Community and the Administration of Aboriginal Governments

by Leslie A. Brown

October 1994

Contents

Executive Summary

The purpose of this paper is to provide insight into the administrative environment of Aboriginal governments from the standpoint of those engaged in the daily practice of Aboriginal governance. The research focused on two areas: administration and the community, and education and training. In doing so, the paper identifies critical tensions and dilemmas that contribute to the complexity of the task of administering Aboriginal governments. Data were collected in a diverse range of ways: interviews, teleconference focus groups, documents, surveys, observations and a literature review. Overall, 28 different Aboriginal organizations participated in some manner in the research.

The initial tension identified arises from the two paths, social and political, being pursued by Aboriginal communities. Politicians spoke of frustration that their community members are unable to comprehend and engage in the legal, political and policy-making efforts that would shift the structural foundation of their organizations, while frontline service workers complained that politicians are out of touch with the basic need in their communities for food, housing and health. The two paths ─ political, concerned with land claims and self-government, and social, concerned with community healing and unity ─ may often appear to be different, but in fact are interdependent and mutually reinforcing routes to effective self-determination.

Issues of membership and constituency are complex, however much the administrative challenges that exist appear to result from the tension between membership as defined by the organization (internal) and as defined for the organization by others (external). Generally speaking, internally defined constituencies were considered more consistent with principles of self-determination and self-government.

The reality of Aboriginal governments is that they are accountable to many. The matrix of external funding programs that administrators negotiate is not conducive to integrative community programming. The need to be accountable to external bodies can compete with the need to develop and maintain accountability to the community. Community education is a key administrative task for Aboriginal governments if all constituents are to develop an understanding of the goals and activities of the organization as well as the means for communicating and participating in governance.

The solution to self-government administration difficulties was often expressed as the

need to consider the cultural as well as the political. In fact, it was found in example after example that the cultural *is* the political. The reality that administrators must be cognizant of the cultural and political context of their work is uniquely prominent in Aboriginal governments.

There was an overwhelming call for education and training for the administrative development of Aboriginal governments. Inherent in this expressed need are several dilemmas for Aboriginal governments. Pointing to the need for education becomes an easy way to `blame the victim' for difficulties encountered. If there is a perceived lack of qualified personnel in Aboriginal governments, it is a ready explanation for self-governing initiatives that encounter problems.

Another tension is the immediate need of Aboriginal governments for qualified staff. This urgency often compounds the difficulty of developing effective short- and long-term educational plans for community members.

The need for educated people is influencing education and training institutions around the country. As mainstream universities and colleges develop programs to respond to the needs of Aboriginal students, they are using the expertise and advice of Aboriginal people in a variety of ways. While such efforts are laudable, they pose a dilemma for First Nations. Efforts by Aboriginal consultants to help improve established college and university programs only increase the difficulties facing First Nations-controlled education institutions in competing with more established programs for funding and recognition.

More widespread and higher levels of professional education can impede, as well as facilitate, the ability of Aboriginal governments to be accountable to their communities. Aboriginal administrators face a bifurcated reality. They are expected to be `Aboriginal' ─ to be community members, and to be culturally aware and thereby retain close communication and relations with the community. At the same time, they are expected to be `professional' ─ to behave in a way that is seen as credible to outside agencies. The two are not always compatible.

The conclusions arising from consideration of these issues include the following:

● Community education strategies need to be undertaken, and supported financially, as a key activity of governance.

● There needs to be recognition that the right of First Nations to self-government, notwithstanding the Charter, includes the ability to determine constituency.

● Funding programs of the federal, provincial and territorial governments require

co-ordination to recognize the integrated nature of First Nations community needs.

- A national strategy for the funding of administrative education and training for Aboriginal students should be developed by First Nations, governments, educators and community people.

- Funding for training must become a part of all agreements for development between First Nations and governments.

- Two types of funding allocations need to be made: funds for Aboriginal people to gain access to education and training, and funds for institutions that offer relevant education and training programs.

- Funding is needed for the development of First Nations curricula.

- Literacy training and basic upgrading need to be considered as part of the commitment to education and training for self-government.

- There is a need for education and training for non-Aboriginal people, particularly those working in federal, provincial and territorial governments, on Aboriginal government administration.

<div align="center">

Community and the Administration
of Aboriginal Governments

by Leslie A. Brown

</div>

Aboriginal Governance and Administration

Scope and Approach of the Research

Aboriginal governments in Canada are a diverse group of organizations. They come in various sizes, shapes and structures as well as locations and jurisdictions, all to serve a vast array of people. The administrative systems that support these governments are as varied as the governments, communities and people themselves. The purpose of this paper is to provide insight into these administrative systems from the standpoint of those engaged in the daily practice of Aboriginal governance. In so doing, it identifies critical tensions and dilemmas that contribute to the complexity of the task of administering Aboriginal governments.

The term Aboriginal government is used throughout this paper to describe the organizations used by Aboriginal people to conduct the policy, actions and affairs of their communities. Aboriginal government and self-government are used as synonyms, in that both terms are intended to encompass the organizations and efforts used to realize goals Aboriginal people have determined for themselves. The term administration is used to refer to the management of the efforts of Aboriginal governments.

The general research approach used to investigate the administration of Aboriginal governments is characterized by a focus on people, in this case, people engaged in the drama of Aboriginal governance and administration. This includes community members, the leadership, and the administrators, professionals and staff of Aboriginal organizations. Governance is a process, not a product. The paper then considers the issues that arise from the relationships among the people taking part in the process of governance. Further, it considers issues arising from relationships between these people and others external to their governments, such as those associated with federal, provincial and territorial governments as well as other Aboriginal organizations.

Following this relationship-centred analysis, the focus shifts to the activities and related issues, tensions and dilemmas that make the practice of administration, particularly

administrative accountability, in Aboriginal governments complex. Accountability generally means being responsible, bound to give an account or explanation. For the purposes of this inquiry, attention to accountability refers to those administrative practices that influence a government's ability to explain its actions and take responsibility for these actions.

In consultation with a guiding committee of Aboriginal people, research questions were designed to guide the collection of data. The questions, reproduced in Appendix 1, focused on two areas:

Administration and the community: This area emerged from the recognition that the relationship between governments and their communities is a critical aspect of accountability. Aboriginal governments are shaped by, and in turn shape, the communities in which they are created and operate. Aboriginal governments and their communities are reciprocally defined through dialogue and the daily practice of governance and community organization. Effective dialogue is not easily attained. To illustrate, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples has heard members of Aboriginal governments express their difficulties in engaging community members to talk about self-government when so many people in their communities are struggling with basic needs: food, shelter and social problems. The research questions developed in this area are concerned with the mechanisms governments are using to facilitate communication and accountability with their communities.

Education and training: In keeping with a focus on people engaged in Aboriginal governance, the second area of questions concerned the preparation of administrators for work with Aboriginal governments and the need for education and training. It was recognized that the expertise of those employed by Aboriginal governments affects how administration is practised within an organization, so that the means of preparing people for this work are critical to the inquiry.

A recurring theme was the worry that, by constructing the inquiry as an examination of the administrative accountability of Aboriginal governments, the research would `find' difficulties or problems in the organizations and communities involved. The purpose of the research was to support the efforts of Aboriginal governments, not to construct problems. Evaluating or judging the effectiveness of these governments was not the intent of the research, and the guiding committee and participants wanted to ensure that the results would not be used as such. People are understandably cautious about constructing the reality of Aboriginal

governments as a problem, thereby inviting judgement and blame from others. This is a particularly sensitive issues at a time when many communities are in the process of negotiating land claims, self-government or other agreements with federal, provincial and territorial governments. The approach to the research questions was to evaluate, therefore, but rather to explore the issues, tensions and dilemmas of governance.

The research methods used derived primarily from the general focus on people. Participants were given the opportunity to shape the content and form of the information they provided. That is, the research was interviewee-focused rather than researcher-controlled. This approach to data collection, which gave control to individuals and communities and not the researcher, was seen as the most respectful way to conduct the research, as well as the most appropriate and methodologically valid means to gather information from the perspective of people involved in governance. Such participative research goes hand in hand with advocacy-based research.

The approach to data collection around these research questions was multifaceted and occurred over a two-month summer period. The paper relies heavily on personal interviews with administrators in Aboriginal governments and teleconference focus groups of educators, administrators and professionals. Snowball techniques were used to develop contacts for participation. Other data were collected from Aboriginal communities and organizations (Aboriginal governments and educational institutions), through documents (e.g., annual reports, newsletters), surveys (conducted by organizations), interviews with organization and community members, and observations of meetings and other gatherings (e.g., band meetings). Organizations determined what information they wished to provide and how they wished to collect it. Generally, organization or community members conducted any data collection activities themselves. A literature review was completed to assist in providing a framework for analyzing the data. Finally, the transcripts of the Royal Commission's hearings were analyzed to determine the reliability of the themes and conclusions emerging from the data received from individuals, communities and organizations participating in the research. To give an authentic voice to individual Aboriginal people, quotations from these hearings are used throughout this paper to illustrate the findings.

The number of communities, organizations, institutions and individuals participating was limited only by the time available for the research. An attempt was made to include a broad range

of data sources, from all areas of the country, from differing types of organizations, and from men and women of differing ages and roles in their communities or organizations. A list of the communities and organizations that participated in the research is provided in Appendix 2. The research was not a comprehensive survey of all Aboriginal administrations or administrators. The experiences of participating individuals or organizations are not necessarily examples of good or bad administrative practices, or even of representative practices. Rather, the intent of the research is to provide a framework for understanding the issues, tensions and dilemmas from the perspective of those involved in governance.

The Administrative Environment

The administrative environment within which those involved in governance interact with one another provided the framework for examining the issues and tensions. This environment is seen to consist of four major aspects:

- mission and means,
- constituency,
- operations, and
- personnel

Understanding the mission or goal of the organization's activities is integral to understanding how and why administrative systems are employed as they are. From the perspective of the people participating in this research, there are varying opinions on what the principal goal is ─ where to start or what to do first in the development of self-governing First Nations. Many people said they were not ready for self-government; their communities needed healing. For example, an employee of a band on Vancouver Island stated that alcohol and drug abuse and sexual abuse in the community had to be dealt with before they were ready to think, as a community, about self-government. Others had considered various strategies and decided that settling land claims was a precursor to self-government. For example, after an intensive internal community process, the people of Shubenacadie decided that pursuing land claims is their first priority. Others were already moving into their version of self-government. Sechelt, for instance, has been operating their community's vision of self-government since 1986. Some were conducting activities more related to community control and self-determination. For example, the Mowachaht people are building community consensus around relocating and rebuilding their

community and culture. This debate around `readiness' for self-government and its effect on the articulation and understanding of an organizational mission is explored in the next part of this paper.

Organizational constituency is the second aspect of the administrative environment to be examined. Aboriginal governments and their communities, or constituencies, are reciprocally defined. That is, ideally there is a mutual understanding of who is a member of an organizational community. This is a complex issue for Aboriginal organizations, which find that this issue of membership is often influenced by external definitions imposed by the *Indian Act*, geography, funding bodies, other organizations and so on. For example, Bill C-31 restored status under the *Indian Act* to many people but often put them in a separate category of band members and/or a different eligibility category for services. The effect of defining membership, or constituency, is examined in the third section of the paper in light of its effect on the ability of administrators to remain accountable.

The review of people's perspectives on the operations of Aboriginal governments yielded consideration of three major aspects of administrative accountability:

- to whom Aboriginal governments are accountable,
- external influences on administrative practice, and
- funding arrangements.

There are many factors that influence the ability of Aboriginal governments to have authority to make their own decisions. Jurisdictional issues, mandates and funding arrangements were seen to affect First Nations' authority; however, a significant number of participants spoke of the number and perceived expertise of non-Aboriginal people in their governments and communities and how this was hampering their ability to develop leadership and administrative skills necessary for self-governing decision making.

Communication strategies that encourage dialogue with and accountability to communities was a central theme in the research. Various innovations, from newsletters to cable television to conferences, were suggested as ways to support the critical relationships between an organization and community.

Much of the work of administrators is affected by funding arrangements that support program delivery. While the level of funding, and the activities involved in securing it, was a strong theme in participants' comments, equally prominent was the expressed need for First

Nations to control their own finances. The relationships between First Nations administrators and federal and provincial bureaucrats echoed the dependent nature of the financial arrangements established. The fourth section of the paper   considers these aspects of operations.

Two other aspects of the operations of Aboriginal governments are culture and politics. The relationship of these is explored in the fifth section of the study.

The personnel of Aboriginal governments is the last aspect of the administrative environment to be examined. As the research is grounded in the experience of people working in and with Aboriginal governments, the section on personnel is understandably the most extensive. There is an overwhelming call for education and training for self-government. This is explored by considering the need, the current nature of education programs available, and issues related to education programming. For instance, the cultural relevance of education is a complex issue. It affects the content of curriculum and the approaches taken to teaching and learning, as well as the fundamental issues of who has authority to control First Nations education. Another critical issue explored is the funding of education for Aboriginal people. There were great disparities in participants' reported experiences regarding their ability to secure the financing necessary to go to school. Again, issues of membership had an impact on access to resources.

There are some real dilemmas imbedded within the call for more and more education and training. People expressed exasperation that the call for educated people by their governments was being interpreted by some to mean that their governments were unqualified. Identifying a need for education has become an easy way to `blame the victim' for problems that Aboriginal governments experience. It therefore masks other possible explanations that may be more structural or systemic in nature (e.g., funding arrangements with the federal government).

Another dilemma is the tension arising from attempts to balance the immediate need for qualified personnel with the desire to have a long-range strategy for education. Given scarce resources, it is often difficult to engage in long-term education planning and support. Rather, short-term workshops are seen as a priority. The urgent need for staff also contributes to the employment of non-Aboriginal people, whose presence can impede the development of community people for administrative positions. Such dilemmas are explored in the sixth section of the paper.

A key issue in education and training is the call for Aboriginal authority over First Nations education. Section seven looks at the ways Aboriginal people are influencing education

programs and considers what accountability issues First Nations-controlled institutions encounter.

Finally, a significant theme of the research is the dilemma posed by the increasing professionalization of Aboriginal governments. This development of a professional bureaucracy can have the effect of distancing governments from the grassroots elements of their communities. As one person stated, the "brown bureaucracy" is no more trusted than the "white bureaucracy" of the federal and provincial governments. Aboriginal professional people spoke of the conflict they can experience in trying to maintain communication with the community in a way that facilitates accountability. They need to be seen to be professional, to be competent in their jobs. Yet by doing so they run the risk of behaving in ways that are seen to be bureaucratic, or foreign to the community's cultural norms. The effect of this phenomenon of professionalization on the ability of Aboriginal governments to be accountable is considered in section 8.

In summary, what emerged from the analysis of the data was not a list of `problems' in Aboriginal administration. Rather, what emerged were some consistently expressed tensions that exist in Aboriginal governments and influence their relationships and, ultimately, their accountability to their communities. The purpose of the paper is to articulate these tensions in order to promote an understanding of them as dilemmas, not problems or dysfunction, with no quick fixes or ready solutions. The research hopes to assist First Nations governments, and others, to understand these tensions and their influence on administrative practice.

Paths to Self-Government: Mission and Means

The Goal of Self-Government

Much has been written about the goal of self-government for Aboriginal peoples and the range of means to achieve it. Aboriginal governments and the people within them interpret this goal in different, sometimes conflicting, ways. Such diversity of opinion, if unrecognized, can hamper the ability of administrators and organizations to carry out activities that support a collective mission.

Too often, people assume that their understanding of self-government and the means to achieve it is shared by others. From the administrators and community people spoken to, it is evident that such assumptions can be erroneous. For example, the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples published a discussion paper, *Partners in Confederation* (1993), that argues

that existing constitutional arrangements include the right to self-government for Aboriginal peoples. However, the *Constitution Act, 1982* was developed without partnership with Aboriginal peoples and, therefore, what the paper fails to question is whether Aboriginal peoples want to be a part of such arrangements. This is but one example of how assumptions about the goal of self-determination can be made and adopted by organizations without recognizing that the people affected may have differing perspectives.

While leaders and academics often describe goals of self-government, community members and service providers participating in the research often said that the goal of their organization or community should be community health. There appear to be two different paths being pursued toward self-determination. On the one path are the leaders and politicians of Aboriginal governments who are working hard to develop mechanisms to negotiate self-government for their communities. The second path operates at a different level and usually involves service delivery efforts in health, social services and education. With such differing opinions among those engaged in the work of the organization about what the mission should be, the ability of administrative practices to support organizational goals is affected. This section explores the tensions inherent in the struggle to achieve community healing while attempting to advance political goals of self-determination and increased autonomy.

The Social Services and the Healing Path

People engaged on this path often believe that community healing must occur as a precursor to self-government. People spoke of the physical, spiritual and emotional abuse that they and their communities suffered and continue to suffer. Strong arguments were presented for interventions to arrest the cycle of oppression and its symptoms of sexual abuse, alcoholism, drug abuse, poverty, family violence and low self-esteem. These arguments demonstrated the view that the mission of Aboriginal governments should be the health of communities and that the foundation for community health is healthy individuals. From this, healthy families, communities and nations can be built.

> You ask for solutions. There is only one that I can think of. We have to change our priorities. We must have personal and community healing. A mere transfer of power will change nothing but the faces of leadership. When we truly commit ourselves to healing in our minds and hearts and with our resources, I believe then it will become clear that self-government will happen for everyone, a government truly equal and representative of all people.[i]

For many Aboriginal communities, the take-over of social services has been the beginning step in developing self-governing communities. There are many examples across the country where bands and tribal councils have taken over responsibility for child welfare services (for example, the Spallumcheen in British Columbia, the Tikinagan Child and Family Services in Ontario, and the Champagne-Aishihik Band in the Yukon). These transfers of responsibility for child welfare have been increasing over the past fifteen years. The development of Aboriginal-controlled child welfare agencies is providing the opportunity for Aboriginal communities to develop expertise in managing services and leadership and administrative capabilities within their communities.

Those who are pursuing the social service and healing path, especially in the area of physical health, child welfare, family services, education, and so on, are not just interested in administering someone else's programs, but are particularly concerned with community jurisdiction and community control over policy decisions. In many of these arrangements, however, First Nations are administering programs and policies set out by provincial and federal governments. For instance, Usma, the Nuu-Chah-Nulth child welfare agency, has been set up as an agent of the province in delivering services. The agency must therefore struggle to balance its own policies and procedures with the provincial law. Such agencies continue to pursue jurisdiction to develop their own policies. Services take-overs such as these are therefore pioneering and critical aspects of the evolution toward self-government.

Another example is the Spallumcheen Band. The federal government entered into an agreement for funding the band's child welfare service in 1981, and the provincial government entered into a memorandum of understanding under which the B.C. government acknowledges the band's authority in child welfare matters. The Spallumcheen Band has developed policies and a service delivery system that fit their community's needs. For instance, particular attention is given to placing children at risk with extended family. Spallumcheen also invests the chief and council with authority in making child welfare decisions. They also take care to integrate their child welfare program with other programs, such as culture, health and education services. This approach is significantly different from that seen in provincially controlled child welfare arrangements.

In recent years, transfers of responsibility for health care have also been on the increase. Education is another area where many Aboriginal communities have decided it is important to

have community control. The high level of activity in these community and social services fields is reflected in the high numbers of Aboriginal people who are choosing to study social work, education, nursing and other human services training at universities and colleges across the country.

An important aspect of this approach to pursuing self-government is the significant role of women in social services and community healing. The call to deal with social problems has often come from the women in Aboriginal communities. Women's organizations have brought to the attention of community leaders and provincial and federal governments the need for services for families. For example, in the 1970s the Saskatchewan Native Women's organization brought to light the need for transition homes. Women on southern Vancouver Island who objected to the justice system's response to abuse have begun an organization called Women of Our People to train Aboriginal women to offer services to abused women and children in their communities. The path of community healing is one that is close to women's realities in their families. The health of their families is paramount in their everyday lives, and it is perhaps understandable, therefore, that the leaders on this path are women. Debbie Foxcroft of the Nuu-Chah-Nulth is one such woman. She was part of the organization set up to take over child welfare and through her leadership has inspired other Aboriginal people to be involved in self-government initiatives.

Community healing to develop healthy children and families was strongly asserted, at a meeting of First Nations social workers who participated in this research, as the critical factor in their communities becoming truly self-determining and achieving effective self-government. Social workers spoke of how people in their communities were not able to participate effectively in negotiating treaties or self-government agreements while they lived in situations of abuse, poor housing and poverty. The playing field on which treaties are negotiated will not be level unless healthy Aboriginal people are at the negotiating table. Therefore they saw their role as vital to the long-term health of First Nations.

The Self-Government and Land Claims Path
Constitutional debates, treaty negotiations, land claims, and so on are the activities that characterize the political path to self-government. A considerable amount of energy and resources are invested by First Nations in political activities aimed at developing new relationships with federal and provincial governments.

Some communities are putting their efforts into negotiating self-government arrangements based on their inherent right of self-government. Many communities believe that self-government is not possible without a land and resource base. As Chief George Watts told the Commission,

> [Y]ou cannot separate self-government negotiation from land claims negotiation, because once we put our signature on that paper in terms of our land and resources, we will no longer have power, other than the power that we have agreed to in that document. And if you do not have power, what reason would governments come to you and talk to you about self-government for?[ii]

For some, then, pursuing land claims is seen as the first necessary step:

> I think with the land claims process, if we can get it moving again, eventually self-government, I think that's where our opportunity lies.[iii]

For the people of one community who participated in the research, the development of consensus among community members that land claims was their primary goal was an important step and has had a tremendous impact on how the administration organizes its work for the next while. It will affect whom they employ, the tasks of those employees, and the basis on which they will be held accountable by the community. It will fundamentally affect the nature of the dialogue within the organization and with their community as well as with external bodies.

Generally speaking, the political path of self-government and land claims is a highly visible one that captures much of the public's (non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal) attention.

Tensions Between the Two Paths

Many people stated that their community was not ready for self-government. As one person explained, the priority was for communities to be healthy, and until that happened, efforts to move toward self-government were doomed to fail. Many of those who spoke at the Royal Commission hearings echoed these thoughts:

> I say that the Native people here are not ready for land claims or self-government because of our dysfunctions. In order to have land claims or self-government, I really believe that we need healthier people and healthier communities. I believe it should be role modelled at the top, from our leadership. We should have a leadership that is healthy, a leadership that is in recovery, and sober.[iv]

> I spoke of self-government and I said strongly that, yes, self-government is here, but our people aren't healthy and ready to take that responsibility on and so we do have to start within our communities and we have to start healing our people. Our women need to gain the respect that they had in our traditional culture.[v]

In their frustration, some people also felt that self-government was being thrust upon

them by the federal government or by their politicians. Feelings about the Aboriginal leadership that emerged during the constitutional referendum process still echo. As noted in 1991 by Phil Fontaine,

> You can have the most beautifully worded constitution, with the clearest recognition of the inherent right of self-government, but if communities can't deal with themselves it's all for naught.[vi]

There is a tension between the path of community healing and the path of self-government. Frontline service workers complain that their politicians are out of touch with the basic need in their communities for food, housing and health. Politicians are frustrated that their community members are unable to comprehend and engage in the legal, political and policy-making efforts that would shift the structural foundation of their organizations. Further, some leaders object to talk about the need for healing in Aboriginal communities, as they believe that it implies that their communities are sick and perpetuates negative attitudes.

There is a danger that the two paths will not meet. Expertise in each path is developing, and without a concerted effort to bring together the people and the ideas and efforts of the political and services paths, the frustrations of communities will continue. The tendency is for each path to vie against the other for resources to pursue its goals. The following is typical of such an argument:

> I would like to see in this area ─ hire someone to work with Native People or First Nations to plan social programs and how we can heal our communities. We need to solve our social problems before land claims is settled because we need educated people to run our self-government. Land claims settlement will get us ─ First Nations ─ to run our own affairs.[vii]

The paths are often construed as a dichotomy, denying the inter-reliance of health and autonomy. Some think they need services and healing before being ready for autonomy, while others think autonomy is the only way to end oppression so that healing can happen. Federal and provincial government funding and policies feed the two-path system. The awkward co-ordination between federal, provincial and territorial governments, departments, programs and bureaucrats does not assist First Nations communities that are attempting to act more holistically. Government policy makes distinct categories of the issues. Land claims negotiators and child welfare workers seldom meet to discuss what their work has in common. There is a bureaucratic tendency toward specialization at the level of functions. First Nations have to work with specialized government bureaucrats in relations with that government.

Integrating the Paths

Community cohesion and a developed sense of self-esteem and self-determination are necessary to ensure that any efforts at land claims negotiations, self-government or community health initiatives are taken on by the whole community and not individuals. As the members of one community said, until they began to make decisions and began to behave as a community, they could not effectively begin to strengthen their cultural awareness and community health or develop an appropriate community governing model.

One person commented that only through developing community health will the politicians get the support they need to complete their job effectively. His comments show a recognition of the interdependence of the two paths:

> We know now that the only way we will finally take back our dignity, pride, self-respect and control of our health and social problems is to be given the opportunity to govern ourselves. Therefore we are now in the process of discussing, recognizing and finally acting on the need for a community healing, which we feel is needed to prepare our people to support our leaders at a national level for when the colonials finally free us from their dominance on our society.[viii]

A growing number of governments and communities are taking a second look at their priorities and working toward an integrated approach. The aim is to get the two paths to work together and not allow them to veer off on separate irreconcilable tracks. The following is an illustration of one community's efforts to regroup:

> I want to give you an idea of the confusion that exists in our communities. A recent survey conducted in one of our communities was asking a question and the question was: `What is most important to you in your lives right now in this community?' ...employment was the most important thing in our communities because, the fact is in our communities, at this time we have upwards of 85 to 95 per cent unemployment and the welfare rate is as high.
> The second most important concern of people who responded to that particular survey was that recreation was important and what is significant to me about the response to that particular questionnaire is that...self-government...was second to last in importance in their lives.
> ...land claims rounded out in the end as being the least important, but I think the significance of the way the people responded to the question is that people in our communities are in a desperate situation. We have been pushed so far away from the Canadian status quo that we exist in our communities on welfare, and even though our people know that we are the original owners of this land and even though they know that we have and practise our inherent form of self-government, but the most pressing thing in their minds is the need to have a job so that they can take care of their families. That is the state of life in most of our communities, but fortunately we have a lot of people, a lot of good people

throughout the First Nations of this country who have made the issue of our title to our lands and our inherent right to self-government as their priority in terms of their lives.[ix]

This same community in the fall of 1993 was continuing its efforts to bring the paths together by holding a self-government conference for all its community members. Through an attempt to balance attention to the daily needs of people and to the education of the community around issues of self-government and land claims, they hope to build a healthy community.

Administrators in Aboriginal governments have the task of translating the perceived organizational mission into program planning and implementation and must therefore attempt to address both healing and autonomy to be seen as effectively advancing the entire community's goals. Despite the rhetoric, administrators and organizations are working hard to advance goals in both areas. An administrator of a child and family service organization, for example, must be concerned with family and community healing as well as with degrees of autonomy with regard to community jurisdiction over policy decisions. Thus, political autonomy as well as community health and well-being are both concerns for administrators who want to increase First Nations' decision-making power and need Aboriginal community members healthy enough to participate and offer input in effective planning.

The political path and the social path may appear to be different but in fact are interdependent and mutually reinforcing routes to effective self-determination. As a research participant noted, if you think of them as forming a circle, then one does not necessarily precede the other.[x] Governments, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, need to struggle with how to come to grips with this reality. However, once understood, it will affect how federal government policies, for example, will be pursued. As Hudson and Taylor-Henley point out, "No further progress seems possible unless the federal government, or at least its agent, INAC, begins to connect and understand the community-level interrelationships between the constitutional process and service development."[xi] Devolution procedures, claims negotiations, resourcing agreements and other arrangements that are to apply to First Nations will be affected by the recognition that not all First Nations wish to move to self-government in the same way.

Federal, provincial and territorial governments also have a responsibility to rethink how they organize their work if they are going to support a more holistic, integrated approach to Aboriginal community health and self-government. The separation of areas and functions between and within these governments is not necessarily efficient for First Nations development.

It will require a different way of thinking to be able to respond effectively to concepts of governance that First Nations envision for themselves.

The task of administration is never easy. It is particularly hard when there are fundamental issues related to organizational goals. The two paths characterize the administrative challenge for Aboriginal governments.

Organizational goals can act as constraints on administration in that decision making is evaluated in terms of the organization's goal(s). If there are multiple goals, or a hierarchy of goals, this is further complicated. One goal may tend to dominate. For example, if self-government is seen as the primary goal, then decisions that further community healing must also be seen to further self-government. In such a case, however, decisions made to further self-government are not always evaluated in terms of community healing goals. Alternatively, goals can be seen as interdependent, as argued in this paper. This reframing of the relationship between political and social goals requires co-operation and communication. It necessitates a reciprocal, integrative approach to administrative decision making.

Organizational goals can also act as inducements for employees. This is particularly relevant to Aboriginal governments. Aboriginal people have an investment in achieving community health and self-determination. As employees, then, they may have more loyalty (expressed as both support and critique) to organizational goals than to system goals such as administrative efficiency. As one participant noted, it's more than just employment. This intensifies the need for Aboriginal governments to have clearly understood and agreed upon organizational goals. The individual in the organization can be effective in terms of the organization's goals only to the extent that she or he is able to pursue appropriate actions, has a conception of the purpose of the action consistent with the organization, and is correctly informed about the conditions surrounding the action. Within these boundaries, choices and actions can be supportive of organizational goals. Such conditions for effective administration point to the need for communication and a shared understanding of the integrative and interdependent nature of the various paths to self-government. It requires community education of employees and constituents of Aboriginal governments. It requires federal and provincial government policies and employees to contextualize their work similarly within the whole picture of First Nations community self-determination.

Constituency

Issues of Identity and Membership

The issue of what constitutes the public in Aboriginal public administration involves many related but distinct factors, including culture, resources and ancestry. Identity as an Aboriginal person is a founding element of any discussion of citizenship in a nation or membership in an organization.

Cassidy and Bish make a distinction between citizenship and membership. They describe citizenship as involving cultural identity and participation in decision making and membership as involving eligibility for services and compensations. The federal government seems to perceive the First Nations as members of bands that have some delegated powers:

> ...Band membership is an important issue...but it is not a citizenship issue. According to Canadian law, membership in Indian governments is not so much a matter of citizenship as it is a matter of entitlement to certain rights and privileges as a member in a legislatively-created grouping that is more than a registered society and yet less than a real government.[xii]

Certain rights and benefits can accrue to identifiable members of bands or nations. But there is a problem with membership definitions imposed by federal guidelines. As Aboriginal governments move ever closer to self-determination, it seems obviously consistent that they should be empowered to determine membership for themselves.

Membership is a defining ground rule for an organization. A clearly understood and accepted definition is necessary if people are to participate effectively in the organization. Complex membership status definitions affect the ability of an organization to act cohesively in pursuit of its goals. There is a potential for sub-goals to be created when there are different statuses of membership within an organization.

The complex nature of membership poses several challenges for the people involved in the practice of governance. Feeling marginalized within a community, a factor that several people reinstated under Bill C-31 people spoke of, causes strains in relations with other community members and organizational employees. This is often exacerbated by differential policies that affect the services they receive. For administrators attempting to be accountable to their constituents, the identification of these various groups of constituents affects how they are able to carry out their responsibilities. Identification of members and assimilation into the community becomes part of the administrative task.

For example, one employee expressed frustration with the dilemma she found herself in.

She felt the need and commitment to involve band members living off-reserve in a particular administrative issue, yet on-reserve members, who saw themselves as those legitimized by federal policy, expressed concern that their interests were not being seen as paramount.

Membership issues affect the work of Aboriginal leaders as well. For instance, the strength of a leader's position in negotiations with federal or provincial leaders or with other Aboriginal leaders is affected by the ability to identify the constituency that she or he represents. The fact that enumeration of their members is an important activity of government development for the Métis illustrates this point.

Many administrators in Aboriginal governments strive to address issues of all the members they are mandated to serve, yet funding restrictions can make effective service for all members difficult to achieve. This resource scarcity comes at a time when more marginalized members struggle to add their voices to the fray. Women, elders and youth, as well as urban and off-reserve members, have reported feeling left out of important community decision-making processes.

This section explores the complex nature of membership and identifies some of the tensions created by membership definitions, particularly between membership as defined by an organization itself and membership as defined for an organization by others.

Defining Constituents

Communities can consist of people who live in a certain geographical location, or people who share a common interest or attribute. There is a vast range of First Nations communities, including those defined by ancestry, territory, legality (status list, treaties, agreements), membership codes, participation in an organization, Indianness and self-declaration. Individuals may identify with one or many organizations, as the Royal Commission was told during its public hearings.

> In the area of politics I stand before you as a proud member of the Moose Factory First Nation. And I stand before you as a proud member of the Aboriginal community of western James Bay.[xiii]
> There are two basic ways in which organizational membership is determined:

1. internal ─ membership is defined by the organization, and

2. external ─ membership is defined for the organization by others.

Whether an organization's membership is defined internally or externally is often determined by

the purpose for which the membership is defined. A nation, for example, can normally decide who are members and who are not. However, if membership is tied to entitlement to payments from a federal or provincial government, the body making the payments has the authority to decide who is going to receive them. As the *Indian Act* and its definitions of membership are left behind, new means of identifying constituents will have to be developed. For example, determining membership will no doubt be a part of treaty negotiations between First Nations and the federal government.

Tensions Among Constituent Groups

Although many organizations may be considered to be self-defining, this is often within laws, conventions and paradigms constructed outside the organization. That is, the federal government still controls the rules within which most communities and organizations can define themselves. Issues such as on-reserve and off-reserve, status and non-status affect the `self'-definitions of organizations. Franks (1987) notes the potentially divergent interests of on-reserve and off-reserve members of First Nations. Because of different issues and interest, off-reserve members may require some form of their own administration to meet their needs. In cases where off-reserve community members are not eligible to benefit from band services, like counselling or housing, off-reserve people have to rely on whatever urban services they can locate. The New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council, for example, is an off-reserve organization formed to represent Aboriginal people in the province who previously been unrepresented by the band system. Such divisive definitions are sometimes bitter:

> ...no matter where an Aboriginal person lives (on or off reserve) we are one, all brothers and sisters, and should not be treated unjustly because of residency.[xiv]

A mutual definition of membership, a reciprocity of understanding, needs to exist between an organization and its community. For example, an organization that claims to represent a group of people but cannot demonstrate that these people identify with the organization will have difficulty acting effectively on their behalf. This necessary reciprocity of understanding is developed through dialogue between an organization and a community. This dialogue is not unfettered, however. Communities and organizations are not able to engage in dialogue and develop a mutual definition without interference from governments. Federal policies around membership criteria, status, and so on appear to play out a divide and rule strategy. For example, Bill C-31 has restored status to many Aboriginal people, but their label of

`Bill C-31 members' sets them apart from other band members or Métis persons and often puts them in a different eligibility category for services:

> ...in my community,...Local Métis Number 124, at this point in time, we don't even have a membership [list] up to date, because the local membership that we used to have...says, no I'm not going to sign up with the Métis, because I'm not a Métis, I'm a Bill C-31 Status Indian.
> The Métis Nation of Alberta, Zone 1, they said there is no Bill C-31. That should be Métis or member of your Local. So when I came back to the community and explained that, if you're a Bill C-31, you're not a Métis. I don't know where we're at. Now, that's how we lost most of our membership, and now, these Bill C-31s are straddling the reserve, they're sitting outside and they don't know where to go. We're talking about land claims. If we're not a Métis, we're not a Bill C-31, let's form up ourselves a group of Natives here. We can ask for our piece of land, reserve wherever and start our own lives over.[xv]
> Under the *Indian Act*, as amended by Bill C-31, First Nations communities can define

their own terms of band membership, within certain parameters, as distinct from the Indian status list maintained by the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (DINA), provided that bands inform the department of their intention to do so and that the majority of the band electorate agrees to the criteria to determine membership. The department must approve this application to establish a membership list and of the process bands choose to create it. This could mean that band members may not be status Indians under the meaning of the *Indian Act* but could still be band members and beneficiaries of band services (though not beneficiaries of services directly from DINA). Membership determination is further complicated by federal statutes concerning First Nations marriage, mobility and funding.

The *Indian Act* system of elected band government co-exists with traditional forms of government in many communities. The former is recognized externally; the latter is recognized as legitimate by the community. Both can fulfil particular purposes and perform particular functions. At the national level, Aboriginal organizations may continue to apply federal recognition as their defining criterion. For example, the Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en Office of Hereditary Chiefs, established on the basis of traditional systems, is not the body formally recognized as representing the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en by the Assembly of First Nations (AFN). Rather, the elected band system, created and maintained by the federal government, is the body recognized by the AFN until such time as the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en pursue a change to a customary system under the *Indian Act*. In other words, their traditional system must be recognized by DINA before the AFN will do so.

Despite new opportunities for some bands to have greater control over determining their membership, this process is still limited by imposed federal guidelines. The Bill C-31 amendment to the *Indian Act* (1985) reaffirmed the federal government's role in determining membership. In so doing, it continued denying this role to First Nations, even though many First Nations leaders argued (through the AFN and the Penner Report) that this was an inherent right and an important part of preserving culture.[xvi]

First Nations want to determine their own membership but find continued federal interference. By maintaining some control over membership the federal government can ensure that definitions serve federal needs, which are not necessarily those of First Nations. A prime example is the federal failure to make adequate funding provisions for new and returning band members when Bill C-31 created problems for bands with resources too limited to enable them to meet new members' needs.[xvii]

The control of funds is the mechanism through which federal and provincial governments often try to construct or reframe Aboriginal governments. Jockeying for scarce resources requires that organizations define their membership in ways acceptable to funders and that facilitate the administration of services. Organizations also try to define membership in terms of the needs of their community constituents. These are not always compatible. The controlling practices of external governments, as can be seen in agreements between the federal government and First Nations communities, forces the development of internal membership criteria and results in conflict:

> I was finally accepted as a Labrador Inuit Association member on May the 17th of 1990. I was elected to the board of directors in April 1991. My membership was revoked on June the 6th, 1991. The reasons given for revoking my membership are, from the president, I do not fit the time frame. When I asked what time frame, he just said, "You don't fit the time frame." From the vice-president of LIA, my grandmother, Emiline Blake, was not born in a recognized permanent community. And from a board member, I do not have a living connection in Rigolet. And I asked her if my relatives in Rigolet had died and if they had I should have been notified because it was important that I attended the funerals. They are still alive. ...It is ludicrous, ridiculous and downright stupid for anyone to maintain that one only has rights as an Aboriginal person if they live within a claim zone. I can accept that certain restrictions may have to apply to those who have chosen to live in non-Native towns and cities across this country. I believe that all Native people should have equal status...regarding basic rights and services throughout Canada. Any Aboriginal person living outside claim area or areas and working for the benefit of Aboriginal people should have the same rights, services and privileges

that are applicable to the residents of the claim area that they associate with.[xviii]

Though First Nations band governments struggle with inadequate resources to meet members' needs and must cope with continued federal interference in membership determination, many bands have adopted membership codes and attempt to infuse some customary values and processes into them within the framework of federal guidelines. The Cumberland House Cree Nation of Saskatchewan has instituted an appeal process, using an elders council, for those denied membership. The Sarcee Nation of Alberta requires new members to have knowledge of local community history, language and traditions. Their appeal process involves committees of men, women and elders. A 75-per cent vote of the band electorate is required to admit new members, since the collective rights of the community are considered to outweigh the individual rights of applicants.[xix]

Negotiated agreements are another mechanism for establishing membership criteria. The allocation of resources that accompanies such claims agreements heightens disputes around membership:

> I also feel that it is very wrong to define our Native blood in fractions. The Labrador Inuit Association application form states, `If you claim membership as a descendant of a person who was alive in March 1975, and who had not less than one-quarter Inuit blood and who is not a person listed above, please attach complete details.' ...That implies that once you pass this magic number you can no longer consider yourself an Inuk, or a person of Inuit descent. This fractioning of blood was the white man's solution for assimilating Aboriginal people into the white race. If fractioning of our blood continues and mixed marriages [continue to] increase...Aboriginal people will cease to exist. Surely the most important factor should be that we have Aboriginal roots, that we identify with those roots and that we have pride in who we are. Individually we determine who we are and we will exist as long as the sun shines and the rivers flow.[xx]

Administrative Issues

Membership is also affected by issues, policies and interests. This creates some fluidity in membership; that is, people will move their affiliation from one organization to another depending on the issue or interest being served. As one person said sarcastically, "People won't stay in their boxes!" This is not administratively convenient, but it is the reality. Fluidity of membership may be seen as a problem if control of members is an issue. Often it is an issue only for those deemed by society to need a high degree of monitoring ─ often the poor, deviant, and other marginalized people. Transfer of membership would not likely be the same issue for middle-class employed people travelling from province to province. But for welfare clients,

prisoners, and Aboriginal people ─ those requiring a box ─ it is often perceived as an administrative problem. While this construct of membership as a means of control has been transformed somewhat over the years into an issue of eligibility for scarce resources, the administrative desire to keep people in their boxes remains. Individuals can belong to more than one organization. These organizations do not always agree with one another on issues. Relations between organizations with common members therefore become an important part of managing the organizations.

> Our women members may belong to the Native Women's Council, which may have conflicting ideals on self-government.[xxi]

Membership issues have significant administrative implications for different groups. Community resentment of new Bill C-31 members, for example, may be directed toward administrators, thereby compounding the difficulty of managing services for new members. New members may not be aware of the culture or history of the community or may not know their rights or benefits. This may require the administration to develop alternative communication strategies in order to enhance accountability to the entire community.

It is not always feasible to provide access to participation in decision making or social services to all constituents (e.g., those living off-reserve). Also, non-status persons have no opportunities to receive services from or give input to band governments.[xxii] Yet this exclusionary way of determining membership and community involvement contradicts traditional customs of wide community involvement. A representative of the Urban Treaty Indians Organization suggests that

> It is not part of our custom to deny participation in the decision-making process to certain segments within our society. This is discriminatory and cannot be tolerated any longer. The fulfilment of self-government requires a vibrant and active participation of the people in determining their future. It cannot be a top-down process but one that emanates from the community itself, and the community must be broadly defined to include those whose rights will be affected by any definition of self-government.[xxiii]

The tasks of administration are to plan, lead, organize and control. How these tasks are carried out is affected by membership issues, which create tensions and challenges for the people engaged in them. Certainty about who belongs to the constituency and how changes in the constituency will come about are critical to effective planning. The Métis, for example, have the challenge of not only planning for their constituents but also identifying who these constituents are and building a cohesive constituent community.

Common planning activities such as population projections based on birth and death statistics are significantly influenced by changes in membership criteria. When these criteria can be altered by mechanisms outside the control of the organization (e.g., Bill C-31), the planning task is not only more difficult, but there is less confidence in the ability of the organization to make projections and plan realistically.

Similarly, membership issues make the leading and organizing functions of administration complex. As we explore in the next section, effective participation of the membership in the organization is central to community accountability. Complexities in membership criteria and statuses have definite repercussions in an organization's ability to be seen to be involving all constituent groups effectively and appropriately.

Lastly, the scarcity of resources intensifies the issue of membership in an organization. The availability of funds, programs and services can pit one group of constituents against another. The administrative task of allocating and accounting for resources effectively can be affected daily by issues of membership.

A Principle of Aboriginal Authority

The issue of membership in an organization is related to the purpose of that organization. It is consistent with the movement toward the self-government of First Nations that organizations have the ability to determine their own memberships. Generally speaking, the principle should be that Aboriginal organizations have the authority to determine who are their constituents. This will mean that when organizations are obtaining funds or services from external sources, such as the federal government, they will be able to negotiate who will be the recipients of such funds, irrespective of the current restrictions placed on them by the *Indian Act* or other policies created without their input.

The experience of some women who fought not only the federal government but their own First Nations governments to regain status rights has shown that simply respecting the authority of First Nations governments to determine their membership does not, in and of itself, guarantee fairness. It will therefore be imperative that First Nations organizations, individually and collectively, assume responsibility for developing appropriate mechanisms to resolve disputes around membership and develop means for accountability to Aboriginal people on the development and maintenance of membership policies and practices.

Administrative Accountability

Operations and Accountability

The focus for looking at the operations of Aboriginal organizations was the relationships between people engaged in and with the organization. Within this perspective, the accountability of the organization to its community constituents was of particular interest.

There is a diverse range of organizational structures and decision-making processes within the organizations considered in the research. Consensus methods of decision making were evident, but so were examples of majority vote, authority or expertise, and combinations of various approaches. No matter what the approach, however, the people involved commented on how communication practices could influence the extent to which decision-making processes were seen to be effective. This visibility of process is necessary for accountability.

The nature of financing for Aboriginal governments significantly affects the work of administration. Most Aboriginal governments depend on external funding sources for a major portion of their operations, and this leaves them accountable to funders in ways that may interfere with their ability to be accountable to constituents.

First Nations governments have a relationship with funding governments that requires them to expend a significant amount of resources on accountability-related tasks. Participants in the research noted that accountability to their constituents has often taken a back seat to the demands of federal and provincial funding agencies. First Nations governments are recognizing the need to shift their attention to their communities. As they do so, the communication mechanisms used to maintain the relationship between governments and communities remain a critical function of administration.

There is pressure on First Nations to communicate effectively with other governments. It is not just a political issue, but a matter of survival. The safety and well-being of impoverished First Nations communities depends on the ability of Aboriginal administrators to communicate and negotiate effectively for funds and services.[xxiv]

Many communication issues facing First Nations in preparing for and implementing self-government involve struggles for various and sometimes conflicting agendas. While all communities and societies struggle to resolve the political differences of their members in order to allow them to get on with daily life with some semblance of political and community

harmony, First Nations communities are finding out how the side-effects of an imposed version of self-government consistent with federal devolution policies generates conflicting expectations and disappointment over expectations unmet in new efforts to operate as autonomous governments.

This section of the paper examines three key issues in administrative accountability:

1. the myriad external and internal agencies and constituencies to which Aboriginal governments are accountable and the tensions that arise in balancing activities to meet differing expectations,

2. the external influences on administrative practice, and

3. the complexities of funding arrangements.

This section also examines the importance of community accountability and the strategies Aboriginal governments are using to enhance it.

External and Internal Accountability

Aboriginal administrations are accountable to external (e.g., federal government) and internal (e.g., community) agencies and constituencies. The relationship between First Nations and the federal government, via the *Indian Act*, is an established line of accountability that flows upward to the minister of Indian affairs and Parliament. This external line of accountability overshadows the development of systems for the accountability of First Nations to their communities.

Accountability issues for workers in Aboriginal governments arise largely because of the plethora of sources to which they must account. Being answerable to so many forms of government as well as to community members is a central part of their work.

First Nations administrators have little discretion in planning for and controlling service delivery. Not only do they have to follow professional guidelines set up for them by other governments and service agencies, but they must also attempt to follow cultural and contextual guidelines adopted by their own communities. Effective liaison between First Nations administrators/service professionals and the community is hampered by bureaucratic interactions with other governments.

At a regional meeting of band social workers in B.C., workers discussed some of their difficulties in the area of planning and controlling services. One of the difficulties was jurisdiction. Workers had a difficult time planning for service delivery to band members when

they were uncertain about jurisdictional responsibility for providing services to on-reserve band members. For example, it was not clear which level of government was responsible for such things as daycare and family support services. It seemed to fall to the social workers to untangle the jurisdictional confusion around some social services areas. Federal and provincial agencies may point to each other as responsible for funding and supporting different services, since the federal government sees itself as responsible for First Nations on-reserve but provincial governments are responsible generally for social services off-reserve. Because the province is normally responsible for daycare services, the federal government will not provide on-reserve daycare, and because the federal government is seen as responsible for on-reserve First Nations, the provincial government does not want to fund or support on-reserve services. The workers must try to obtain needed services for their band members and must try to figure out the jurisdictional problem for an area of service needed in their community. These workers noted that this detracted from their ability to communicate effectively with band members.

It seems that program administrators in Aboriginal governments take on most of the responsibility for facilitating communication between Aboriginal governments and communities. But this task is problematic for many reasons. First Nations administrators are finding that they are still bound by complex funding and implementation restrictions, despite the `self-government' label applied to transfers of responsibility for government and service delivery to First Nations communities. There is an expectation on the part of First Nations community members that First Nations-administered programs will meet their needs better, but often this is not the case. Some sectors of communities (e.g., women, youth, elders, urban residents and non-status people) feel that their special needs have not been addressed any more adequately by First Nations governments than they have been by federal, provincial or territorial governments.

Effective participation of special groups of constituents is a challenge for First Nations administrations as it is for all organizations. The particular needs of Aboriginal women, youth and elders require their participation in administrative structures. While some First Nations have taken steps to ensure this, others have not. The Metis Society of Saskatchewan, for example, has established a Metis Youth Committee designed to "represent the voice of young people [and]...build up a talent pool for possible Metis leaders of tomorrow".[xxv] Finding resources for such ventures and developing mechanisms for youth, for example, to participate meaningfully in administration is difficult. A youth in one B.C. community complained that there were no visible

role models in the administrative work of his community. He commented that meetings of chief and council took place behind closed doors, as did most administrative work, and that the youth of the community were therefore uninformed and uninvolved.

Several individuals commented that to provide better opportunities for First Nations women in the decision-making aspects of self-government, more women are needed in management positions. There is obviously a difficulty in involving women in First Nations government if women do not hold leadership positions in First Nations governance structures.

One participant suggested that because the stories of First Nations women were not being adequately told by others, and they did not have a means of expression of their own, they had to start their own newsletters and radio programs in order to see their issues addressed in a way that accurately portrayed their experience.

Part of the problem may be an internalization of Eurocanadian paradigms of patriarchy:

> Because our present form of administration was created by and for, quote, white society, the elders, the women and the youth of our membership do not play a significant role in forming community policies and they're often overlooked by our administration which is formed largely by middle-aged men whose first responsibility is never conceived as being linked directly to the people they live with and supposedly provide services for. This is of great consequence to our elders, our women and our youth. The other segments of our population, which are most often directly affected by decisions made at the band level and because band policies are often produced without their input they do not feel they are part of any meaningful process and, therefore, our community suffers in all areas. I sometimes think that my chief and council do not feel they are accountable in any way at all to the people. In fact, sometimes I think they feel we all work for them and are accountable to such.[xxvi]

Sharon McIvor of the Native Women's Association of Canada is concerned that the attitudinal shift necessary to facilitate better communication with these sectors of the community will not be accomplished in time to ensure that women's concerns are addressed in planning for self-government implementation. Speaking in regard to First Nations-administered justice programs, she wonders

> ...how will this impact upon Aboriginal women? This time is like an eclipse of the moon. It is a period of darkness. Native self-government means men keeping power and control over women, children and elders within the Native communities... There is no respect for Aboriginal women, culture, language, or traditions... There will be no returning back to Aboriginal matriarchies... This is a time for patriarchies. Male government. Male laws. Male power. Male control. And only men's voices. It is not the women who want Native justice. It is not

women who want a return to customary law. What is customary law? It is the law made up by Europeanized Native men who have an opportunity now to keep money, power and control in men's hands... In this time when we have access to justice, supposedly, and law enforcement in our communities, supposedly, Aboriginal women and children have never in our history been so systematically victimized and abused. What will happen when Native men have unfettered powers to dominate Native women not only in the home, but also in the community?[xxvii]

The issue of involving elders raised several perspectives. Some organizations have developed elders councils:

We started to involve the community in decision making. An elders council was formed and this year, on July 1, they will take over the leadership of the community from the government council.[xxviii]

A worry expressed by some was that involvement of elders, or other particular sectors, would amount to tokenism. Examples were given of elders being invited to attend meetings to conduct ceremonies but not to participate in the decisions being made. Another concern expressed was that elders who had been through the residential school system had internalized mainstream devaluation of First Nations and sometimes came into conflict with organizations that wanted to throw off the yoke of stigma.

Aboriginal administrations must face the challenge of not only finding qualified people to employ, but also expanding the definition of qualified to include the knowledge of elders, youth and women.

External Influences on Administrative Practice

In addition to formal lines of accountability to external agencies, external bodies and persons affect the nature of accountability in Aboriginal governments in other ways. One issue raised by participants in the research was the problematic fact that policy and program decisions are often made by provincial, federal or private consultants, who are rarely local, or even Aboriginal, people. This impeded the ability of Aboriginal governments to develop leadership skills in making decisions around planning and delivering services.

This view that non-Aboriginal consultants are taking over in First Nations leadership is echoed by others:

The `Indian industry' has proven to be a very lucrative business for many opportunistic non-natives for many years and, unfortunately, this still continues today. There are non-native parasitic consultants waiting in the wings to seize the

opportunity to move in on the misinformed Aboriginal communities and dispense their own versions on the applicability of Aboriginal self-government... There are, unfortunately, some Aboriginal groups that have more non-native experts on staff than Native people; so much for self-determination.[xxix]

Another individual noted that the presence of non-Aboriginal leadership in self-government efforts not only hinders the development of leadership skills and prevents First Nations members' participation in decision making, but also contributes to the existing problem of culturally inappropriate services and programs that are inappropriate for the communities they are intended to serve; this is an issue First Nations have had to contend with since long before self-government implementation:

Administrators and teachers, greedy for the control of `Indian dollars', continually seek to control the agenda while paying lip service to community input and involvement. Changes and improvements are superficial changes rather than substantive changes to their approaches.[xxx]

Another comment was that non-Aboriginal people, by the mere fact of being non-Aboriginal, do not have as much at stake as Aboriginal administrators. "It's not `just a job' for Aboriginal workers," said one participant in the research.[xxxi]

A case study by Smith outlined many of the dynamics of external influence in his examination of a Dene community's struggle for self-determination.[xxxii] The community was experiencing conflict with, and about, Eurocanadian interference with Dene efforts to implement self-government. The study revealed how Eurocanadians were constructing subtle, as well as more tangible, barriers to the creation of a post-colonial society during a struggle for decolonization. Smith felt that the Eurocanadians involved in constructing such barriers, while seemingly concerned with the implementation of self-government, were not yet ready to give up their image as humanitarian benefactors or their positions as persons with power and authority. They also continued to foster a rather racist perception that First Nations were not yet competent to handle their own affairs, taking great delight in self-government `failures', which they regarded as affirmation of this perception of incompetence. Failures to implement self-government smoothly were blamed on the actions of First Nations administrators, and the Eurocanadians did not seem to consider their own role in the failures.

Sabotaging community processes for gathering input, reinforcing federal and provincial guidelines and authority, and manipulating conflict within the Dene community were among the ways the Eurocanadians involved in the process attempted to prevent effective and autonomous

First Nations governance and encouraged community members to maintain and foster relations of dependency with Eurocanadians.

Obviously, First Nations administrators and communities must learn to work around continued barriers to fully autonomous and culturally- and community-driven self-governance structures. The devolution of government authority will not be the ultimate, or even the immediate, solution to problems in community empowerment and economic and social development. Work must be done to anticipate and increase awareness of barriers that persist from a colonial past at the same time as work is being done to remove these barriers. Attention needs to be given to the new problems and barriers that a post-devolution government structure will generate for the ultimate development of genuine self-government.

Non-Aboriginal people working with First Nations must also be aware of and address how they are maintaining oppressive and colonialist practices. Part of this lies in modifying policies that maintain top-down relations with First Nations and part lies in questioning assumptions that mainstream ideas and processes are superior to those of First Nations. Because non-Aboriginal governments are embedded in this top-down paradigm and process, they are unable to be receptive to recommendations that are community-driven and culturally relevant. This may partly explain why there is a lack of co-ordination among non-Aboriginal governments and organizations as they attempt to meet the needs of First Nations. For example, because of the complex matrix of funding programs, First Nations cannot present integrated requests. Federal and provincial government departments and programs do not have the capacity to receive and deal with such requests because of the specialization of departments and information.

Complexity of Funding Arrangements

The funding arrangements under which First Nations governments operate is another major factor influencing administrative effectiveness. Since funding arrangements need to be negotiated continually and frequently and long-term funding is not readily available, the process of acquiring financing and the consequent accountability requirements form the basis for the continued relationship with government funding agencies.[xxxiii]

The resources of First Nations administrations are already stretched by the activities necessary to obtain funds. For example, band leaders are estimated to spend between 30 and 40 per cent of their time negotiating financing and jurisdiction with the department of Indian affairs

in land claims and service transfer agreements.^{xxxiv} Accountability to the department for the funding received takes another 30 to 40 per cent of their time, leaving little time left for the other activities of governance and administration. It is a time-consuming and expensive activity.

There are similar issues in the Northwest Territories in financial and accountability relations between local governments and territorial governments. Franks (1987) cites the Drury study and its account of how most communities in the Northwest Territories were unable to raise sufficient revenue from a local tax base and were dominated by the budget process of the territorial government. As budget negotiations usually occurred between local and territorial administrative officials, not between elected representatives, holding local politicians accountable for financial decisions was difficult.

Part of the overall funding issue is lack of co-ordinated funding efforts; it is not just a problem of insufficient funds but also of funding transfer delays and confusion over who is responsible (at other levels of government) for funding each aspect of self-government programming.

In a sense, maintaining rigid, confusing and numerous rules for funding accountability is one way the federal government can maintain its agenda of social control while appearing to make the progressive gesture of allowing First Nations some self-determination through a limited form of self-government.^{xxxv}

Malone (1986) notes that funding in the form of specific-purpose grants further maintains First Nations in a subordinate role in interactions with federal, provincial and territorial governments. These grants are conditional upon meeting federal funding guidelines, often for purposes determined and/or approved by federal and provincial governments. An example is seen in the Cree-Naskapi settlement where disbursement of settlement funds was continually dependent on approval of the department of Indian affairs. Also, some First Nations are required to negotiate constantly for specific-purpose grants with senior governments, which may determine their own priorities for discretionary funding.

For many Aboriginal governments, a delegated form of self-government does not seem to represent substantial degrees of compensation and autonomy for First Nations governments and their communities. No matter how much legislation is passed or how many settlements are arranged, the reality of limitations on resources and authority does not change. Despite the fact that First Nations governments need adequate resources if self-government is to work

effectively,[xxxvi] obtaining funding from external sources seems to open First Nations to a situation where they are accounting to others for their autonomy.

First Nations governments are obviously experiencing great difficulties in attempting to institute a relationship with federal and provincial governments in such a way that those governments recognize and respect First Nations' rights to autonomy and resources. In Canada, and the United States as well, First Nations lack a resource base to make their visions for self-government a reality[xxxvii] and are thus forced to settle for limited versions of self-government dependent on the visions of funders. Stuart notes that the fundamental problem in funding is not just the way autonomy is restricted but also because arrangements seldom make adequate provision for the `indirect' costs of devolution. First Nations' overhead costs and capital starting costs will be larger than those of established governments. His assessment is based on study of self-determination efforts in the United States where tribes struggle with the same issues ─ monitored devolution (called `termination'), inadequate resourcing, and efforts to communicate effectively with First Nations administrators.[xxxviii] An example of these unanticipated costs is the cost of facilitating better processes for community input into decision making and developing more effective mechanisms for accountability to communities.

People involved in Aboriginal governance spoke of the need for adequate funding to fulfil their objectives. For example, one organization had had the funding for its newsletter cut. As this means of communication between the organization and the community was seen as a vital component of their ability to be responsive and accountable, such financial restraints had far-reaching implications for overall administrative effectiveness.

More commonly, however, people spoke of the need to control their own finances. Running programs and services on grants and contracts from federal and provincial governments smacked of `work for welfare' for several participants in the research. The inability to engage in long-term planning that would respond effectively to the needs of constituents was a common frustration expressed. Jockeying with one another for resources, both within and between organizations, accounted for a good deal of the energy spent by administrators.

Strategies for Community Accountability
Hall suggests that an open process of policy development in conjunction with community opportunities to assist in development and in evaluations would go a long way toward

developing policies in First Nations governments that communities are informed of and that they can use to ensure that administrators are accountable. The absence of written policy, made accessible to community members and subject to regular review, leads to poor communication, confusion, unfairness, etc.[xxxix]

First Nations leaders also need to be in touch with the grass roots in a way that is more interactive than formal processes, such as policies, formal meetings and needs assessments. Though formal written policy may foster better mechanisms of accountability, administrators also need to keep in touch with community members by going out into the community and initiating open, informal discussions with people.

Some people feel that despite the problems of self-government implementation, First Nations are at least benefiting from better communication with their own administrators than they had with the federal government. In regard to administration of student support, one person suggested that

> Abuses still occur, but not as often as when INAC had control. The accessibility of the post-secondary program has a huge impact on why more First Nations people are applying for educational assistance. Now the program is in the community, not a far away city where you have to ask a complete stranger for educational assistance.[xl]

Numerous other factors can influence the ability of the administration to communicate effectively with the community. Communication with federal and provincial governments has been constructed by the bureaucracy through the use of memos, forms and manuals. These means of communication do not necessarily work effectively for communication with communities. The size and complexity of an Aboriginal government also can influence its ability to engage in dialogue with community members. Intergovernmental relations can affect how administrators are viewed in the community. For instance, Dave Rundle of Southeast Child and Family Services in Manitoba noted that he relates differently with each of the nine communities he works in because they each have a different relationship with the tribal council. He defined a good relationship as clarity from political leadership. Such clarity establishes a good communication climate for providing service.[xli]

Another First Nations observer on the issue of communication indicated that communities should also take some responsibility for improving communication. People need to treat each other in ways that lessen division and derision and open up lines of communication.

One administrator of a First Nations social service agency indicated that the type of program involved may factor into the ability of administrators and professionals to involve the community in planning and decision making. Child welfare services are stigmatized as traditional social control mechanisms run rather punitively by other governments (e.g., residential schools, child apprehensions), and this negative reputation has been transferred in some cases to First Nations-run child welfare services. As a result the administrator was unable to find community people willing to sit on the agency's committees. This has a circular effect on communication, as the community then becomes out of touch with the service and the issues facing it.[xlii]

Another administrator suggested that along with critical skills in analyzing continued federal influence, First Nations must try to weave cultural communication traditions ─ such as seeking wide input and community involvement ─ into contemporary forms of communication to increase the effectiveness of accountability. One way her band attempted to do this was through a newsletter to First Nations youth in the area. The newsletter informed youth of community events, attempting to stimulate greater youth involvement.[xliii]

A liaison worker noted that elders advisory boards were good ways to stimulate interactions between elders and band councils or service agencies. This was also a way to incorporate the customary value of elder wisdom into accountability and communication mechanisms. He lamented that elders were not as involved as much as they should be in these boards. When he needed consultation, he would take responsibility for initiating contact with elders.[xliv]

Another administrator explained that she used a survey approach to stimulate wide community input to the development of social service programs. A community survey was conducted in a way that she felt captured the impressions of community members on service needs and recommendations for service implementation.[xlv]

Newsletters and community meetings, along with an annual community report, were part of the approach used in another instance where a child and family service agency was responsible for serving many different band communities. Newsletters and regular reports were distributed to all area band offices. Items reported included types of programs offered, expenses, etc. Sometimes cable television and radio broadcasting were used to report on agency activities to First Nations communities throughout the large northwestern area served by the agency.[xlvi]

The Mowachaht have enjoyed success in operating their own cable channel, The Wheel, to which all community members can contribute. The Ehattesaht hold regular breakfast meetings for community members with guest speakers. Workshops and conferences are other popular and effective forms of communication and community education. The New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council has recognized the critical nature of effective communication and hired a communication worker to facilitate relations between the organization and the membership. Another community has decided to hire community education workers to spend time in the community, going house to house to talk about governance issues, claims and so on. Community camp-outs and other recreational and social events can also have a positive influence on communication. Yet efforts made to broaden communication are hindered by significant funding cuts to First Nations communications. This has resulted in the loss of newsletters, radio shows, language programs and other news sources.[xlvii]

Administrators seem to be taking on the work of both encouraging community input into the operations of government and services and organizing output to communities through regular reporting to account for activities undertaken. Communication, to be effective, must run both ways.

The Challenges of Accountability

This section has explored the operations of Aboriginal governments and the tensions and challenges that accompany the tasks of administration and the obligations of community accountability. The reality is that Aboriginal governments are accountable to many. The web of external funding programs that administrators negotiate is not consistent with integrated community programming. The need for funds and the necessary activities to secure and account for those funds can seduce administrations into behaviours that are responsive to dominant governments rather than community constituents.

External influences such as the involvement of non-Aboriginal people in Aboriginal governments is another sensitive area that can give rise to tension. Some argue that it is necessary to use administrative expertise, wherever it comes from, to facilitate self-government and administrative competency. Others argue that this impedes the ability to develop and respect the expertise of Aboriginal people.

It is clear that communication and participation are key to community accountability.

This is not easy to achieve. Community education is a key administrative task for Aboriginal governments so that all constituents develop an understanding of the goals and activities of the organization as well as the means for communicating and participating in governance.

The Cultural is Political

Role of Culture in Aboriginal Governments

Participants in the research often saw the solution to self-government administration problems as cultural as well as political.

> Self-government must be more than just self-administration, but must encompass
> our form of laws and policies based on our culture and way of life.[xlviii]
> In much of the data collected, from social workers speaking of the need to have

Aboriginal control over the upbringing of children to administrators struggling to find effective ways to communicate with community members, it was observed that the cultural is the political ─ that is, that addressing the cultural needs of a community is more than just an administrative reality, it is also a strong political tool.

Not everyone agrees, however, that culture and politics can work hand in hand. For example, Boldt suggests that sovereignty and political nationhood are not conducive to cultural development.[xlix] He believes that the constitutional positions of First Nations leaders show that "cultural concerns have been subordinated to political concerns" and that this is inevitable for the political development of First Nations. Such a perspective denies any interdependence of the cultural and the political.

This section of the paper, then, looks at the role of culture in the development of Aboriginal governments. It considers the strengths of culture in the political development of First Nations and points out some of the administrative challenges of working in a culturally relevant manner.

Historical Context

In considering the phenomenon of the cultural as political, one must recognize first that the political activity and development of Aboriginal peoples fit into a cultural milieu and become one expression of the greater whole that constitutes the various Aboriginal cultures. It is extremely important to maintain a broad understanding of the concept of culture, as it is often defined narrowly to include only traditional expressions such as eagle feathers, songs, drums,

buckskin and other less stereotypical yet limited constructs. In fact, expressions of Aboriginal cultural identity are extremely diverse and go beyond tradition into art, employment, politics, economics, spirituality and all other aspects of life. In short, culture is the collective expression and integration of knowledge, belief and behaviour as it reaches into every aspect of life.

To clarify further the relationship between these two constructs it is also essential to situate historically a number of key intertwining issues that affect both the cultural and the political vitality of Aboriginal people. First, we must consider the colonial legacy. Underlying the colonial agenda have been racist assumptions of Eurocanadian superiority; imposed patriarchal political structures that ensured Aboriginal people remained politically ostracized and ineffective; and the capitalist economic system (using the policies of the *Indian Act*) that ensured the complete liquidation of lands and resources that were traditionally the source of livelihood for Aboriginal people, thus ensuring their poverty and dependence on the mainstream welfare system.

The colonial campaign of cultural genocide began with attempts to wipe out Aboriginal people through disease and starvation. As these strategies proved less than completely effective, the campaign transformed and focused its efforts on undermining Aboriginal people through political, social, spiritual and economic means. For example the residential schools were an effective education strategy that destroyed families, communities and individuals and took away the language and traditions of generations of Aboriginal people. Similarly, the *Indian Act* was a powerful piece of legislation ensuring Aboriginal people were economically, socially and politically marginalized and significant spiritual and cultural practices were outlawed. The potlatch of the west coast communities and the sundance ceremony of the plains people are two examples of important cultural practices that were outlawed in the genocide campaign.

With the expropriation of lands and the development of the reserve system, Aboriginal people lost control of important natural resources that, in a capitalist democracy, meant they were effectively eliminated from self-determining political participation by these measures. Additionally, the relationship to the land is central to the Aboriginal worldview, and this relationship informs various aspects of cultural expression that constitute the fabric of Aboriginal society. In all cultures the worldview, the values and beliefs, underlie the development of key spiritual, social, economic, educational, communication and political institutions. All these institutions are interrelated and all have, as part of their function, the role of socializing members

of the society. If a dominant society controls, overshadows or wipes out this fundamental institutional function then it also takes control of the cultural constructs that become the defining characteristics of the smaller society. As a result, the smaller culture becomes sapped of its traditions and its autonomy ─ in short, it loses touch with its life blood and a period of social dis-ease ensues. This has been the partially effective strategy behind the Canadian government's relationship with Aboriginal peoples. The impacts of these phenomena are numerous; most notably Aboriginal people feel immense rage and shame that has been internalized (within the individual, the family and the community) through a long-term process of racist victimization. These feelings are apparent in the symptoms of depression, family violence, suicide and addictions that prevail in Aboriginal communities and are described as a dark period in the cultural development of Aboriginal peoples by numerous writers.

Cultural Healing for Political Strength

To understand further the relationship between the cultural and the political it is useful to examine the healing endeavours of Aboriginal people to reconstruct healthy communities, families and individuals. Helping people to reverse the devastating effects of colonization entails a two-pronged approach. First, Aboriginal people have begun to develop and disseminate a critical historical analysis of the effects of colonization and racism in their lives. This information is empowering in that it allows people, in their healing, to objectify the problems in their lives and helps them to realize that they are not crazy or the problem. They are the victim of an immense and historical campaign of genocide aimed at all aspects of their lives. Their symptoms are a healthy response to an insane attack on generations of Aboriginal people.

The second step is cultural revitalization. Values, beliefs and traditions are supported and taught through a multitude of facets of community life, including pedagogy, ritual, ceremony, celebration, work, community life, conflict resolution, songs, stories and key relationships. These values and beliefs are also espoused by and fundamental to the institutions of the community, which are the backbone of cultural expression. Cultural rejuvenation is a starting point to build collective esteem and self-determination; further, the cultural underlies and directs the political pursuits of Aboriginal people. To choose a culturally specific act or ceremony or process is a political act in this context, as it is equivalent to a choice *not* to assimilate, not to accept the status quo of the mainstream even though there is immense pressure to conform to prescribed

models of the dominant non-Aboriginal culture.

For example, the day-to-day operations of the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs revolve around a value base that is distinctly Aboriginal. In the activities of the Union, though everyone is treated equally (with the exception of special treatment of elders, who are highly regarded), there is also an emphasis on individual and family health. This allows people to bring children to the office for their work day if they need to; encouragement and allowances are provided for employees to continue hunting, fishing and other traditional activities; people are given time to go to cultural ceremonies or rites of passage in their communities; employees are encouraged to be politically active, for example, to take part in protests or political organizing; the Union acknowledges the important role of hereditary chiefs; and the Union supports Indigenous people internationally wherever possible. This is only a handful of examples relayed by a former employee of the Union ─ and not all Aboriginal organizations choose to operate on these principles ─ but they illustrate the relationship between culture and institutional development. As institutions operate with the integrity of representing the community they evolve from, when they express a cultural perspective in the way they do things, they also support the continuing development and strength of that cultural community. With renewed strength there is a shift in the distribution of power with the dominant society because these actions serve to lift the weight of colonial oppression.

In 1972, the National Indian Brotherhood issued a report suggesting that First Nations control over education is necessary to an educational system that would fit the cultural and contextual needs of local First Nations communities. In this sense, the report, already familiar with the notions of self-determination associated with contemporary self-government discourse and concepts, appears to recognize and assert a growing articulation of the idea that the cultural *is* the political. Political jurisdiction ensures that it is possible to address the cultural, and, as Cozzeto (1992) has argued, the cultural component is as necessary as the political, since without a distinct First Nations group there would not be a First Nations self-governing unit. They need each other to survive.

Another example of the close relationship between the cultural and the political is the concerted reactions of Aboriginal women to section 12(1)b of the *Indian Act*. The women of Tobique, and many others across the country, based on their cultural birthright, undertook a massive campaign of political organizing and protest to overthrow these laws. In this case,

women led the way for other Aboriginal people to question the membership guidelines and the overall impact of the *Indian Act*, which had the effect of strengthening cultural resolve and self-determined political action. It also gave some power back to the people who have been alienated from their communities, their families, their heritage and parts of their cultural identity for many years because of section 12(1)b.

The development of Aboriginal media institutions is another example of modern cultural development that is political in nature. For generations Aboriginal people's reality was essentially omitted from all media. The information conveyed in print and on film was often based in racism and stereotypes that effectively sustained the marginalization and oppression of Aboriginal people. More recently Aboriginal people have begun the work of validating their own lives by telling their own stories through their own media institutions. One example, is the proliferation of Aboriginal-controlled newspapers; regular national and regional publications are staffed by Aboriginal writers who write about Aboriginal issues. *The Native Voice*, *Windspeaker*, *Awkwesasne Notes*, and *Ha-Shilth-Sa* (the Nuu-chah-nulth paper) are only a few examples of these publications, which are vital communication links for people across the country. In addition, a number of Aboriginal novelists and playwrights are publishing books, plays and movie scripts for North American audiences that portray an authentic view of Aboriginal people's lives from their own perspective. As well there are recent television, video and film productions by Aboriginal people that present an alternative view of history and culture. For example, Alanis Obomsawin directed *Kanesatake: 270 Years of Resistance*, which chronicles the events in the summer of 1990 during what the mainstream media termed `the Oka crisis'. In contrast to the mainstream media, which presented much of their story from the army and government side of the razor wire, this video is about life inside the blockade and the political and historical events leading up to and following the incident. Its production is a poignant political act, as it is highly critical of how the federal and provincial governments dealt with the issue. It had an immensely positive impact on countless Aboriginal people, giving them a sense of pride and dignity from observing others stand up to protect their heritage. The event also exposed the struggles of Aboriginal people to a national and international audience.

In the modern technological information age, the media hold immense political power, as they produce knowledge, shaping our exposure to and perception of events around the world. This process is controlled by a core of business and political elites that represent the interests a

relatively privileged few.[1] It is driven by the values of capitalism and democracy that have ensured historically that Aboriginal people remain politically, economically and socially marginalized. As Aboriginal people gain some control over their own media institutions they begin to have a legitimate place in the forefront of the political affairs of the country. They have a new set of tools to develop culturally and politically. In this way their concerns are slowly gaining authentic representation in the mainstream.

Aboriginal education institutions are another example of cultural revitalization that has immense political power. Mainstream curricula, like media, have been used historically to diminish or destroy Aboriginal cultural distinction. The residential schools were a tangible and, at times, violent example of the genocidal intentions of Canadian governments in their treatment of Aboriginal people. Though educational services for Aboriginal people have evolved somewhat since the residential schools, the institutions are still, in large part, controlled by federal and provincial governments, which are largely incapable of delivering curricula and instruction that promote culture and are relevant to the lives of Aboriginal people. Aboriginal students of mainstream schools in the past 30 years have seen little or no validation of their lives; most report stories of blatant racism, stereotyping and ignorance. In short, these institutions have been a colossal failure.

In furthering the goals of self-determination Aboriginal people have begun to develop their own education institutions based on the realization that their children will not develop culturally in mainstream schools. At times parents made the decision simply to remove their children from mainstream schools and begin their own schools with what little resources they had.   These schools offer a curriculum that is tailored to the cultural needs of the community and, in so doing, advances a political agenda of self-determination and self-government. This was the case at Mount Currie, B.C. in 1973 when nine families withdrew a total of 27 children from the public school in order to give them a chance to learn and develop an understanding of their culture and language that was not offered in the provincial school system. The parents began the school, with few resources and little experience, to ensure the cultural survival of their nation. In the 1950s the community had a DINA-operated school (where speaking one's language was punishable). In the 1960s it was a federal school run by the Sisters of Christ the King, and in the late '60s the government began to phase out the school (one grade per year, beginning with grade 8) and send kids to Pemberton school approximately 6 miles away. The parents wanted to

keep their children in the community and offer them language programs and other culturally relevant curriculum, as they felt the provincial school would be unable to provide their children with quality education (for example, many Aboriginal students were put together in an `ungraded' classroom where all worked at different levels and most did not graduate with grade 12).

The parents' actions made a political statement about their refusal to assimilate quietly into the mainstream where their culture is not supported. In 20 years the school has evolved significantly and now provides daycare, a nursery, instruction for kindergarten to grade 12, adult basic education and pre-employment programs. Graduates have entered a variety of post-secondary institutions, including Simon Fraser University, the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria, as well as community college programs such as Caribou College.

Similar examples of political expressions of Aboriginal cultural self-determination take place daily. Individuals may choose small acts of rebellion such as having a traditional marriage ceremony even though it is not recognized by provincial governments. Communities are using justice, child welfare, mental health, economic development, artistic or spiritual means to accomplish the same end. All these actions are determined statements of continuing cultural distinction, autonomy and development; in short they echo the same cultural self-sufficiency Aboriginal people enjoyed as pre-contact nations.   And these acts of defiance continue to be played out within, or in reaction to, the same mainstream institutions that were used to advance the goals of genocide and assimilation.   The changes are necessary for the survival and development of Aboriginal cultures; at the same time, they are political in nature, in that they all resist the status quo that seeks continued assimilation into the multicultural melting pot of non-Aboriginal society.

Culture and Administration

As discussed in the previous section, communication between First Nations governments and their communities is critical to accountability. An inherent conflict between mainstream and Aboriginal management styles may be partly responsible for ineffective communication between First Nations governments and community members. Chapman and his colleagues describe how First Nations values of collectivist and consensual decision making, group-oriented values in

decision making, and holistic employee development may conflict with the values and practices of individualism and the valuing of expert professional knowledge consistent with Eurocanadian mainstream management styles. Evaluations of First Nations managers and management training programs need to consider cultural values and customs to ensure that administration maintains cultural relevance in training and practice.[li]

The dynamics of incorporating wide input to ensure that community needs are met are facilitated by communication processes that are culturally based. But there may be a danger in placing too little emphasis on the political. A balance needs to be maintained so that political considerations accompany cultural considerations and both can be addressed effectively, because both must be present if First Nations government is to be culturally and community-relevant. This means considering the politics and culture of First Nations communities but also continuing to address the politics of relationships with other governments. Federal and provincial government policies still have significant influence on First Nations governments, despite the surface appearance of the value of First Nations self-determination. Attempting to `culturize' First Nations management as a solution to contradictions between mainstream and First Nations management styles ignores the influence that other governments still have over First Nations through policies and funding arrangements.

First Nations communities must work to ensure that their administrators and service professionals are operating in ways that are consistent with cultural and community needs, but they must also be understanding of the limitations administrators face in attempting to assert community influence over policy and programming.

Administrative Training

The Call for Education

The focus of the research on people and their relationships led inevitably to consideration of who these people are and what prepared them for their work in and with Aboriginal governments.

Education and training for self-government is a common theme in discussions about the development of Aboriginal governments. Time and time again, people spoke to the Royal Commission about the need for educated Aboriginal employees for their governments and organizations.

> Education is the key to the future and especially so in Indian Country. With the
> trend of self-government come many opportunities for our people. These job

opportunities need training and bands cannot afford to wait much longer for the positions of authority. To me, this is what self-government is all about: Native people working for their own people in every capacity.[lii]

The need for education and training poses some dilemmas for Aboriginal governments, among them the following:

Blaming the victim: The perception that Aboriginal governments lack qualified personnel can become a ready explanation when mistakes occur in implementing self-governing. The perceived need for education becomes an easy way to `blame the victim' for difficulties encountered. Other factors associated with failures do not receive the same attention from theorists and government.

Short- versus long-term needs: Another tension is the immediate need of Aboriginal governments for qualified staff. This urgency often compounds the difficulty of developing effective short- and long-term education planning for community members.

Professionalization: Increasing levels of professional education of people can impede, as well as facilitate, the ability of Aboriginal governments to be accountable to their communities. Several people interviewed noted that the professionals in their organizations were not viewed as still being a part of the community. They had been distanced from the grassroots through their education. How, then, can these people develop the necessary relationship with a community for effective accountability?

There are many aspects to consider when examining the call for education. This section of the paper explores the need for administrative and management training and the issues and tensions that accompany this consistently expressed need. It considers how some training programs support a delegated model of Aboriginal governance as opposed to governance founded in self-determination. It identifies issues related to access to education, such as funding availability and management, location and scheduling of courses, and support services. Finally, it explores the issue of culturally relevant education, in particular curriculum and teaching approach. Subsequent sections consider the related issues of Aboriginal control of education and the dilemma posed by professionalization of Aboriginal governments.

The Need for Administrative Training

A survey of First Nations education workers found that training in management and administration was desired by 79 per cent of respondents.[liii] Statements made to the Royal

Commission support this call for training. Often this need is expressed in response to the federal government's expectations concerning their plans for devolution of program responsibility to First Nations governments. Training for the administration of self-government is needed now more than ever, "especially if self-government is coming!" one administrator noted.[liv]

That is, the needs of First Nations are commonly construed in terms of the qualifications needed to manage devolution. The federal government appears to have a perception, supported and informed by several studies, that Aboriginal self-government works only with effective and efficient mechanisms of accountability to the federal government and, to some extent, to an organization's own communities. Audits and evaluations go more smoothly if there are competent staff to operate and report on self-government initiatives.

Many First Nations communities feel a need to obtain formal and technical training in order to acquire or maintain funding and to avoid being regarded as a second-rate service.[lv] In practical terms, many First Nations communities are feeling the need for persons with the skills to communicate and negotiate effectively with other governments, service agencies and political organizations. Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal inter-organizational relations would be enhanced by administrators possessed of such skills.

Cozzeto (1991) argues that training is very important when it comes to implement land claims agreements that include a self-government component. "Suitable and comprehensive" training is necessary for First Nations to manage their own post-claims public administration infrastructure. He believes that the training factor could actually mean the difference between the success and failure of such initiatives and that without it, efforts to achieve self-determination through claims settlements and program delivery will be in vain:

> ...training programs targeted at public administration management processes are tantamount to the development of successful models of governance for Aboriginal people in Northern Canada.[lvi]

Many First Nations people concur with Cozzeto. The lack of trained First Nations administrators is an issue not only for public administration but for business administration, financing and law. One participant at the Royal Commission hearings noted that "most business failures" in First Nations were the result of "management weaknesses" and agreed with the perception that there are not enough First Nations members in management training:

> Indian exposure to training has been limited to a narrow range of courses and subjects, i.e., upgrading, job-readiness, short-term vocational, social services,

carpentry training, stuff like that, and underrepresented in courses directly related to management and financing.[lvii]

The overwhelming call for education and training needs a response. In acknowledging this need, however, caution must be exercised, given the temptation to use it as a rationale for deeming that Aboriginal communities are "not ready for self-government" or to explain the struggles experienced in implementing self-government. The is a danger in seeing incompetence as the cause of failures in the management of self-government.

The solution offered is opportunities for First Nations to change, to improve their competence in administrative processes defined and evaluated by mainstream administrators and audit standards developed by a culture foreign to First Nations. Seldom are non-Aboriginal people called upon to change, even if cases abound where failures could have been `caused' by incompetence on the part of non-Aboriginal governments in failing to address the needs of First Nations communities effectively, to involve them in planning and policy, or to make appropriate training arrangements. The belief expressed on occasion is that mainstream administrative training is the answer to self-government problems. This is not to deny that formal administrative training is needed or wanted, but that the intensity of its construction as a panacea for self-government ills requires examination.

Training Programs

Education in a direct service area is the formal training commonly pursued by Aboriginal people. Social work, teaching, health care, and nursing are the most popular areas of study.[lviii] People trained in service delivery sometimes go on to receive formal administrative training. This pattern is consistent with the development of community control or self-government found in many places:

> Many Indian communities have found, for example, that limited initiatives with reference to education or child welfare have led to the generation of the skills and experience which have led to more comprehensive efforts to achieve self-government.[lix]

Aboriginal governments and their employees face an immediate and continuing need for training to meet the planning, controlling and service delivery functions of administration. Universities and community colleges are offering a growing number of certificate and degree programs in these areas; several of them are offered in `module' form to meet the needs of

working administrators living at some distance from the educational institution (e.g., Nicola Valley Institute of Technology's off-site community economic development program). Aboriginal government administrators are also obtaining short-term training through non-credit workshops, seminars and college programs. Many contract with private consulting companies for such training.

Training services offered by consulting firms are usually technical in nature (e.g., computer training), and bands contract for small-group or one-on-one training.

However, one administrator expressed dissatisfaction with short-term and contract-based training, seeing them as "one-shot deals" on specific subjects, such as community development, environmental management, office procedures, and so on. Her band wants to move on to explore more long-term management training, but funds are often not available for this. Funding arrangements for administrative positions are also often on a short-term contract basis. The band obtained a recent funding contract for an office management trainee position, but the funding allowed for only 1800 hours.[lx]

Conferences such as the Winnipeg Child Welfare Conference, sponsored by the Assembly of First Nations in 1991, are another popular form of education where First Nations members can network and exchange information.

One type of on-the-job training can come in the form of feedback from federal and provincial government funders ─ for example, the Lester Norman Desjarlais audit of a child welfare case was instructive to Manitoba First Nations ─ or from First Nations community members themselves. For example, First Nations women's groups have protested the failure of Aboriginal services to deal effectively with abuse against Aboriginal women and children.[lxi] Interaction with governments and communities gives administrators and service deliverers the sometimes brutal benefit of learning through fire.

The curricula of administration training programs vary in terms of the issues and skill areas covered and depth of coverage. Obviously, a one-day seminar will cover personnel management in much less depth than a two-year certificate. The depth of coverage may also depend on the topic as well as time factors (that is, instructors and program administrators decide that depth is more important in some areas than in others). Several programs seem to concentrate on management basics, accounting and the completion and management of government forms.

A majority of administration programs for First Nations are designed for

middle-management positions. Hall (1992) found that because many First Nations people lacked proper training in management, First Nations were often in a position of no real control. They were prepared for managing decisions made elsewhere. One participant in the research commented,

> We are allowing ourselves to be kept in the mind-set that `someone else' needs to tell us what to do ─ that they are better, etc. This is not true. This is being done and we don't even know it.[lxii]

Hall suggests that because of the structure of most available training and the current delineation of roles in First Nations organizations, service delivery roles are often construed as `management', with the result that training for administration ─ along with real control of administrative functions ─ may suffer. He argues that the federal government and educational institutions are training Aboriginal people for middle-management in service delivery.

The issue of training for management, as opposed to training for administrative functions, must be addressed in terms of the remedial nature of such training. Administrative training programs for First Nations that do not equip graduates with the same management capacities as graduates of conventional programs (those not especially catering to First Nations students) send a message that First Nations need more basic training. Undoubtedly, some do need this lower-level management training. But the skills associated with economic development and decision making on broader policy issues, not just skills in implementing decisions made by others, also need to be addressed at some point in training curricula. Without a training philosophy premised on self-determination rather than delegated authority, First Nations will not be equipped to break the chains of paternalism as administrators working to implement self-government.[lxiii] A paradigm of delegated authority is assimilated along with the management training. While lower-level administrative training is needed for any governing unit, senior-level management training is much needed as well.

Issues in Education and Training

Participants in the research raised several issues regarding education and training in administration. These issues fall generally into the following categories:

- pre-administration training needs,
- practicalities of attending training,
- funding,

- educational environment,
- community and cultural relevance, and
- employment opportunities.

Important pre-administration training education needs are not being met. These include cultural healing, basic educational upgrading, and access to basic literacy programs.[lxiv] The foundation for administrative training should be considered part of the response to the need for training for self-government.[lxv] One community expressed frustration about a situation they had faced. They had the opportunity to send a community member for professional training in forestry and resource management ─ a critical need in the community ─ but they could not find anyone in the community with the basic skills, both academic and social, to take advantage this opportunity. For such communities, talk of professional administrative training needs and opportunities is wistful.

Access to basic education is a frustration for some. One educator commented that youth must `fail' in the regular system before they can gain access to funds for adult basic education. Eligibility requires having been out of school for at least a year, so young people are forced to fail miserably before a different approach to their education can be pursued. Naturally, self-esteem is wounded in these young people, thereby increasing the arduousness of the task of upgrading. The failure is in the education system, not in these young people.

The Gabriel Dumont Institute, a Métis-controlled educational institution in Saskatchewan, outlined in its 1991 report the need for basic literacy and upgrading training for Métis communities, as well as education for self-government nation building. It cautioned, however, that such training must be provided in a context of respect for traditional culture and language and preparation for self-government.[lxvi]

Some practical barriers impede the ability of Aboriginal people to obtain training. Many organizations explicitly encourage employees to enrol in educational programs, as they recognize the ultimate benefits to the organization. However, losing valuable staff time to the pursuit of education sometimes leaves organizations in difficulty. They cannot always afford to have workers away for long, or even short periods of time. Staff given short leaves to attend workshops or courses find that their work just piles up back at the office while they are away. Organizations have little capacity to provide relief staff ─ either for financial reasons or because of the lack of qualified relief staff. Organizational support for their worker-students

understandably becomes less tangible and the situation more frustrating for students.

Donna Felix, director of Child and Family Services for the Spallumcheen Band, recommends on-the-job training as a means of allowing workers to gain the experience needed to move from frontline service to administration. She feels such training should be combined with technical formal training according to mainstream academic standards but that this training would ideally be offered in a First Nations educational institute to ensure the provision of First Nations content.[lxvii] On-the-job training was identified by several people who see the needs of working administrators. The loss of these people to distant training programs tends to exacerbate the problem of administrator shortage.

The child care needs of Aboriginal students were a common theme of women. This higher cost of education is rarely acknowledged satisfactorily. If women are to have an equal chance to be trained, then serious attention to such barriers is essential.[lxviii]

Those who are able to attend educational institutions encounter other barriers. There are race-related barriers associated with being a minority in post-secondary education. Issues like the `chilly climate' for minority students at universities can seriously affect a First Nation's training plan.[lxix]

There is a related lack of meaningful First Nations presence in training institutions, as curriculum developers, instructors and program administrators are usually non-Aboriginal. The expertise growing in these areas is growing in people from other cultures and communities. There is a lack of control over hiring and training standards, despite efforts of First Nations advisory boards. First Nations participation in non-Aboriginal institutions does not constitute effective control in many people's minds. As one band social worker observed, important decisions in training and practice issues are made too often by external consultants, impeding opportunities for leadership development in First Nations communities.[lxx]

Several participants noted the lack of opportunities for experiential learning for administrators in government and service delivery, as current leadership and consultation positions are occupied by whites. First Nations leaders and managers are apparently surrounded by a glut of white consultants, professionals, and government officials.

The 1986 Nielsen Task Force report on improved program delivery was critical of administrative training programs for First Nations that were not targeted closely enough to job opportunities. The report specified that federally funded programs should be targeted to positions

in Aboriginal self-government.

On the flip side, Aboriginal employers noted that there is a recruitment problem. Many Aboriginal students do not return to their communities after schooling. One leader of an Aboriginal government complained that he couldn't afford to hire members of his own community once they had qualifications. He could hire non-Aboriginal people with qualifications for less. This was an ethical and financial dilemma for him. Salaries and career opportunities for trained Aboriginal people are perceived as better in places other than most First Nations organizations. This competition means that First Nations governments often must spend more time and energy than other governments and organizations to recruit and maintain professionally trained and qualified employees.

Franks notes that the recruitment problem stems from the fact that many educated Aboriginal people may not want to work for Aboriginal self-governing units. There are disparities in pay between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal organizations, and Aboriginal people form a sub-class within the public service as they do in society generally, though Franks found that the disparities tend to be smaller in federally funded Aboriginal advocacy groups, which provide more attractive employment opportunities than bands.[lxxi]

The idea of Aboriginal people forming a sub-class in the public service has implications for the training necessary to achieve self-government. One educator suggested that the reason First Nations governments were scrambling for training opportunities was because it may be a way for First Nations to prove themselves competent enough for self-government or fair land rights settlements:

> Unlocking the Aboriginal justice programs, language programs that we are doing, all the different things we are doing on integrated resource management planning, training programs we put into place because we are told, `You are incompetent. We don't trust you.' So what do we have to do? We have to prove ourselves before we get anything out of the courts or before we get anything defined in terms of the constitution or any other piece of legislation.[lxxii]

This feeling permeates the planning for training for self-government as First Nations internalize the view that they are a sub-class of administrators. This forces bands to hire trained people from outside the community. Even if bands wanted to hire community members without formal training, they are restricted by the qualifications insisted on by federal funders of band programs. This situation prompted one administrator to reflect:

> The federal government is still controlling through the purse strings. Formal

education is needed for our own people if only to meet the qualifications desired by funders. This is especially true considering the increase in band services and programs.[lxxiii]

Funding Education

Almost everyone consulted remarked on the issue of funding for education and training. Hazel Mills, a business management administrator with an Ontario First Nations agency, discussed the issues she faced attempting to acquire training in the North. Inadequate funding for programs and unavailability of programs were important obstacles. She paid for her own training by working during the day and taking night school courses. There was "not enough money" to fund her courses. In some areas of the North it was "impossible" to get training when the closest institute was 250 miles away. She found that basic accounting and financial management "beyond just accounting" were necessary skills for her current position.[lxxiv]

One study involving First Nations education workers outlined the need for expanded funding to deal with student costs.[lxxv] This review of post-secondary student support programs for First Nations mentioned some of the funding problems of students attending training institutions away from their home communities, some of whom had to maintain two households while away at school. Most respondents indicated they were unable to receive supplemental funding from bands and tribal councils, so they relied heavily on DIAND post-secondary education funding, which was commonly regarded as woefully inadequate. Workers agreed that resources for band administration of funding to First Nations students were also extremely inadequate.

Training programs sponsored by the federal government, such as through the Northern Careers Program and the National Indigenous Development Program, to improve management skills among First Nations, have not been made available to non-status or Métis persons, compounding the issues for these groups.[lxxvi]

Other participants pointed out that post-secondary support programs do not necessarily have the flexibility to meet training needs, even if availability of funds is not an issue. For example, in one community two young people were refused funding for helicopter pilot training because it did not coincide with federal guidelines for education support.

A legally blind woman living off-reserve expressed exasperation about her attempts to co-ordinate the efforts of her band, the department of Indian affairs, the Canadian National

Institute for the Blind, and the Vocational Rehabilitation Program to ensure appropriate support for her training and integration to the work world.[lxxvii]

Access to funding and appropriate training is a difficulty. Funding varies from province to province, from band to band, from category to category (status, non-status, Métis). Funds are lacking for support services such as daycare and travelling expenses. These represent obstacles for First Nations leaders and administrators attempting to move on to the advanced and more effective training plans needed to prepare for self-government.

First Nations are under increasing pressure to evolve quickly and effectively without benefit of the resources and jurisdiction other Canadian governments enjoy. Yet they are under constant scrutiny from the federal government, the provinces, and their own communities. Do better with less, is the message heard everywhere, but scrutiny and scarcity are serious impediments to the development of autonomous organizations. There is an expectation that First Nations communities will not succeed. This makes for pressure and defensiveness on the part of First Nations administrators, which in turn create problems with communication and accountability in managing government and delivering services, as well as problems in effective communication and liaison work in educational and training planning.

Cultural and Community Relevance

There is a recognized need for training to be culturally relevant to the Aboriginal student and to First Nations.[lxxviii] This objective is being tackled in a variety of ways by existing programs. Generally, there appears to be no concrete cultural component in curricula, in the form of required texts, articles and assignments, which would establish an official cultural framework. Course sections and readings are not entitled "Cultural Aspects of Aboriginal Administration", for example. Program efforts to address cultural relevance are less visible than efforts to address administrative content. Indeed, few First Nations instructors or authors are used in formal programs.

Mechanisms to ensure cultural content seem arbitrarily dependent on the actions of individual instructors who use participatory and reflexive techniques (such as teaching techniques that draw heavily on experiential knowledge) using First Nations students' knowledge and experience to cover this area. For example, an instructor might ask First Nations students to provide the case examples used in class from their own community experiences.[lxxix] The need to

provide cultural content in training programs may also be met merely through the presence of First Nations consultants, instructors, instructional assistants, and community advisory boards or committees. Through curriculum development, policy development, and consultation processes with First Nations, training administrators and instructors have made conscious efforts to construct a distinction between the `technical' (professional administrative) aspects and the `cultural' (First Nations customs, values, conditions) aspects of First Nations administration and management training programs. Cultural aspects seem to be adapted to technical content, or technical content is applied within a First Nations context. There is an apparent respect or valuing of local First Nations perspectives but at the same time an inability to articulate in curriculum and policy exactly how this value will be operationalized in course content. Cultural content is constructed more as a process issue or an issue of classroom composition than as a content issue.

The lack of concrete cultural information may be problematic in that it forces dependence on experiential teaching/learning. Not having cultural or historical aspects formulated in a more tangible way (e.g., documents, curriculum policies or course syllabuses) reduces the ability of community representatives to evaluate cultural relevance.[lxxx] This approach may also increase a tendency toward what Castellano and her colleagues described as a recycled mainstream curriculum, with any First Nations component becoming an extension or fringe component of the curriculum.[lxxxi] When treated as an add-on, cultural content can be perceived as less valid than technical content.

It may be difficult for a dispersed consultative committee (from different First Nations, for example) to monitor and discuss an approach to incorporating cultural content that is more of a social process than a matter of content. If First Nations consultants are to provide the benefit of their experience in evaluating and constructing the cultural components, they must be able to be present in such contexts. It is probably difficult for busy administrators to provide a strong cultural connection once removed from the classroom. There is some assurance that the presence of the First Nations students in the classroom will facilitate the input and monitoring of cultural and contextual components, but the value and specific nature of experiential knowledge remains ethereal and more difficult to evaluate. It may be difficult, too, to pass on the benefits of a process-reliant approach to the next class as you could with a favourite article. There is no tangible record to benefit future learners. Achieving an effective balance of visible content with

appropriate process is a continuing challenge.

Though some programs seek to compensate for this by offering courses specifically involving First Nations content (e.g., Band management principles; a `cultural camp'), these courses are often not part of the required core curriculum, and students may not be able to spare the added time or expense of attending them. In this sense, the cultural has become a luxury.

As with the value of cultural content in formal programs, there is a related value of familiarity with local or regional context, including history, community events, customs, government policy, land claims, and so on. There appears to be an assumption that administrators from, or familiar with, the local community they are serving have automatically received knowledge of local First Nations history and culture through their daily experiences. "We live it," explained one administrator.[lxxxii] At the same time, First Nations persons from different nations or communities (other than those they are serving) may be as uneducated in local culture and history as a non-Aboriginal person would be, though it is sometimes recognized that a First Nations person from another area would at least have the experience of a First Nations perspective.

One First Nations administrator suggested that formal training and First Nations ancestry were "not enough" as qualifications, though they were admittedly valuable. An administrator or service professional who was unfamiliar with local community history pertinent to a particular First Nations linguistic group would experience a "hard time adjusting".[lxxxiii]

The government of the Northwest Territories Special Committee on the Northern Economy recommended that, to be effective for Nunavut or any other claim implementation, administrator training would have to incorporate considerations of special cultural/community needs and the traditions of subsistence economy.[lxxxiv] Such a call may be somewhat naive. To be effective, training must operate in accordance with Aboriginal aspirations in claims settlements. Yet training is provided, monitored and evaluated by governments and corporations that have their own stake in claims settlements. This appears to be a conflict of interest. It seems unlikely that Aboriginal governments would ever be `allowed' real power to design training according to their claims aspirations[lxxxv] when their opponents in negotiations (governments and industries) are controlling the standards for funding, training, and implementation of post-claims governance.[lxxxvi]

Despite common agreement that cultural components are necessary elements of training,

one is forced to ask whether cultural content is in fact valued highly enough in planning for self-government implementation, given the lack of tangible components in formal programs and hesitation on the part of funders to provide adequate financial support for First Nations institutes with a stronger emphasis on cultural content. And, asks one First Nations educator, "How can First Nations have self-government with no culture? I'd be interested in knowing what they plan to base self-government on."[lxxxvii]

Tackling the Issues of Education

Education is a critical aspect of the development of Aboriginal governments. First Nations' planning for the education of their people needs to be considered part and parcel of treaties, land claims and other agreements (e.g., child welfare transfers) so as to ensure that the necessary training funds are secured to support self-government initiatives. All negotiations for land claims, etc. should include funds for education as an integral part of any settlement.

Education funding involves more than the cost of tuition and books. For education planning to be effective, it needs to encompass resources for such expenses as travel, child care and relief staff for the organization while employees are away on training. In addition, education funding should include more than just formal administrative training. Community education is an important strategy for effective government. Also, literacy and other pre-administrative training need to be thought of as a part of an overall education package.

Finally, Aboriginal people need to be financially supported to develop education and training programs and materials that are relevant to their communities and cultures. There is a need for research to consider what constitutes administration and service delivery in a First Nations environment and the effects of mainstream knowledge and education on the development of Aboriginal governments.

Aboriginal Control of Education

Authority for Education

One of the dilemmas identified by participants was the need for relevant education, yet the options for schooling are either mainstream institutions with doubtful relevance to First Nations or a small number of First Nations institutions that have yet to establish credibility in the academic world. As one participant said, `Indian programs' are seen as second-class, while

`white man's education' is seen as irrelevant.

This dilemma is recognized by all. In response, mainstream universities and colleges are being attracted by the availability of funds to create programs for Aboriginal students. First Nations are responding to the problem by creating their own educational institutions with the expertise to develop academic and community credibility. Control of education for First Nations was identified by many as an important self-government issue.

Urion (1992) writes of the lack of First Nations control over education, describing the paradox of self-administration of the school system with no real control over policy. Though he was speaking of primary and elementary educational structures, a similar paradox can be observed in the lack of First Nations control over First Nations-administered post-secondary educational student support structures and training for First Nations government and service delivery.[lxxxviii]

Urion argued that local First Nations control, not just school administration or fiscal management, constitutes real control. He saw the education issue as part of the larger issue of control for First Nations communities. The difficulty of obtaining the control needed to implement First Nations' own agendas is compounded by a realization that

> despite whatever non-Native governments profess about their agenda for First Nations control, the real agenda remains what it has always been for the past 120 years, containment and social control.[lxxxix]

Hall points out that leaving funding for education under federal self-determination policy (including band administration of post-secondary funding and elementary school systems) leaves bands and organizations controlled by the same bureaucracy and guidelines that apply to the department of Indian affairs. The situation is therefore one of no real control, only operation of programs. Thus for Hall, First Nations `control' under these circumstances can be neither "sound" nor "proactive", as it consists of a

> doomed educational facade based on Indians' reaction and response to federal government proposals and policies developed for Indian education...without any significant input by Indians.[xc]

What is permitted is First Nations involvement, not control ─ this is the message often repeated by theorists and practitioners. But involvement without control perpetuates top-down power relations between federal and provincial governments, which maintain ultimate authority in decision making, and First Nations governments, whose involvement in decision making

continues to be limited.

The National Indian Brotherhood report of 1972 is a good example of a national Aboriginal advocacy organization taking a leadership role in lobbying for Indian control as well as a stronger cultural context at all educational levels. It offers specific recommendations for achieving the objectives of control and cultural relevance.[xci] The report suggests that First Nations communities should not only control and administer local elementary school systems, but also play a strong consultative role in post-secondary training and education programs. Setting up community education committees and encouraging school board participation, in consultation with local, provincial and national First Nations organizations, would provide a forum for community control. The report recommends that policy and planning for First Nations education take place with other First Nations organizations and not be transferred to provincial jurisdiction without the express consent of the local communities involved.

The aspirations articulated in the 1972 report continue to be espoused by many First Nations organizations and communities. Many efforts on the part of First Nations and other educators and administrators have been made to implement these ideas. In many instances, however, First Nations control over First Nations education has not graduated fully from theory and recommendation to practice.

With respect to control of post-secondary education ─ so vital to planning of and access to training for administration and service delivery ─ the Assembly of First Nations points out that even First Nations involvement in advisory boards and band administration of post-secondary funds may reflect delegated involvement with no jurisdictional control.[xcii] Despite many efforts to be involved in planning for appropriate training, First Nations governments still feel their influence is limited in many cases. Frustration with this process was expressed by one educator. "The days of tokenism are over," he said.[xciii]

This section of the paper considers the role of First Nations in delivering post-secondary education, from student influence in mainstream university and college programs to First Nations-controlled institutions. It analyzes the accountability issues First Nations are encountering as they create their own institutions and programs.

Mainstream Programs and First Nations Involvement
Universities and colleges across the country are beginning to make efforts to make education

more accessible and relevant to Aboriginal students. They are encouraged to do so by the unquestionable needs of these students and the availability of funding for such initiatives in times of general restraint.

An example of a mainstream institution grappling with how to make its programs relevant for First Nations is the newly created University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC). Margaret Anderson, director of First Nations Studies, lists the First Nations programs at UNBC as nursing, social work, anthropology, Native studies, and environmental studies, as well as management and administration. To demonstrate the importance to the institution of participation by First Nations as consultants and partners in planning and teaching, and as an expression of the value of First Nations-directed training, UNBC has Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal instructors co-instructing courses if fully qualified Aboriginal persons cannot be found to teach a technical administration course. UNBC consulted with many bands, tribal councils and organizations, including the Nisga Tribal Council and the Northwest Tribal Council. But they will also work with First Nations that want to develop their own administration training programs, such as the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en, near Hazelton, B.C.[xciv]

Such arrangements exist in several post-secondary programs and exemplify efforts to strike an effective balance between cultural relevance and technical requirements in planning a mainstream curriculum with a strong First Nations presence.

There is much that non-Aboriginal institutions can do to provide culturally and community-relevant programs to assist First Nations preparing for self-government in a way that is consistent with First Nations' own agendas. As Ron Short, president of the Association of First Nations Post-Secondary Institutes, said in a presentation to the Association of Community Colleges of Canada, it is important for colleges to make education for First Nations learners "more productive, more relevant and more meaningful."[xcv]

While such efforts by colleges and universities are laudable, they pose a dilemma for First Nations. Short points out that efforts by First Nations consultants to help improve established college programs only increase the difficulties facing First Nations educational institutions in competing with more established programs for funding and recognition:

> It seemed that anything we could do to assist you would only exacerbate our own difficulties in gaining acceptance as serious and necessary contenders in the education network; in developing our own capacity to identify, serve and meet the educational needs of our communities of origin.[xcvi]

Short confirms the importance of culturally and community-relevant and -directed training, suggesting that the emergence of First Nations institutions is a result of training needs in First Nations communities. This is because First Nations-controlled education is more community-driven and also because First Nations have not experienced high success rates in mainstream educational institutions. He cites the high loss of First Nations learners as compared with the national average. Only 4 per cent of First Nations learners graduate from grade 12, while 88 per cent of all learners in Canada do so.[xcvii]

One strategy is affiliated autonomous training programs.[xcviii] These First Nations-run training programs are affiliated with existing universities or colleges (usually for resource and accreditation reasons). Often, however, they are considered fringe or add-on programs and are treated as extensions of mainstream programs. First Nations participation and consultation in curriculum development is possible, but there seems to be a tendency toward developing an extension curriculum as a recycled form of the mainstream curriculum:

> If instructors and materials are simply redeployed from the regular program, conventional knowledge, skills and attitudes will also be recycled.[xcix]

If this occurs, curriculum would be less likely to be driven by the needs of First Nations students and their communities. The climate would be less favourable for asserting First Nations context and cultural issues, processes and values.

Representatives of First Nations governments and organizations serve on the advisory committees of governments and training institutions to help effect positive culturally and politically sensitive change. Although First Nations persons were involved as advisers in many of the programs reviewed, they tended to be professionals and were seen by some First Nations as somewhat removed from grassroots community issues.[c]

Despite the problems associated with tokenism and curriculum recycling, as well as the potential for competition between mainstream and First Nations institutions, many non-Aboriginal management and administration training programs are, to their credit, working hard to involve First Nations governments in planning content and format. The University of Manitoba First Nations Management Program has a First Nations Management Committee with participation from 15 tribal councils in Manitoba and Ontario. Program administrators co-ordinate liaison efforts and promote involvement by setting up consultation meetings in different parts of the region to bring this process closer to First Nations communities.[ci]

It is possible that despite the problems associated with tokenism, First Nations may rely on it to some extent to assure at least some level of involvement, especially if they do not have sufficient resources to initiate their own processes or to meet support, resource and access needs. Student support and program advisory projects are as underfunded as most areas of First Nations government and services.

Aboriginal people and organizations use several strategies to improve existing training programs in administration and service delivery. There is some variability in the planning and the level of involvement of Aboriginal governments and organizations. Sometimes issues of effective control, curriculum and access are resolved through the efforts of concerned individuals; in other cases, this is achieved through more formal means (e.g., the Metis Society of Saskatchewan's involvement in the Gabriel Dumont Metis Training Institute to ensure programs are provided to meet the needs of Métis students and their communities).

Through input and consultation from their own and other communities, First Nations governments seek to establish their own definition of what constitutes effective training for administration and service management and delivery. They must also balance this input with the advice of education professionals   and government sponsors, the goal being to establish a truly effective plan for training, funding, and access that both meets the needs of First Nations communities and responds to the requirements of sponsors and funders. There may be a structural contradiction, however, in having education funding come from organizations with which First Nations are in process of negotiating land claims and self-government agreements. The agendas of First Nations education planners and federal/provincial funders could well conflict if disputes related to claims and jurisdiction overflow into discussions about the nature of and funding for the education and training programs First Nations are seeking.

Developing training plans also involves lobbying government sponsors and training institutes to encourage their support for effective curriculum and processes. These efforts may be more problematic if conflicts arise from competing agendas.

First Nations Programs

What types of training for administration and service delivery are being offered by First Nations' own institutes and programs? Are First Nations programs doing a better job of meeting the need for preparation for self-government? Is First Nations jurisdiction over programs resulting in more

culturally appropriate and community-driven training in practice? Or do First Nations programs still largely reflect priorities and standards imposed from outside First Nations under the federal government's devolution plan?

If First Nations programs are still funded by other governments, they are still bound by a degree to the interests of those governments. Even though First Nations appear to control such programs, reliance on funding from other sources means operating programs according to the funding policies of those sources. Just as corporate and government sponsors of training programs in mainstream facilities have strongly influenced the curriculum for First Nations learners, government sponsors of training programs in First Nations institutions may also be in a strong position to influence curriculum and processes, albeit possibly in subtle ways. The selection of course offerings and development of curriculum for those courses seem to be influenced more by mainstream academic standards and federal devolution policy whims than by First Nations communities. Just as the choice of course offerings is influenced by transfers of responsibility from the department of Indian affairs (e.g., transfer of responsibility for child welfare and social work training), so are curriculum considerations within subject areas influenced by mainstream curricula.[cii]

A recent departmental review of Indian and Inuit training opportunities shows that many training programs in First Nations institutions are very similar to what is available for First Nations in mainstream programs and institutions across the country in the subject areas most associated with administration and services:[ciii]

- band manager/public or business administrator
- community worker
- First Nations teacher/teacher's assistant
- social worker/drug and alcohol counsellor
- health/justice worker

The programs appear to be mainly certificate programs of two years or less. This carries a `para-professional' connotation, supporting Hall's assertion that First Nations people are being trained for middle-management functions, not for decision making or planning functions under self-government. In reality, then, training in a First Nations program or institution will not necessarily meet all the needs of First Nations in implementing self-government in terms of community control and community-driven training plans, even if such programs are closer to achieving the ideal of First Nations control of educational and training programs.

Some First Nations communities have initiated their own training programs in an attempt to resolve these issues. The Gitksan Hereditary Chiefs and Nunavut both have their own administration training programs. Nicola Valley Institute of Technology and the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College are recognized and successful First Nations colleges offering credit programs in administration and service areas such as social work and justice- and health-related fields. Although funding constraints remain problematic, First Nations governments, leadership organizations and communities continue to believe in the value of investing time and energy to make training more appropriate for First Nations learners and their communities.

The Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research in Saskatchewan is a Métis-controlled educational institution established to ensure that the Métis agenda in education is met through greater Métis involvement and control.[civ] The Institute seeks community input in planning and establishing priorities to meet the education needs of Métis in Saskatchewan. Education issues are a top concern for the Métis according to a recent report from the Institute, both to address the cycle of poverty and unemployment besieging the Métis, and to prepare Métis communities for self-government.

The Institute wants to take a leading role in education for self-government and nation building. It seeks to provide community education for those segments of the Métis population that would probably not participate in formal post-secondary training. Workshops and forums are provided in the following areas:

- Planning for Self-Government: Metis rights and land claims
- Self-Government Implementation: Discussing how implementation will occur
- Community Involvement in Research: Planning for self-government. Research on local environment, history, economy, and education levels will provide a knowledge base for future decision making.

The Institute seems to play a dual role in raising awareness of self-government issues: gathering input from the community about local community context, and disseminating information to local communities about economic and education rights and opportunities. Its 1992 report, *Towards Self-Government: A Mandate for the Nineties,* describes a vision of balance between past and present, between traditional language and culture and the contemporary need for literacy and economic self-development. Because of their control of the Institute, the Métis hope to exercise a form of self-determination as well as educate for self-determination.

Accountability in Aboriginal Post-Secondary Education

In implementing self-government, Aboriginal communities are creating their own institutions to ready themselves to take over services from provincial and federal administrators. A continuum of readiness to take over services appears to be emerging in communities and urban centres across the country. For post-secondary education and training institutions this is definitely the case. At this time of transition, Aboriginal schools ─ whether training schools, colleges or universities ─ are often caught in an accountability bind that sees them trying to balance the needs of funding bodies (often the federal government) with provincial standards, with academic standards, and with the needs of their own communities. Aboriginal learning centres adopt different strategies to realize an optimal degree of autonomy in their mandate to provide services that are relevant to their communities. Many begin as private post-secondary institutions, so that their funding and accreditation status may be compromised; the larger institutions are therefore trying to move to public status to assure the greater resources and independent authority afforded by accreditation, but as they do so they will be also become more accountable to provincial governments.

To illustrate, the B.C. government is in the midst of changing its policies so that Aboriginal-controlled institutions can be funded directly by the province while maintaining a degree of, and moving toward greater, autonomy. At this early stage of the change process, the discussion revolves around exactly how to achieve greater autonomy. Most of the interim options focus on amending legislation or invoking regulations to accommodate the unique status of Aboriginal institutions, many of which are now considered private institutions and must become public institutions if they want provincial recognition. The government is also devising a process of gradual change from private to public institution status that would call on Aboriginal institutions to meet certain criteria, such as affiliation with a public institution (e.g., for the first five years), comprehensive course offerings, institutional structure, minimum number of students, and a specified number of years in operation. As well, some affiliated institutions have a degree of autonomy already; for example the En'owkin Centre, which is affiliated with Okanagan University College, has very little accountability to that public institution.   Another example is the Native Education Centre in Vancouver, which is affiliated with Vancouver Community College, but is accountable only in the sense that a member of VCC sits on the NEC board of directors. Even these provincial initiatives are only a starting point, as there will be a

need for negotiations between the provincial and federal governments at some point in the future to renegotiate jurisdiction.

These changes will mean that some Aboriginal institutions in B.C. will be able eventually to get accreditation and provincial resources while maintaining their association with the reserve communities where they were conceived, supported and developed and where they have been operating. This is a welcome change for the Association of First Nations Post-Secondary Institutes, an advocacy group that has been pushing for provincial recognition of, and direct funding and negotiation with, Aboriginal-controlled institutions. The guiding principle of this organization is the inherent right to autonomy, which includes offering relevant educational services for Aboriginal communities around the province. In practice this will necessitate the removal of legislative and policy barriers preventing the provincial government from negotiating directly with Aboriginal institutions. At present Aboriginal institutions must become involved in a complex web of affiliations and legal diversions to gain access to funds develop, establish and maintain quality education programs. These barriers arise, at least in part, from jurisdictional conflicts between the federal and provincial governments. As well, from the standpoint of Aboriginal organizations and communities, the barriers reflect a paternalistic assumption that Aboriginal people cannot do things for themselves or do not have the inherent right to run their own institutions, to deliver services, or to take part in changing outdated or ineffective services. When it comes to disciplines such as cultural studies, for example, it is a slap in the face for Aboriginal institutions to have to resort to affiliations with mainstream institutions be validated and accredited for courses of study that are directly related to their own lives and communities.cv

One choice Aboriginal institutions is simply to opt out of provincially devised recognition or accreditation, based on the conviction that opting in would compromise service delivery. For example, the mandate of the First Nations Tribal Justice Institute in Mission, B.C. is to train tribal police departments. Their graduates go on to work in First Nations communities and in municipal police forces. By choice they are not recognized by the province, because the provincial mandate with respect to justice contradicts the First Nations concepts of law and justice. Jim Maloney, president and co-ordinator of programs at the Institute, believes that justice is on the "front door of sovereignty", so the only way for First Nations people to determine their own path in their justice institutions is to begin service delivery based on the self-determination philosophy and the support of Aboriginal communities. In this context the Institute is

accountable, through enrolment and fee-for-service funding, only to its students and to the communities they come from. If the communities or municipal police forces do not believe that the program is of high enough quality, then potential students will simply go elsewhere. The school also has a board of directors from Aboriginal communities and tribal councils throughout the province of British Columbia.

Other institutions are trying to secure resources and autonomy from the government. For example, Chemainus Native College is a small First Nations college on Vancouver Island with 150 to 160 students and 23 staff members; it offers courses in adult basic education, business management and community economic development. (Its five-year plan calls for expansion to more comprehensive course offerings, including community health, early childhood education and teachers' education.) The school began, like others, with a need to establish culturally relevant curriculum for community members; they have been able to accomplish this by using the curriculum materials of the Open Learning Agency and adapting them to the community's specific needs.

The school is band-operated, so funding comes from the federal government through the band council to the school. DIAND conducts a yearly audit of their operations, and they must submit yearly proposals for funding to the provincial Indian Students Support Program committee (an ad hoc funding administration committee of DIAND) to secure funds for the following year. Last year the committee threatened to cut off funds for the 1994-95 school year. As well, funding does not include capital spending, so the school must divert funds from the operations budget, which diminishes their ability to offer the services they would like to. Their hope is to gain provincial recognition so that they can secure greater financial resources. One of the main tensions with respect to accountability for the school is that the first two criteria set out in the provincial *College and Institute Act* relate to the autonomy of the institution (i.e., from the band). The provincial government will provide funds only directly to the school, not through the band, and the board of directors is to be the intermediary between the school and the government. Further, the school must offer comprehensive programs to be an accredited institute, so they must expand their program offerings with limited resources. One problem is that it is difficult to separate the school from the band, because the Chemainus band founded the school (the Chief is chairman of board), and it is a source of prestige for the community to own the school. The school administration recognizes that without independence from the band they will

not get accreditation and that they will have to affiliate with larger non-Aboriginal schools, which will again compromise their autonomy.[cvi]

An Example ─ Saskatchewan Indian Federated College

Similar problems with funding and accountability are experienced in other provinces. Saskatchewan Indian Federated College (SIFC) is an example of an Aboriginal post-secondary education institution striving for greater autonomy while confronting the demands of government and affiliation.[cvii] At SIFC a number of accountability issues constrain the school's ability to exercise full autonomy. The school gets core funding from DIAND for programs and service delivery but no capital funds because it is not located on a reserve. To overcome this issue the school has to divert program funds to operations. There are plans to buy a building with land and to work to change the status of the land to reserve land; in this way they will be eligible for more money from DIAND because the jurisdictional issue will no longer exist. In addition, operating on reserve land will give the school more autonomy for operations as well as taxation advantages.

SIFC is affiliated with the University of Regina and the University of Saskatchewan for purposes of granting degrees, but their relationship is still very paternal, in that SIFC doesn't have the power to change curriculum or programs without the approval of one university or the other. Ironically, the SIFC School of Social Work is accredited by the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work, so even though the school is recognized by a professional body, it still needs approval from the University of Regina, which grants its degrees, for changes in programs and curriculum.

The SIFC board of governors is made up of chiefs of tribal councils, two senators, and faculty and student representatives. The board's mandate is to examine the development of the college and give feedback and direction from the communities. There is some tension in the relationship between SIFC and the board, but (from the SIFC perspective) they have developed a `distance' or flexibility based on an understanding that the ideals of the board are not always immediately attainable and that the means to attain them are varied, so the school has some operational discretion.

In addition to the accountability balancing act between the universities, the board and the SIFC administration, there are informal links with organizations such as the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations (FSIN) for different reasons. For example, the School of Social

Work is introducing program changes in an attempt to develop a curriculum that reflects the current child welfare needs of the different communities around the province and the provincial child welfare legislation. In this process the school seeks consultation with the FSIN to maximize the integrity of their future programs.

There are also accountability issues and tensions within the department itself as it aspires to greater autonomy. At present 40 per cent of the faculty are First Nations members. In the move toward greater self-determination, the school wants to increase the percentage of First Nations faculty, but it must do so in a way that is consistent with human rights codes and labour laws. The transition will likely take some time, given the legal implications of the change and given that new positions cannot always be filled by First Nations people (much to the chagrin of the board).

The school also struggles to find alternative styles of teaching to translate principles into practice; this in turn gives rise to another accountability bind in relation to students and the communities they come from. Though the faculty may agree on philosophical direction, they cannot always agree on the means. Method is sometimes a source of tension among faculty, whose varying opinions about how they should work are often informed by whether they are First Nations people. At the heart of the matter is whether the students should be trained to understand and observe First Nations people, or whether they should be looking at their own lives as First Nations people, developing the skills to assess the impact of their historical oppression, and incorporating the results in their work with other First Nations people.

Scarce Resources

It is important to keep in mind the colonial relationship with the mainstream culture that is a part of the history and the daily struggle of Aboriginal institutions. It is this paternal relationship that inspires the anger and frustration of many an executive director fighting for resources and institutional recognition. These issues come to light, perhaps more than in other provinces, in British Columbia, home of Canada's newest university. There, in just a few short years, immense amounts of political will were brought to bear in ensuring the resources and legislative changes necessary for the founding of the University of Northern British Columbia in 1994. During the same period countless Aboriginal institutions around the country were fighting for a small share of resources and recognition but met an incredible array of bureaucratic and jurisdictional

justifications for maintaining the paternalism of the status quo.

The First Nations Review of the DIAND Post-Secondary Student Support Program outlines well the problem of inadequate funding for administration of First Nations government and services.[cviii] How can First Nations post-secondary support and advisory programs be controlled locally in an effective manner if they cannot be effectively administered locally? This is also an issue identified by Angus, who writes that the only possible formula for self-government must include several components: recognized control, sufficient resources for effective control, and mechanisms to enforce control. Otherwise, First Nations governments, bound by funding restrictions to other governments, will always be more accountable to foreign funders than to their own communities.[cix]

Given these conditions, it becomes more understandable how First Nations governments are prevented from achieving local control over education and are thus less able to plan training for administration (or any other area) in a way that will meet the needs of First Nations communities planning for and implementing self-government.

Professionalization

Professionalization is one of the fundamental tensions underlying much of the information received regarding the development of Aboriginal governments and their relationship with their communities. People spoke passionately about the need for educated people to work in their governments and to set up effective administration systems so that their governments could establish credibility with the community and with the outside world. On the other hand, people often spoke disparagingly about the behaviour of the highly trained people employed by their governments and growing bureaucracies. Some comments expressed distrust of professionals and bureaucrats, even if they were Aboriginal people from the community. Somehow, former neighbours were now seen as part of the `system' that community people were reluctant to trust. This dichotomy ─ the need for professionalism and mistrust of the professionals ─ is the articulation of a major tension in Aboriginal governments. As these governments become increasingly professionalized, they run the risk of distancing themselves from their constituents.

Several participants saw problems arising from assimilation and a resulting mistrust of First Nations persons who had become `too professional' and `too white'. Formal education for Aboriginal people may be too far removed from local community contexts. After their academic

immersion, they may experience difficulties in communicating effectively with their communities. Community members may not trust professionals whose training has changed the way they speak and relate to others. This may be different from the usual ways of relating in a particular community ─ for example, bureaucratic or professional styles of relating, use of forms, formalized bureaucratic/professional language, and so on.

The result is conflict in roles and identity, which affects both full-time students who leave a community and return after training and part-time students who also work as administrators or frontline service providers. A related irony lies in the need to acquire mainstream professional and academic standards in preparing for Aboriginal self-government. These are considered necessary for funding and credibility but can interfere with customary styles of working and relating in the local context that are expected of workers and leaders. Hence the dual and conflicting expectation that service delivery workers and administrators must be twice as good as their non-Aboriginal counterparts: well versed in local mores, values and interpersonal relations, but also possessing technical and professional knowledge, expertise and work styles. This is an issue for First Nations governments to sort through, as well as for mainstream governments and training institutions to consider. Further, as administrators participating in the research cautioned, this dilemma should not be used to stop them from seeking education and establishing effective dialogue with the community.

Being Professional

Professionalism is associated with a certain level of education as well as certain behaviours, language and values. For an administrator or manager, it may mean acting with responsibility. For some, it implies the use of up-to-date knowledge or state-of-the-art techniques and skills. For many, professionalism implies objectivity and rationality in systems and procedures. For most, professionalism is something to be encouraged. It is a `good' thing to be a professional person or a professional organization. An illustration of this is the credibility that accompanies the use of recognized techniques in decision making. For example, the New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council took great care at their annual general meeting to use accepted rules of order. Most everyone in the organization was familiar with such procedures and took pride in maintaining a system that was not only effective for them in their work, but affirmed their competence as an organization.

Professionals in Aboriginal governments have a responsibility not only to their employers but also to the communities they serve and the professional body that establishes standards and issues professional credentials. The expectations of these different groups are not always compatible. Debbie Foxcroft of Usma, the Nuu-chah-nulth child welfare agency, comments that

> This work is difficult, because I'm Nuu-chah-nulth too. If we've just apprehended their child, you don't know if they are going to say hello or punch you. I know the leaders, I know everybody, and I know some things I don't want to know about people and what goes on. It's very tough sometimes.[cx]

Usma and its workers are guided by and accountable to an all-male chief and council who set standards; by the standards set out in provincial legislation; by professional social work standards, including a code of ethics; and by community expectations.

Professional Education

The professional education Aboriginal people receive is not necessarily grounded in the experience of First Nations. Campbell and Ng (1988) expand on the work of Smith (1987) in analyzing how the knowledge, experience and interests of men are reflected structurally in academic and professional discourse and in these environments. Their argument could be extended to acknowledge that, just as women's interests are subordinated, First Nations' knowledge and ways of knowing are even further marginalized in the constructs of academic and professional education. Power relationships are further reinforced by imposing mainstream professional qualifications as part of the requirements for attaining self-government. Georges Erasmus, co-chair of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, observed during the Commission's hearings that education that does not attempt to link professional knowledge with culture will not serve First Nations well:

> Yesterday the chief and I had an interesting conversation. I asked him, `What kind of teacher are we looking at? Is it one where every Aboriginal person is a doctor, a lawyer, a scientist, a professional? And if we did achieve that and we took all the Aboriginal people on one side and all the non-native people on the other side ─ and over there, too, we have the doctors, the lawyers...the scientists ─ what would be different? What would be different between the two groups?'

> Then he told me that what would be different would be what is inside ─ the beliefs, the values, the understanding, the outlook at the world. And so, even though you became professional, similar to the non-native people, the difference would be that you continue to be an Aboriginal person and that would probably mean that if you were going to maintain your culture, even though you were a social worker, even though you were a

lawyer, even though you were a medical doctor, you are probably not going to do things exactly the same as the non-native person.

You probably will start to challenge the way they do those things. If, for instance, you are a medical doctor you might, as an Aboriginal person, decide also to look into the kind of herbal, holistic, spiritual medicine that existed in the past. And so, to also be able to combine the two and to treat the whole patient, not to treat the symptom of the problem. Likewise, if you were in any of the other professions, you would probably influence that culture in a way ─ and that professional group ─ in a way in which it would be different.

And so, it would be still possible for Aboriginal people to maintain their culture, but it would mean that being professional would change over a period of time. You could not do things precisely the same because, if you did, you would be dropping your culture. If the school systems stay exactly the same, if all you are doing is, you are just transferring white people and you are putting Indian people in, it is exactly the same ─ nothing changes, it is exactly the same ─ then, what you have done is you have just shredded everything of the culture that existed in the past and you have just adopted a completely new culture.

And so, for people like myself...I encourage young people to go to school ─ but I know that we are taking an immense risk because we could lose, we could lose badly. We could actually be the cause of total assimilation. We could be the people that are encouraging our young people to go out there and lose everything that is culturally meaningful to them, to be different from other people.

So, I do not encourage young people just to go to university and just to become a professional like other people. That is not enough. That is not the answer. The answer is not to have Indian teachers ─ or First Nation teachers ─ that simply do exactly the same thing that somebody could do from Europe that comes here. That is not the answer.[cxi]

Not everyone agrees on the kind of professional training that is best suited to administering Aboriginal governments. One participant stated emphatically that the best preparation for their organization was the experience and training received as an employee of the department of Indian affairs. But another participant said that such training was the least useful for their government, as it brought with it a particular, and unwelcome, perspective on how work should be organized, managed and accounted for. The way white, male, professional and academic knowledge is organized reinforces current relations between First Nations and non-Aboriginal people by affirming the credibility and desirability of mainstream professional ideas and processes over First Nations ideas and processes. The mainstream proponents `rule' over First Nations; First Nations are forced to adopt mainstream ideas, processes and professionalism.

Examples of treating mainstream knowledge as superior, more credible and necessary,

occurs in three main ways: the tendency of First Nations training programs to offer more mainstream than First Nations curricula; policies and complex funding arrangements requiring First Nations education workers to be accountable and report to federal funders and not to First Nations communities; and token participation of First Nations on advisory committees for mainstream training programs.

Administrative Systems

Administrative systems are established to control the work of an organization. Administrative documents serve as another technique for controlling, just as educational documents and processes do:

> In the continuing search for efficiency in organizations, knowledge is being organized as subjectless and objective in order to create in documents a world known in common, which is thus actionable in the textual realities of administration, management, and professional discourse.[cxii]

Campbell's analysis of the use of documents as a technique for control or `ruling' (a term described by Smith, 1987) is evident in many experiences of bands under the jurisdiction of the *Indian Act*.

For example, the first band manager for the Mowachaht was employed in 1971. This manager described how the band was faced with learning how to manage the band while being inundated with paper from the department of Indian affairs. A steady stream of memos, directives, manuals and forms arrived, all intended to control their operations. The band was not accustomed to this way of operating, and everyone became overwhelmed. As a result, much of the paper went unread and unused until they began to learn how to use this form of direction. It reinforced feelings of inadequacy, but over time they developed proficiency. The paper did more than simply instruct them in a new way of communicating, however; it actually influenced how they constructed their work. Previously little attention had been paid to documentation and correspondence, but with time they began to emulate the department's model of management expressed through the use of documents:

> As their work becomes information-oriented, managers' understanding of their responsibilities gets shaped by their practice.[cxiii]

The professionalization of an organization brings with it a view of how organizations should be structured. The Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council for example, has developed a

sophisticated bureaucracy to manage programs devolved from the federal and provincial governments. They recently had to deal with criticism from member bands that the new bureaucracy was too centralized and out of touch with the communities it serves:

> Of course we have to take these new government programs, but we also have to make sure they become Nuu-chah-nulth. I firmly believe we are getting to be too much of a bureaucracy. White services with brown faces. We've got to start recognizing that none of these services or agencies is separate from the others. We've got to put them together so we work together, with the same policies and approaches. Our leaders are so very busy, but there's an element missing in all the work they're doing. They don't get the time to deal with it amid all that bureaucracy they're so busy building and dealing with. I think we are getting to the point now where there's a possibility to really begin to move toward adapting the basic philosophies and principles of who we are and were.[cxiv]

As a result they are now decentralizing the organization in an attempt to get their services to engage effectively with the community.

A Bifurcated Reality

Individuals as well as organizations face the challenge of relating to the community:

> ...sometimes we tend to be so locked into the bureaucracy that we forget who we are working for. We are working for the students and that is why I would like to see some changes. I get caught by the bureaucracy that was created.[cxv]

First Nations bureaucrats face a bifurcated reality. They are expected to be `Aboriginal', to be community members, to be culturally aware and thereby retain close communication and relations with the community. At the same time, they are expected to be `professional', to behave in a way that is credible to federal, provincial and territorial governments and agencies. The two are not always compatible. The challenge for First Nations bureaucrats is to attempt to establish professional organizations and services in a way that respects tradition, culture and community values.

The cultural context of Aboriginal administration affects its functioning. The Ehattesaht, for example, are working with their community members to discover the meaning `traditional' for them and its implications for their administration. They realized that everyone had their own sense of history, culture and tradition and that a community understanding was necessary if administrative systems were to respond effectively to the expressed need for cultural relevance. Knowledge of language, customs and history can be critical for administrators in First Nations governments. The ability to reconcile this knowledge with professional management practices is

an added challenge.

Distancing between administrators/professionals and community members occurs in part because administrators have to account to other governments. It is exacerbated by the economic divisions between administrators/professionals and impoverished community members. This is a difficult environment in which to carry out effective communication strategies and to work with and account to community members. As professionals, First Nations administrators and service workers are expected to communicate with and be accountable to the community, but at the same time, their professional status seems to diminish their capacity to carry out these responsibility effectively.

To facilitate accountability to the community, organizations need the trust of the community. The experience of many Aboriginal people with the department of Indian affairs is a stumbling block to establishing a trusting relationship with an Aboriginal bureaucracy. Systems and techniques that are considered part of professional bureaucracy (for example, management by objectives, program evaluation, forms) can be seen as culturally foreign, helping to distance the administration from the community. Community members, disenchanted with First Nations governments and services that they see as just another form of `western' institution, may disassociate themselves from those institutions. With increasing professionalization, Aboriginal organizations face the possibility that they are distancing themselves from those they were established to serve. Some Aboriginal governments are beginning to recognize that they have something to lose, not just something to gain, by introducing more technical and professional approaches to administration. A necessary part of this recognition is the effect of the expectations of federal and provincial bureaucracies on an organization's ability to reconcile professional and community values.

Tackling Problems of Professionalism

Aboriginal governments and individuals are developing strategies to deal with this tension. First, there is a strong push to ensure that education for First Nations is appropriate. As noted in the observations of Georges Erasmus quoted earlier, the education system and academic and professional knowledge are being transformed by the Aboriginal people enrolled and teaching in educational institutions. For example, the social work program at the University of Victoria now includes First Nations content as a core part of its mainstream program. The behaviours,

language and values associated with professionalism need to be challenged and examined to determine whether they are inevitably linked to professionalization or whether and how they can be linked to a community.

Second, models and techniques of administration and management require examination to reveal how they can be used to rule and control and how they might be reconciled with other cultural values and practices. While this may occur with the passage of time, vigilant attention is needed to ensure that `brown bureaucracies' are not created in the push to self-government.

Finally, community education needs to be seen as a priority. The dialogue between Aboriginal governments and their communities requires nurturing. Several people expressed concern that change was occurring too quickly. Without the community's understanding of self-government, it was doomed to fail:

> I'm very afraid that maybe we are moving too fast. Many people just aren't involved. It's dry and difficult information to understand. Maybe 10 years from now, when we are in the implementation stage, we'll have people saying, "What is this system you have imposed on us?" I'm afraid that may happen.[cxvi]

The Ehattesaht are an example of a community that has made community education its priority. Through community meetings, newsletters, workshops, research and a creative range of other approaches, this government is attempting to nurture its reciprocal relationship with its community members. Efforts like these may help to resolve the difficulties that emerge from the new professionalism accompanying moves toward self-government.

First Nations communities must ensure that their administrators and service professionals are working in ways that are consistent with cultural and community needs, but they must also understand the limitations administrators face in attempting to assert community influence over policy and programming. First Nations self-government is supposed to be a way for the needs of communities themselves to directing services and policy. Autonomy to enable relevance is the whole point. First Nations governments cannot be expected to do this if their hands are still tied by devolution policy. Despite the appearance of increased autonomy, Lise Bastien observed,

> It is very difficult to assume responsibility for the management of something that is controlled by a government policy in which we have no say...when we propose solutions, nobody seems to be listening and there seems to be no follow-up action.[cxvii]

Another observer notes:

> ...we have to ask ourselves, `Do they [First Nations] really have control?' There are so many strings attached to the funding...the department still has control over those

services...We want to manage the money, not administer the misery that is currently there. We want the ability to manage in its true definition. That is why I say, give us the dollars and let us priorize our needs at the community and design our own procedures and controls that should be designed.^{cxviii}

The mistrust directed toward First Nations administrators seems to be the same mistrust, once removed, directed toward the department of Indian affairs. If administrators are perceived as agents of the department, then in a sense it is still departmental policy that is being attacked, but now the target has a brown face. First Nations administrators and communities need to be aware of how these complex dynamics affect their relations with the community.

Challenges

Community Health, Self-Government and Education

This paper has attempted to examine the administration of Aboriginal governments from the perspective of those engaged in governance and administration. In so doing, it has revealed several issues and tensions with which these people are grappling.

There is debate about what action needs to be taken in First Nations communities. While some argue for entrenchment of self-government in the Constitution, others argue for alcohol treatment programs in their communities. The two paths toward self-determination illustrated by these examples are not unrelated or incompatible. Both can, and must, be pursued. How can a community heal while the very basis for the abuse, the structures on which the *Indian Act* system is based, continue? Similarly, how can a community really exercise self-government if its membership is unable to participate effectively in community governance? People engaged in Aboriginal governance need to be cognizant of the need for structural remedies for colonization and oppression, as well as the need for treatment of their symptoms.

One of the most common themes in the research was the importance of communication between Aboriginal governments and their constituents. Much of the frustration expressed by administrators related to their perception that community members were not aware of the complexity of administration and governance and that involving community members in a meaningful way in governance was a difficult challenge.

- **Community education strategies need to be undertaken, and supported financially, as a key activity of governance.**

Not only will an informed community be better equipped to participate in governance, but the actual practice of community education can establish a means for dialogue, and thereby

accountability, with constituents. The need for education and training for self-government needs to include not only the formal education of staff, but the education, and healing, of community members.

The issue of constituency raised the question of the ability of Aboriginal governments to define their own membership.

- **There needs to be recognition that the right of First Nations to self-government, notwithstanding the Charter, includes the ability to determine constituency.**

However, with that ability comes the responsibility for First Nations organizations, individually and collectively, to develop mechanisms to resolve disputes.

The interrelatedness of issues in Aboriginal governments and communities highlights the difficulties of Aboriginal organizations in negotiating the complex web of federal and provincial funding programs. Federal and provincial governments do not have the capacity to respond to requests that deal with various program areas in an integrated way.

- **Funding programs of federal, provincial and territorial governments require co-ordination to recognize the integrated nature of First Nations communities' needs.**

A National Strategy for Education

There is wide consensus that education and training are key to the success of self-government. While the need to respond is critical, various tensions are inherent in tackling the issues. These include the trap of blaming the problems in Aboriginal governments primarily on the education qualifications of their people; the potential for conflict between the immediate need for trained people and an organization's desire to engage in long-term education planning; and the conundrum of increasing distance between an organization and the community it serves as a result of increasing professionalization.

Franks, like others, finds training so crucial to the success of Aboriginal self-government efforts that he questions the sincerity of the federal government in initiating a devolution policy requiring stringent evaluations of self-government units and then failing to make adequate training provisions for administrators in Aboriginal governments:

> ...training must be made available, and it must be good. Otherwise Aboriginal self-government runs the risk of falling flat on its face. The federal government must make a serious commitment to training and staffing; if it does not, its commitment to Aboriginal self-government (and to economic development) is suspect.[cxix]

The Assembly of First Nations discussion paper on First Nations education speaks to the federal obligation to provide educational resources to First Nations entitled to them under the *Indian Act* and through "...various treaties between First Nations and the Crown."[cxx] Despite these obligations, the paper concludes that the federal government seeks to avoid funding post-secondary students and elementary and secondary students off-reserve.

Resources for First Nations education continues to be a problem, according to the discussion paper. Cutbacks and shrinking resources mean that post-secondary funding may be inadequate for First Nations students. Funds for special services especially pertinent to First Nations student conditions are also inadequate. Training dollars and research funds are low. In addition, complex funding arrangements, imposed guidelines for training, and an inflexible DIAND resourcing structure means that community goals and needs for training and education can not be addressed. Community long-term planning for education would require a multi-year capital budget. First Nations have limited control over resources for all aspects of First Nations education; thus, First Nations education authorities and councils are accountable to funders and not necessarily to a First Nations community. This view that funding restricts accountability coincides with the earlier findings of Hall and Franks, as well as others. Cutbacks in post-secondary funding in 1990-91 prevented thousands of First Nations students from continuing their education plans.[cxxi] Resources are further strained by the increasing number of Bill C-31 applicants, which the federal government did not adequately predict or plan for.[cxxii] Funding levels for those who do obtain resources for post-secondary education are not sufficient to meet the rising cost of textbooks and other expenses. This does not begin address the increasing frustrations of non-status and Métis people, who do not even have access to the funding available to First Nations people with status under the *Indian Act*.

- **It is recommended that a national strategy for the funding of administrative education and training for Aboriginal students be developed by First Nations, governments, educators and community people.**

This strategy should attempt to balance the need for local control of funds (e.g., through block transfers) with the need for equitable treatment for all Aboriginal students across the country. The federal government cannot ignore its obligations to status Indians under the *Indian Act* or to parties to treaties. However, it must extend its commitment to all Aboriginal peoples, including non-status, Métis, Bill C-31, off-reserve and Inuit, especially if it is to follow up on its

constitutional commitment to First Nations education.[cxxiii] Caution is needed to ensure that these groups of people are not set up to compete with one another for scarce resources.

There is an urgent need to increase the amount of funds and support for education and training. At the same time, however, existing sources of funds require co-ordination and rationalization. Job training available through the Canadian Jobs Strategy, provincial programs, DIAND's Indian Post-Secondary Student Support Program, corporations, and so on should be co-ordinated to provide an enhanced and efficient service. More secure funding and streamlined bureaucracy would put Aboriginal people less at the mercy of federal, provincial or territorial governments, which currently hold the purse strings and are in a powerful position to assert their own agendas. This may allow greater opportunities for Aboriginal agendas to come to the fore.

- **Funds for training must become a part of all agreements for development between First Nations and governments**.

Land claims agreements, child welfare transfers, resource development schemes, etc. should routinely involve consideration of the training costs associated with such transfers of responsibility.[cxxiv]

All Aboriginal governments need to develop short- and long-term plans for education and training. Support services need to be available to assist organizations to develop such plans.

- **Two types of education funding need to be made available:**
  1. **funds for Aboriginal people to gain access to education and training, and**
  2. **funds for institutions, First Nations-controlled and mainstream, that offer relevant education and training programs.**

Support for students needs to reflect the realities of their lives and their organizations. Child care, transportation costs, moving costs and living expenses are basic educational needs. For many students, time pressures make full-time training unrealistic, given their double or triple duty as parents, workers and students, often in a culturally foreign setting. The arbitrary designation of the course load necessary to be eligible for funding is not reasonable. Similarly, funding to hire relief staff to fill in for persons away on training should be considered a fundamental cost of education for self-government.

Support services for Aboriginal students, such as preparatory courses, counselling, tutoring and student organizations, should be considered legitimate educational costs for

institutions engaged in teaching Aboriginal students. If Aboriginal students are to cope with the chilly climate of mainstream institutions, they will need support systems to encourage their efforts.

Special needs students should not get caught between conflicting jurisdictions. A co-ordinating strategy is needed to ensure that such students receive an adequate level of support during training and upon entering the workforce.

- **Funding is needed for the development of First Nations curriculum.**

This includes film production, books, pamphlets, newsletters and histories.[cxxv] Attention is needed to the cultural content available to programs that are making genuine efforts to offer training in a cultural context. Consistent with this recommendation is the continuing need for support for language and cultural institutes.[cxxvi]

Many Aboriginal people interviewed during this research had received training in the form of workshops, non-credit courses and other similar programs. They experienced frustration in attempting to transfer credit for this training to colleges and universities. Such institutions should facilitate the transfer of credit for the education and training that many Aboriginal people have already obtained. Bridging from such training to colleges and universities is important for Aboriginal students. Such training is often viewed as `second-class', yet this is what is most available, and sometimes most pertinent, to the needs of First Nations.

Alternative methods of education and training should be explored. Mentoring relationships, on-the-job training and job swapping are among the suggestions received. Such creative responses to the immediate need for training begin to address the concurrent need of Aboriginal governments to get their work done.

- **Literacy training and basic upgrading need to be considered part of the commitment to education and training for self-government.**

Funding for such programs and access to them should be facilitated so that young and old have the opportunity to get a basic education.

There is an expressed need for training for senior Aboriginal administrators. Several suggestions were heard, including the development of a professional institute (much like the Banff School of Management), a conference series, magazines and newsletters.

Local culture and history education is critical for all, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal alike. A common understanding of these lays the foundation for relationships between First

Nations and the non-Aboriginal communities they live with. Such education should occur at all levels ─ primary and secondary curriculum, community education initiatives, and post-secondary curriculum.

Finally, non-Aboriginal people need education about the history, culture, and aspirations of Aboriginal people.

- **There should be education and training for non-Aboriginal people on First Nations self-government.**

This should be at the initiation of non-Aboriginal people and governments. It is not the sole responsibility of First Nations. We are all learners and teachers as we move toward a new vision of Canada. In taking a perspective that sees us all in this together, we begin to address and move beyond blaming the victim and toward a renewed relationship between First Nations and other governments.

Notes

Bibliography

Abele, Francis. 1989. *Gathering Strength*. Calgary: Arctic Institute of North America.

Angus, Murray. 1991. *And the Last Shall Be First: Native Policy in an Era of Cutbacks*. Toronto: NC Press United.

Assembly of First Nations Education Secretariat. 1991. "The Current Situation of First Nations Education in Canada." Ottawa: AFN.

Boldt, Menno. 1993. *Surviving as Indians; the Challenge of Self-Government*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Campbell, Marie. 1988. "Administering Child Protection: A Feminist Analysis of the Conceptual Practices of Organizational Power." *Canadian Public Administration* 35/4, 501-518.

Campbell, Marie, and Roxana Ng. 1988. "Program Evaluation and the Standpoint of Women." *Canadian Review of Social Policy* 22.

Canada. House of Commons. 1983. *Indian Self-Government in Canada*. Report of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

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

Castellano, Marlene Brandt, Harvey Stalwick and Fred Wein. 1986. "Native Social Work Education in Canada: Issues and Adaptations." *Canadian Social Work Review*, 166-184.

Chapman, Ian, Don McCaskill and David Newhouse. 1991. "Management in Contemporary Aboriginal Organizations." *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 11/2.

Chomsky, Noam. 1992. *Manufacturing Consent*. Montreal: Necessary Illusions.

Cozzeto, Don. 1990. "Governance and Aboriginal Claims in Northern Canada." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 14/2.

Cozzeto, Don. 1991. "Training Native Public Administrators: Aboriginal Claims and Governance in Northern Canada." *Journal of American Indian Education* 30/2.

Cozzeto, Don. 1992. "Financing Aboriginal Government: The Case of Canada's Eastern Arctic." *Northern Indian Culture and Research Journal* 16/1.

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1991. *An Analysis of the First Nations Review of the DIAND Post-Secondary Student Support Program*. Prepared by Roland Chrisjohn, Joann Morris, Marcia Mrochuk and Janos Botschner. Ottawa: DIAND.

Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. 1992. *Indian and Inuit Training Opportunities*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Elliot, Jean Leonard, and Augie Fleras. 1992. *The Nations Within: Aboriginal/State Relations in Canada, the United States and New Zealand*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Franks, C.E.S. 1987. *Public Administration Questions Relating to Aboriginal Self-Government*. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University.

Gabriel Dumont Institute. 1992. *Towards Self-Government: A Mandate for the Nineties*. Regina, Saskatchewan: GDI.

Hall, Denis R. 1992. "Fed-Bos: The Federally Controlled Band Operated School and the No-Policy Policy." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 19/1.

Hawkes, David C., and Evelyn J. Peters. 1986. *Implementing Aboriginal Self-Government: Problems and Prospects*. Workshop Report. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University.

Hawkes, David C. 1985. *Aboriginal Self-Government; What Does It Mean?* Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University.

Hudson, Peter and Sharon Taylor-Henley. 1993. "Linking Social and Political Developments in First Nations Communities." In *Rebirth: Political, Economic and Social Developments in First Nations*. Ed. Anne-Marie Mawhiney. Toronto: Dundurn Press.

PEN International. "Silencing Native Voices, The Federal Budget and Native Communications Program." Press Release. 21 January 1991. Toronto.

Jamieson, Kathleen. 1979. "Multiple Jeopardy: The Evolution of a Native Women's Movement." *Atlantis* 4/2.

Malone, Marc. 1986. *Financing Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada*. Kingston: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University.

Metis Society of Saskatchewan. 1993. *New Breed* [Metis Society of Saskatchewan Newsletter]. Saskatoon.

National Indian Brotherhood. 1972. *Indian Control of Indian Education*. Ottawa: NIB.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. 1993. *Partners in Confederation: Aboriginal Peoples, Self-Government, and the Constitution*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Short, Ron. 1992. "First Nations Education for First Nations Learners." *Association of Canadian Community Colleges National Newsletter* 5/5.

Silman, Janet. 1987. *Enough is Enough: Aboriginal Women Speak Out*. Toronto: Women's Press.

Smith, Dan. 1993. *The Seventh Fire: The Struggle for Aboriginal Government*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.

Smith, David M. 1992. "The Dynamics of a Dene Struggle for Self-Determination." *Anthropologica* 34/2.

Smith, Dorothy E. 1987. *The Everyday World As Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Stuart, Paul H. 1990. "Financing Self-Determination: Federal Indian Expenditures, 1975-1988." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 14/2.

Urion, Carl. 1992. "Big Pictures and Paradoxes." *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 19/1.

Administration and Community

1.   How are Aboriginal organizations defining their membership or communities? How are communities defining themselves?

2.   How do Aboriginal governments facilitate communication with their communities? How do they keep their communities informed and how do communities express their ideas to governments?

3.   Who in the organizations are involved in implementing communication strategies? What kinds of issues and information form the basis of the communication?

4.   How are the administrative functions of planning, controlling and service delivery affected by community interaction with the administrative processes of Aboriginal governments?

5.   What difficulties do Aboriginal governments experience in effectively involving particular sectors of their memberships (women, youth, elders)?

6.   What difficulties do Aboriginal governments experience in communicating effectively with other governments? How does this affect the communication strategy of an Aboriginal government with its community?

Administrator Training

1.   What education (formal, cultural, historical) do Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal administrators have to prepare them for administration in Aboriginal governments?

2.   What education (formal, cultural, historical) do Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal administrators need to prepare them for administration in Aboriginal governments?

3.   How are people currently being trained to meet the planning, controlling and service delivery functions of Aboriginal government administration?

4.   What steps (short- and long-term) are Aboriginal governments taking to ensure effective education and training of current and potential administrators and service providers? What difficulties do Aboriginal governments face in educating and training administrators and service providers?

5.   What kinds of provisions should be available for education and training of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal administrators in Aboriginal governments?

Appendix 2
Participating Communities and Organizations

Association of First Nations Post-Secondary Institutes, Penticton, B.C.
Algonquin Golden Lake First Nation, Golden Lake, Ontario
Camosun Community College, First Nations Education, Victoria, B.C.
Champagne Aishihik Band, Yukon
Chemainus Native College, Ladysmith, B.C.
First Nations Tribal Justice Institute, Mission, B.C.
Fort Simpson Band, N.W.T.
Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research, Regina, Saskatchewan
Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, inuvik, N.W.T
Lethbridge Community College, Native Community Development Program, Lethbridge, Alberta
Manitoba Indian Cultural Education Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba
Metis Society of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Mi'kmaq Family and Children's Services of Nova Scotia, Shubenacadie, Nova Scotia
Missanabie Cree First Nation, Thunder Bay, Ontario
Mowachaht First Nation, Gold River, B.C.
Native Education Centre, Vancouver
New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council,   Fredericton, New Brunswick
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology, Native Public Administration, Merritt, B.C.
Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Shubenacadie First Nation, Shubenacadie, Nova Scotia
Southeast Child and Family Services, Winnipeg, Manitoba
Spallumcheen First Nation, Enderby, B.C.
Tikinagan Child and Family Services, Sioux Lookout, Ontario
University of Lethbridge, Aboriginal Management
University of Manitoba, First Nations Management Program
University of Northern B.C., First Nations Studies
University of Victoria, Administration of Aboriginal Governments
Vancouver Island Bandworkers Association, Campbell River, B.C.

Other Participants (Individuals)

Wendy Boies, New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council
Art Daniels, Metis Society of Saskatchewan
Valerie Galley, Victoria, B.C.
Phyllis Gibson, Whitebear First Nation, Carlyle, Saskatchewan
Mavis Henry, Pauquachin First Nation, Brentwood Bay, B.C.
Margarita James, Mowachaht First Nation, Gold River, B.C.
Cindy Jamieson, Six Nations of the Grand River Nation, Ohsweken, Ontario

[i] Lynne Brooks, Transcripts of the hearings of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples [cited hereafter as Tr.], Yellowknife, N.W.T., 7 December 1992, p. 160.

[ii] Tr., Port Alberni, B.C., 20 May 1992, p. 16.

[iii] Tim McNeill, Tr., Makkovik, Newfoundland, 15 June 1992, p. 129.

[iv] Ann Bayne, Tr., Watson Lake, B.C., 28 May 1992, p. 118.

[v] Rita Arey, Tr., Inuvik, N.W.T., 6 May 1992, p. 121.

[vi] Quoted in Smith, 1993, p. 33.

[vii] Alice Frost, Tr., Old Crow, Yukon, 17 November 1992, p. 246.

[viii] Johnny Naktialuk, Tr., Inukjuak, Quebec, 8 June 1992, p. 86.

[ix] Herb George, Tr., Kispiox, B.C., 16 June 1992.

[x] Interview, Valerie Galley, Victoria, October 1993.

[xi] 1993, p. 55.

[xii] Cassidy and Bish, 1989, pp. 53-55.

[xiii] Chief Norm Wesley, Tr., Moose Factory, Ontario, 8 June 1992, p. 18.

[xiv] Interview, member of the New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council, August 1993.

[xv] Elmer Herman, Tr., Fort McMurray, Alberta, 16 June 1992, p. 225.

[xvi] Cassidy and Bish, 1989, pp. 53-55.

[xvii] Cassidy and Bish, 1989, pp. 56-57.

[xviii] Doris Saunders, Tr., Happy Valley, Newfoundland, 16 June 1992, p. 116.

[xix] Cassidy and Bish, 1989, pp. 56-58.

[xx] Doris Saunders, Tr., Happy Valley, Newfoundland, 16 June 1992, p. 118.

[xxi] Interview, member of the New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council, June 1992.

[xxii] Interview, Dave Rundle, director, Southeast Child and Family Services, Manitoba, July 1993.

[xxiii] Margaret King, Tr., Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 28 October 1992, p. 145.

[xxiv] Franks, 1987, p. 33.

[xxv] Metis Society of Saskatchewan, 1993.

[xxvi] Patrick Polchies, Tr., Kingsclear, New Brunswick, 19 May 1992, p. 234.

[xxvii] Tr., Toronto, Ontario, 26 June 1992, p. 470.

[xxviii] Chief Peter Quaw, Tr., Stoney Creek, B.C., 18 June 1992, p. 99.

[xxix] Carol Gauthier, Tr., Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, 11 June 1992, p. 127.

[xxx] Diane Dokkie, Tr., Fort St. John, B.C., 19 November 1992, p. 33

[xxxi] Interview, Valerie Galley, Victoria, October 1993.

[xxxii] 1992, pp. 21-49.

[xxxiii] Franks, 1987, p. 91.

[xxxiv] Franks, 1987, p. 91.

[xxxv] Angus, 1991.

[xxxvi] Angus, 1991; Cozzeto, 1990.

[xxxvii] Hawkes, 1985, p. 18.

[xxxviii] Stuart, 1990, pp. 4-14.

[xxxix] Hall, 1992, p. 65 .

[xl] Marvin Assinewai, Tr., Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, 11 June 1992, p. 284.

[xli] Interview, July 1993.

[xlii] Interview, Joan Glode, executive director, Mi'kmaq Family and Children's Services of Nova Scotia, June 1993.

[xliii] Interview, Donna Felix, director, Spallumcheen Child Welfare Program, B.C., June 1993.

[xliv] Interview, Ron Missyabit, Manitoba Indian Cultural Education Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba, July 1993.

xlvInterview, Barbara Hume, Champagne Aishihik Band, Yukon, June 1993.

xlviInterview, Hazel Mills, business manager, Tikinagan Child and Family Services, Sioux Lookout, Ontario, June 1993.

xlviiPEN International, 1991.

xlviiiFrank McKay, Windigo First Nations Council, Tr., Sioux Lookout, Ontario, 1 December 1992, p. 64.

xlix1993, p. 201.

lChomsky, 1992.

liChapman et al., 1991, pp. 333-344.

liiClarence Fournier, Tr., High Level, Alberta, 29 October 1992, p. 55.

liiiDIAND, 1991, p. 10.

livInterview, Barbara Hume, Champagne Aishihik Band, Yukon, July 1993.

lvInterview, Joan Glode, executive director, Mi'kmaq Family and Children's Services of Nova Scotia, June 1993.

lviCozzeto, 1991, p. 1.

lviiLeon Sock, Tr., Big Cove, New Brunswick, 20 May 1992, p. 143.

lviiiDIAND, 1992.

lixCassidy, 1992, p. 24.

lxInterview, Deborah DuPont, Fort Simpson Band, N.W.T., July 1993.

lxiHolly Nathan, "Nightmare of the Shadow People", [Victoria] *Times-Colonist*, 27 July 1992, p. A7.

lxiiInterview, Valerie Galley, Victoria, October 1993.

lxiiiCozzeto, 1991, p. 6.

lxivAbele, 1989, p. xiv.

lxvCozzeto, 1991, pp. 3-10.

lxviGabriel Dumont Institute, 1992, pp. 9, 18.

lxviiInterview, Okanagan, B.C., June 1993.

lxviiiDIAND, 1991, p. 15.

lxixAssembly of First Nations, 1991; DIAND, 1992.

lxxVancouver Island Bandworkers Meeting, British Columbia, August 1993.

lxxiFranks, 1987, p. 84.

lxxiiDon Ryan, Tr., Kispiox, B.C., 16 June 1992, p. 87.

lxxiiiInterview, Donna Felix, director, Spallumcheen Child Welfare Program, B.C., June 1993.

lxxivInterview, Hazel Mills, business manager, Tikinagan Child and Family Services, Sioux Lookout, Ontario, June 1992.

lxxvDIAND, 1991, pp. 7-10.

lxxviFranks, 1987, p. 86.

lxxviiInterview, Rita Ronalds, New Brunswick Aboriginal Peoples Council, August 1993.

lxxviiiNIB, 1972; AFN, 1991.

lxxixInterview, Don Castleden, director, First Nations Management Program, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, July 1993.

lxxxHall, 1992, p. 64.

lxxxiCastellano et al., 1986.

lxxxiiInterview, Barbara Hume, Champagne Aishihik Band, Yukon, June 1993.

lxxxiiiInterview, Dave Rundle, director, Southeast Child and Family Services, Manitoba, July 1993.

lxxxivQuoted in Cozzeto, 1991, p. 4.

lxxxvUrion, 1992.

lxxxviCozzeto, 1991, p. 3.

lxxxviiInterview, Ron Missyabit, Manitoba Indian Cultural Education Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba, July 1993.

lxxxviiiDIAND, 1991, p. 18.

lxxxixUrion, 1992.

xcHall, 1992, p. 58.

xciNIB, 1972, pp. 41-44.

xcii1991, p. 2.

xciiiInterview with Ron Missyabit, Manitoba Indian Cultural Education Centre, Winnipeg, Manitoba, July 1993.

xcivInterview, Margaret Anderson, director, First Nations Studies, UNBC, Prince George, B.C., July 1993.

xcvShort, 1992, p. 7.

xcviShort, 1992, p. 7.

xcviiShort, 1992, p. 7.

xcviiiCastellano et al., 1986.

xcixCastellano et al., 1986, p. 15.

cInterview, Cindy Jamieson, Six Nations of the Grand River nation, Ontario, September 1993.

ciInterview, Don Castleden, First Nations Management Program, University of Manitoba, June 1993.

ciiCastellano et al., 1986.

ciiiDIAND, 1992.

civGabriel Dumont Institute, 1992.

cvInterview, Don Fiddler, president, Association of First Nations Post-Secondary Institutes, and executive director, En'owkin Centre, September 1994.

cviInterview, Dan Kelly, executive director, Chemainus Native College, September 1994.

cviiInterview, Sid Fiddler, director, School of Social Work, Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, September 1994.

cviiiDIAND, 1991.

cixAngus, 1991.

cxFoxcroft, 1993.

cxiTr., Moosonee, Ontario, 10 June 1992, p. 36.

cxiiCampbell, 1988.

cxiiiCampbell, 1988, p. 43.

cxivRoy Haiyupis, quoted in Smith 1993.

cxvPaul Gull, Tr., Waswanipi, Quebec, 9 June 1992, p. 139.

cxviMonague, quoted in Smith 1993.

cxviiLise Bastien, Tr., Wendake, Quebec, 17 November 1992, p. 149.

cxviiiClarence Daniels, Tr., Brandon, Manitoba, 10 December 1992, p. 140.

cxixFranks, 1987, p. 89.

cxxAFN, 1991, pp. 3-8. For an in-depth look at treaty and constitutional obligations to support First Nations education, see Assembly of First Nations, Education Secretariat, "Background Research for a Legal Opinion on Post-Secondary Education" (Ottawa: 1991); and "Treaties and Education: A Discussion Paper" (Ottawa: 1992).

cxxiUnion of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, "Communiqué to all First Nations, Indian Educators, Students and Councillors by Chief Saul Terry, President" (Vancouver: 1991).

cxxiiDIAND, 1991.

cxxiiiAFN, 1991, p. 3.

cxxivCozzeto, 1991, p. 3.

cxxvNIB, 1972.

cxxviDIAND, 1991.