ghettoization" must be avoided to the mutual benefit of all parties involved. Uniformity of the full range of municipal services to property and people must be ensured to avoid compromising the quality of life municipalities are responsible for. A comprehensive consultation process prior to the establishment of urban reserves must be conducted among all orders of government.



Overall, the Aboriginal right to land is supported. The uncertainty of the outcome and slow process of land claims settlements, as well as unspecified results of expressions of Aboriginal self-government have, however, caused much unease among municipalities.

### Urban Aboriginal Peoples

More than half of Aboriginal people now live in urban centres. Aboriginal leaders have expressed a desire to work together with municipalities to address the many social ills urban Aboriginal people face. Most have not indicated an interest in some form of land based self-government or law-making powers. Instead, they wish to have more control over the planning, design and delivery of services to urban Aboriginal people. Most major urban municipalities have developed a relationship with the Aboriginal community within their boundaries and this relationship is constantly being reviewed and adapted. Nevertheless, local government leaders recognize the need for improvement.

The Aboriginal community within urban centres is not homogenous. The community consists of status and non-status Indians, Métis, and Inuit. Within this diversity, aspirations vary owing to differences in cultural background and socio-economic condition. It is difficult to create one strong Aboriginal organization to represent all the needs of urban Aboriginal people.

In addition, many Aboriginal people living off reserve cannot tap into reserve based programs. Different jurisdictions and programs or policies dealing with the variety of Aboriginal groups result in situations where people living in the same community can receive different treatment. This also makes it problematic for municipalities to have a uniform approach. Indeed, the Aboriginal community itself has differing views whether generic services or specific programs for specific groups offer the most potential for improvement.

The relations between local governments and urban Aboriginal communities vary from virtually non-existent to being positive and structured. Some municipalities view the urban Aboriginal community as the concern of ethnic and race relations policies and programs only. Others have recognized the distinct political status of Aboriginal peoples and have made efforts to establish separate agencies and committees. On the other hand, urban Aboriginal people have not always managed to form a community, especially where many are transient and live among the homeless. Generally, the foundation of municipal/Aboriginal relations in urban centres is cooperation between the local Native Friendship Centre and the local government.

Municipalities have made gestures to ameliorate the situation of Aboriginal citizens living in or adapting to life in the city, especially in crucial areas such as education, employment, housing, social services and health care. Local governments recognize that municipal services are not always culturally sensitive and that service priorities of Aboriginal peoples are not always synonymous with the responsibilities formally assigned to municipalities.

The working relationship with Aboriginal political and service organizations varies and often depends on the issues in question. In general, urban municipalities acknowledge the importance of separate service delivery and the need for Aboriginal people to manage their own socio-economic affairs. Most urban municipalities provide funding for Aboriginal organizations and programs within their communities.

The City of Regina, Saskatchewan, provides financial support to various Aboriginal groups. In addition, there are Aboriginal representatives on the Community Grants Review Board, the Economic Development Authority and the Board of Police Commissioners. In this manner, members of the Aboriginal community are able to participate in key processes in local government.

The City of Vancouver, British Columbia, supports two programs for its Aboriginal population: the Urban Native Indian Education Society and the Vancouver Police and Native Liaison Society. The City also had a Native Services Planner for a two-year period to review services for Aboriginal people and to facilitate communication among the community, federal and provincial funding agencies and the City. Vancouver also has a First Nations Education Advisory Committee.

The City of Edmonton has established an Aboriginal Representative Committee to provide a forum to discuss issues affecting the Aboriginal community. The City has also appointed Aboriginal members to the Police Commission, the Royal Alexandra Hospital Board and the Advisory Committee on Community and Family Services. Aboriginal representatives were also included in the Steering Committee to develop an Economic Strategy for Edmonton and the Mayor's Task Force on Safer Cities. The Chamber of Commerce has decided to appoint an Aboriginal representative to its Board.

The City of Winnipeg has an Aboriginal Advisory Committee. There are regular discussions with representatives of Aboriginal groups focusing on current issues and problem-solving. The Race Relations Committee for the City of Winnipeg includes a sub-committee on Aboriginal Relations to deal with potential conflicts. In addition, certain units of the City emphasize training for City staff with respect to Aboriginal culture.

The City of Calgary has an Aboriginal Urban Affairs Committee authorized by Council to investigate areas of concern affecting Aboriginal people and make policy recommendations to improve the opportunities and quality of life of Aboriginal people in the City of Calgary. The Social Services Department has a Native Liaison Program.

The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has established a Community Reference Group, which has Aboriginal representatives, to assist in the improvement of planning, development and delivery of services to the Municipality's ethno-racial and Aboriginal groups. The Aboriginal community in Metropolitan Toronto has many separate service delivery agencies. In addition, the Municipality is actively involved in employment equity programs for Aboriginal people, the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force has launched an Aboriginal Peacekeeping Unit to deliver police services which are sensitive to Aboriginal needs, and the Native Child and Family Services of Toronto has been in operation since 1986.

Our research does not suggest any preferred model of service delivery for Aboriginal people living in urban centres. There does seem to be a need, however, for a central location where Aboriginal people can find assistance, referrals and guidance. Some municipalities report regular inter-agency meetings. These meetings could become the foundation for a one-stop approach to urban Aboriginal services. This scenario would, however, require all orders of government to cooperate instead of focusing on the delineation of jurisdictions as is now the case.

For its part, the federal government cannot draw a line separating Aboriginal people on reserves and Aboriginal people in urban areas. Some residual responsibility must remain. The needs of urban Aboriginal people must be met through a distinct process separate from agreements with reserves. In this context, municipalities must be included in discussions among governments with respect to changes in their relations with Aboriginal peoples. Municipalities should not be left responsible for services previously provided by federal or provincial governments without consultation and an appropriate transfer of funds. For example, in 1993 the federal government unilaterally withdrew its support for urban Aboriginal housing.

Increasingly, services to urban Aboriginal people are off-loaded to provincial governments, ultimately compromising their quality. The lack of consultation with local governments and with Aboriginal populations by federal and provincial governments will eventually erode the local political will to explore new approaches and partnerships.

While the relationship between municipalities and the broader Aboriginal community remains limited, there is an increasing awareness of the distinct needs of the Aboriginal community. Cooperation is growing with experience.

## CONCLUSION

The nature of municipal/Aboriginal relations stretches the entire spectre of attitudinal expressions, ranging from non-existent, to tentative, to business-like, to excellent. The overall trend, however, is one of improving communication and understanding. While we recognize the unique parameters of each situation and while the statistical data gleaned from our survey cannot be conclusive, some general observations can be made.

We can ascertain that some local governments are uncertain as to an appropriate role with respect to Aboriginal peoples. Conversely, from an Aboriginal viewpoint, the appropriateness of their involvement in what constitute non-traditional styles and institutions of government is questioned. At times, Aboriginal peoples show a reluctance to assert themselves as distinct political communities. Alternatively, local governments are not always aware of the distinct status of Aboriginal peoples.

As a result, municipal/Aboriginal relations in Canada present a rich kaleidoscope of unique historical, geographical and demographic situations. This diversity does not lend itself easily to any ideal model, but rather to certain principles underlying good relations. The experience of municipal governments is of value to Aboriginal peoples as they pursue their aspirations for local autonomy with larger political structures supporting and representing their interests, but requiring cooperation beyond the immediate boundaries of their community. Government to government relations between municipalities and Aboriginal peoples highlighted in our research are a pragmatic response to the interface of municipal/Aboriginal interests and a testament to Aboriginal self-government in practice.

No government can act in complete isolation from others. It is, therefore, difficult to contemplate the successful implementation of recommendations with respect to improving the relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people without the approval and cooperation of all governments, including local governments. Interdependence and cooperation, the characteristics of a federal system, must also be reflected in municipal/Aboriginal relations. Aboriginal people, as other members of society, wish to have control over their destinies. It is time to set aside stereotypes and recognize that Aboriginal leaders have been trying to implement responsible government for many years. Defining and implementing Aboriginal self-government will require a great deal of understanding, cooperation and goodwill.



We do not need any more indicators of the marginalized position of Aboriginal peoples in Canada. We do need a collaborative design towards change. We must move beyond merely managing situations to adopt a comprehensive plan which includes objectives and concrete strategies. Municipal leaders must combine efforts with Aboriginal leaders to identify and overcome barriers of mistrust, misperception, racism and systemic discrimination. Practical solutions can be found at the local, grass-roots level regardless of constitutional fiat: we can commit to building better communities together.

In the past, agreements between the Haudenosaunee Confederacy and Canada were governed by principles symbolized by the Two Row Wampum: on the River of Life, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples would navigate together, side by side, on parallel courses. Each boat would be governed by its own laws, traditions and beliefs; neither people would make laws over the other. While respecting the spirit of these principles, FCM hopes that this brief will encourage a dialogue between municipalities and Aboriginal peoples toward a common course to a shared destination.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The research and consultations conducted in the process of preparing this submission to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples have evolved into an overview of current municipal/Aboriginal relations. While realizing this is only a beginning, we believe we have laid the foundation for further efforts. To develop a better mutual understanding and strategy for action, we make the following recommendations:

### General Recommendations

1. There is a need to develop a coherent and comprehensive explanation of self-government. At present, it is difficult for FCM to advise its members on what "self-government" means in conceptual and operational terms. Foremost, a clear differentiation must be made between land-based Aboriginal self-government and Aboriginal self-government without a land base, and which form would be preferable in which situation.
2. A useful form of Aboriginal self-government would resemble municipal government. Local governments have become the principle public agent for the quality of life of all citizens.

3. The role local governments have played in the evolution of Aboriginal self-government and the effect of this development on local responsibilities must be recognized definitively by federal, provincial and Aboriginal governments. Municipalities must be a party to the negotiation of land claims and Aboriginal self-government. Federal, provincial and Aboriginal governments must support consultative or negotiating mechanisms to ensure that the implications of any agreements on local responsibilities, industries and economic development are addressed. Finally, the potential for Aboriginal jurisdiction within municipal boundaries must be addressed conclusively.

#### Recommendations for Municipal Governments

1. Local governments must become more aware of the specific requirements of Aboriginal peoples and adjust their approaches accordingly.
2. Municipal leaders must combine efforts with Aboriginal leaders, both nationally and locally, to identify barriers of mistrust, misperception, racism and systemic discrimination. Practical solutions can be found as our research indicates.

3. Municipalities are in a position to make a practical contribution to the evolution of Aboriginal self-government with knowledge and capacity of service delivery to people and property. Municipal leaders should seek out such opportunities.
4. The establishment of a central location where urban Aboriginal people can find assistance, referrals and guidance, a one-stop approach should be a priority in urban areas with significant Aboriginal populations.
5. There is a need for a joint strategy to strengthen ties between communities. Involving key Aboriginal groups and people at the grassroots level is essential. In this context, municipalities can become actively involved in assisting Aboriginal people in developing the administrative and technical skills necessary to advance their communities. Individual, local accomplishments with respect to positive municipal/Aboriginal relations must be emphasized.
6. Successful municipal/Aboriginal relations can be achieved through the establishment of regular communication. Meetings between municipal and Band Councils have proved to be a successful mechanism. Participation by Aboriginal people in local government boards, agencies and committees is another positive avenue. Municipalities must be proactive and supportive.

7. Successful municipal/Aboriginal relations can be achieved through the pursuit of joint economic development opportunities. Where this has been attempted, both municipalities and Aboriginal communities have benefitted.

#### Recommendations for Aboriginal Peoples

1. Aboriginal leaders, both nationally and locally, must recognize municipalities and local government leaders as legitimate and valuable partners in the development of Aboriginal self-government.
2. Few if any Aboriginal people are represented at the senior political and management levels of local government. Improved political participation and managerial representation by Aboriginal people at the municipal level must be pursued.
3. The potential entanglements resulting from the establishment of urban reserves can jeopardize otherwise positive relations. Aboriginal communities must work together to build effective communities without compromising the jurisdiction and territorial integrity of local governments. Aboriginal peoples must develop a sense of ownership through full and equal participation in all local affairs beginning with appropriate representation on all relevant municipal boards, agencies and committees. Municipalities must support this process.

### Recommendations for Federal and Provincial/Territorial Governments

1. The municipal tax base and the financing of services must be considered during negotiations of land claims agreements. The lack of clarity on this matter has created much uncertainty, especially in situations where municipalities are already owed taxes by the Aboriginal community.
2. The resolution of outstanding land claims must be given urgent priority.
3. A comprehensive consultation process involving all orders of government must be established with respect to the potential of urban reserves. In this context, research into developing Aboriginal urban self-government through separate service delivery agencies must be given a high priority.
4. The federal government must not draw a line separating Aboriginal people on reserves and Aboriginal people in urban areas. Some residual responsibility must remain. Urban Aboriginal peoples do not have adequate services available to them. The federal government in maintaining its fiduciary role must cooperate with municipalities and Aboriginal communities in developing strategies, financial and otherwise, to remedy this situation.

### Recommendations for FCM

1. Local governments and Aboriginal communities have developed regular consultation to advance mutual interests and mechanisms other than the courts to resolve disputes. Community to community relations have evolved across Canada. Experiences of successful models should be broadly shared through FCM.
2. Information about Aboriginal peoples, issues and benefits must be developed and distributed to local governments to facilitate understanding and allow local governments to engage in more meaningful discussions.
3. Resources must be identified so that FCM can advise and assist individual municipalities with the process of improving all aspects of municipal/Aboriginal relations. FCM should also provide liaison with the national organizations of Aboriginal peoples and the provincial/territorial municipal associations.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography contains only the major works consulted for this study:

Angus Reid Group, *Canadians and Aboriginal Peoples*, 1992. A Syndicated National Public Opinion Research Study.

Cassidy, Frank and Bish, Robert L, *Indian Government: It's Meaning and Practice*. Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1989.

Frideres, James, S., *Native Peoples in Canada, Contemporary Conflicts*, 3rd edition. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc., 1988.

Morse, Bradford W., (ed.), *Aboriginal Peoples and the Law: Indian, Métis and Inuit Rights in Canada*, Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1985.



# APPENDIX

## MUNICIPALITIES WHICH CONTRIBUTED INFORMATION

District of Abbotsford	Town of Cobourg
City of Airdrie	City of Coquitlam
Town of Altona	City of Corner Brook
Town of Ancaster	Community of Cornwall
Village of Anmore	City of Côte Saint-Luc
Village of Arborg	Cartwright Community Council
Village of Arthur	City of Cranbrook
Town of Assiniboia	Town of Creston
	Town of Cut Knife
Town of Banff	
City of Bathurst	Town of Dalhousie
Ville de Beauport	City of Dawson
Town of Biggar	Town of Dieppe
Town of Bonnyville	Town of Digby
City of Brantford	Ville de Dollard Des Ormeaux
Town of Bridgewater	Town of Dominion
Town of Brooks	City of Dorval
Ville de Buckingham	Town of Dryden
Village of Burns Lake	
	Town of East Gwillimbury
County of Cape Breton	Town of Eckville
Ville de Caraquet	City of Edmonton
Town of Carlyle	City of Edmundston
Village of Carmacks	Township of Esquimalt
Ville de Charlesbourg	Town of Essex
City of Charlottetown	City of Etobicoke
Municipality of Chester	
District of Chilliwack	Town of Flamborough
Town of Clarendville	Town of Fort Smith
District of Clearwater	City of Fort St. John
Village of Coalhurst	City of Fort Murray

Town of Fort Frances	Town of Leader
Town of Fort Qu'Appelle	City of Leduc
Town of Fort Smith	Town of Lewisporte
City of Fredericton	City of London
	District of Lunenburg
Town of Gander	Town of Lunenburg
Town of Gibbons	
Village of Gold River	District of Mackenzie
Town of Grand Bay	Town of Maple Creek
City of Grande Prairie	District of Maple Ridge
Town of Grande Cache	Village of Masset
Ville de Greenfield Park	Ville de Matane
City of Guelph	District of Matsqui
	Town of Meadow Lake
Village of Haines Junction	Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto
County of Halifax	Town of Middleton
Region of Hamilton-Wentworth	Municipality of Miniota
Ville de Hampstead	District of Mission
Town of Happy Valley-Goose Bay	City of Moose Jaw
Town of High Level	Town of Moosomin
Town of Hinton	Town of Morden
Town of Indian Head	Town of Morinville
Village of Irma	Town of Mount Royal
	County of Mountain View No. 17
Town of Kamsack	Town of Mulgrave
City of Kanata	
Village of Kaslo	City of Nanaimo
District of Kent	Town of Neepawa
Town of Kentville	City of Nepean
City of Kimberley	Village of New Denver
Township of King	City of New Westminster
District of Kitimat	Town of Nickel Centre
	Town of Niverville
Town of Lacombe	Town of Norman Wells

District of North Vancouver  
 City of North Vancouver  
 Community of North River  
 Municipality of North River  
 Town of Oakville

City of Richmond  
 Town of Riverview  
 Ville de Rivière-du-Loup  
 Ville de Rosemère  
 Town of Rosetown

Community Council of Cartwright  
 County of Parkland No. 31  
 Town of Parry Sound  
 Town of Peace River  
 Town of Penoka  
 Village of Perth Andover  
 City of Peterborough  
 District of Piniwawa  
 District of Pitt Meadows  
 City of Pointe Claire  
 Town of Ponoka  
 Town of Port Hope  
 City of Port Moody  
 City of Port Coquitlam  
 City of Portage la Prairie

District of Saanich  
 Ville de Saint-Lambert  
 City of Saint John  
 Municipalité de Saint-Emile  
 Ville de Saint-Eustache  
 Ville de Sainte-Geneviève  
 District of Salmon Arm  
 District of Sechelt  
 Village de Senneville  
 City of Shediac  
 Ville de Sherbrooke  
 Village of Slocan  
 City of Spruce Grove  
 City of St. Albert  
 Town of St. Alban's  
 Town of St. Paul  
 Town of Steinbach  
 City of Stoney Creek  
 Town of Stony Plain  
 City of Stratford  
 County of Strathcona  
 Town of Strathmore  
 Region of Sudbury  
 District of Summerland  
 District of Sunshine Coast  
 District of Surrey  
 Town of Sussex  
 City of Swift Current

Rural Municipality of Portage la  
 Prairie

District of Powell River  
 City of Prince George  
 City of Prince Rupert

County of Queens

City of Red Deer  
 Town of Redwater  
 City of Regina

City of Sydney  
Town of Sydney Mines

City of Yellowknife  
Association of Yukon Communities

District of Taylor  
Town of The Pas  
City of Thompson  
Town of Three Hills  
City of Thunder Bay  
Town of Tilbury  
City of Trail  
Town of Truro

Alberta Association of Municipal  
Districts & Counties

Village of Ucluelet

Town of Valley East  
City of Vancouver  
Ville de Vanier  
Town of Vegreville  
Ville de Verdun  
City of Victoria

Village of Wabamun  
Town of Wadena  
Town of Walden  
Town of Watrous  
Municipality of West St. Paul  
District of West Vancouver  
City of Westmount  
City of Wetaskiwin  
City of Weyburn  
City of White Rock  
City of Whitehorse  
City of Winnipeg