COMMUNITY MODELS OF INDIAN GOVERNMENT

by

Robert L. Bish
University of Victoria

COMMUNITY MODELS OF INDIAN GOVERNMENT

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

There are two different ways to approach community models of Indian Government. One is to follow the European tradition of associating a government with sovereignty, and looking for *the* model of Indian government which will facilitate the assumption of Indian government sovereignty over Indian affairs. While citizens may have a voice in such governments, governments themselves create governments and set the rules for governing. This is the tradition Indians have been subject to in Canada.

The second approach is to consider the authority to govern as stemming from inherent right of citizens to create and control their own governments, with explicit recognition that citizens will create different governments for different purposes, and with explicit recognition that citizens will be citizens in more than one government simultaneously. This approach stems from consensus, covenants, compacts, and constitutions created by citizens and no single government possesses sovereignty. I believe this latter approach is most philosophically consistent with Indian attitudes toward governance: that is, Indian people have an inherent right to govern themselves; self-government is not simply something to be granted by the Canadian government. Equally important, the latter approach leads to a focus on *different models for different functions* and is also a much more useful and practical way of thinking about government as Indians reassume control over their own affairs.

In this paper, I will take as given the right of any person to have a voice in the creation of his or her governing institutions. From this perspective, I will briefly 1) examine the range of activities Indians are likely to want to control; 2) explain the matching of different models of government with different activities; 3) examine the relationships among different governments, and 4) indicate some special issues that First-Nation people must face. Throughout this analysis, I will draw on examples from the organization and operation of local governments (not because local governments are subordinate to higher governments) because local governments in some countries do possess considerable independence, including constitutional independence in some U. S. states, because local governments in these states represent solutions created by local

1

citizens, and because these solutions cover a wide range of different activities, many of which are the same ones Indians must deal with.

Upon conclusion, I hope to show you the usefulness of thinking about multiple models for the governance of Indian Affairs.

THE RANGE OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

Governments undertake a vast range of functions. In 1986, in a paper for the Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en Tribal Council, I provided a list of 47 functions for discussion as to whether the function was critical, important, useful, or not necessary for Gitksan-Wet'suwet'en control (see the Appendix). These functions were divided into regulations applying to everyone within Indian territory (e.g., business practices, building codes, fisheries, forestry, land use control), regulations applying to First-Nation citizens regardless of location (e.g., family law, citizenship), public services within Indian territory (e.g., courts, fire protection, policing, roads, sewers) and public services for First-Nation citizens regardless of location (e.g., child welfare, higher education). The purpose of the list was not just to decide which were critical to Indian self-government, but to begin to discuss how different services were from each other and why it is useful to provide different services through different governing mechanisms. For purposes here, it is useful to examine some differences among functions.

General Regulations versus Specific Services

Regulatory authority can potentially span a wide range of activity. For example, businesses can be regulated in terms of hours of opening or in order to provide adequate parking and many citizen activities can be regulated, including for noise, burning, control of animals or firearms. Such activities require governments that are representative of and widely sensitive to citizen concerns and preferences and need to be very representative. In contrast, some activities are quite specific, such as managing a water supply system or sewage disposal plant, and these activities can often be governed by a board that is responsible only for that function.

2

Nature of the Function: Culturally Sensitive or Impersonal

A second important dimension of government activity is whether the activity is very culturally sensitive, such as policing, family law, welfare, childcare or education. Not only must government policies reflect cultural sensitivity, but the provision of these activities involves direct personal relationships between government employees and citizens. Unless both policies and individual employees are culturally sensitive, such activities are unlikely to be satisfactory to citizens.

In contrast, other activities are totally impersonal. Activities such as water supply, road paving or street lighting are not culturally sensitive. While Indian governments may want to make general policy decisions concerning such activities, it is more important that they be provided in a technically competent manner than that the individual employees be culturally sensitive to Indian concerns.

Scale of Activity

There are two components to the scale of an activity. One is the scope of the shared concern. At one extreme, for example, a reliable water supply may be of paramount concern to only a small village, while at the other extreme, all Natives will share a concern for constitutional matters in dealing with the Government of Canada. Between the extremes, different concerns will be shared by different sized groups. Several bands may have shared concerns within a common territory as is encompassed by a tribal council or Nation of culturally or linguistically related groups.

The second dimension of scale relates to production efficiency. Some activities may be performed efficiently for a very small group such as a village, but others may best be performed for a larger number of people. For example, a village of 50 or 60 people can look after its roads and wells, but a school would offer more to students if it could serve at least 400 to 600 people. In some cases, such production efficiencies for functions best done on a larger scale can be done jointly with non-Indian groups – as when an Indian village and a non-Indian municipality jointly share a dump or sewage disposal plant. Other times, especially for culturally sensitive activities, several bands may need to

go together to share resources, as when a professional social worker serves several small bands at once because each band separately would find the costs too high.

<u>Observations on the Range of Activities</u>

Governments undertake a large number of diverse functions. Some are very general, others are quite specific; some involve impersonal technical production, others must be provided in a culturally sensitive manner; some are of paramount concern to only a small group, others are of widespread concern; some may be efficiently produced on a small scale, others may possess economies of scale. All governmental systems must accommodate to this diversity.

MATCHING GOVERNMENTS TO DIVERSE FUNCTIONS

Governments can be matched to diverse functions in different ways. One approach is for all authority to be concentrated in a single government, as in Great Britain, with that government delegating authority to lower level governments, special authorities, crown corporations, boards and commissions. Another approach is to have constitutional division of jurisdiction between two or more governments, as in Canada, with each further delegating authority downward. A third approach is for rules concerning the creation of governments to be set out in a constitution, with citizens then following those rules to create governments to resolve problems as they deem necessary. While the source of jurisdiction is very important philosophically – and for some functions – similar systems often emerge even though one may be based on delegated authority and the other on constitutionally based authority. The fact that similar systems emerge provides very strong evidence that there are significant advantages in using different governments for different functions. This evidence is very important for Indians because Indian governments must deal with an exceptionally broad range of functions – involving functions provided by a variety of local, provincial and national governments in the rest of Canada. This is why it is critical that Indians begin to analyze different models of government for different functions. This analysis will also involve consideration of how centralized Indian governments wish to be. To aid in understanding

the potential role of different governing institutions, some general characteristics of different kinds of governments need to be described.

General Governments

Non-Indian governments include national, provincial, municipalities, counties, or in B.C., regional districts. The major form of general Indian government is the Indian Act Band government. Characteristics of general government include:

- elected officials, either at-large or by sub-area
- a broad range of regulatory and public service functional authority
- the same boundaries for many functions
- the possible extension of jurisdiction to citizens and beyond boundaries
- a diverse capacity to raise funds
- to deal with its wide variety of functions, committees, boards, commissions and subordinate organizations may be created
- if the government becomes large with many functions, elected officials will have less control over details and administrators will become policy makers.

The major advantage of general governments is their broad authority. Their major disadvantages include:

- the boundaries will be either too large or two small for some functions
- their size will be either too large or too small for providing some of the services efficiently
- if the government is very large or undertakes a wide variety of functions, citizens will have difficulty indicating their preferences on any single activity, especially if elections for officials are the major way preferences are indicated
- if the government is very large or undertakes a wide variety of functions, the government may be dominated by bureaucrats instead of elected officials. This may be an advantage for technical functions but not for functions where citizen preferences differ from those of producers.

To accommodate to problems of size or complexity, and sometimes to specifically eliminate "political" influence, other governing institutions are needed.

Boards and Commissions

Boards and commissions are generally treated together, as different governments label similar organizations differently. Boards and commissions are generally appointed by general governments. Their major characteristics include:

- providing more specialized policy making for a single important function (e.g., policing, traffic control, recreation programs)
- removal of elected officials from direct control (e.g., policing)
- budget authority is usually limited to a recommendation to a general government ; they seldom possess independent taxing authority
- they may be created to deal with a small area of a larger general government (e.g., a downtown development commission) or may be created by two or more general governments to provide cooperative service provision over a larger area.

The major advantage of boards and commissions is the ability to obtain closer scrutiny over a particular policy area by officials who are responsible to elected officials (and who are not just employees) and to adjust to cover an area that is either smaller or larger than the general government. They also provide for more participation in policy making by interested citizens who have a special interest in or special knowledge of an activity. The major disadvantage of boards and commissions is that they may become unresponsive to the average citizen.

Special Purpose Governments

Special purpose governments have different labels in different government systems, the most common of which are improvement districts, school districts and special districts. They are independent governments, not subordinate to general governments. Their most important characteristics include:

- a single or relatively narrow range of functional authority
- elected officials
- boundaries which differ from those of general governments
- limited taxation or other revenue raising authority.

The major advantage of special governments is their separating out of specific functions, often with unique boundaries and operating independently from other governments with a governing board directly elected by citizens. These elected officials can become experts on their functions while still being directly responsible to citizens through the electoral process. Special governments are most common for providing services in rural areas (water districts, fire protection districts), for providing education, and for functions where the most practical boundaries differ from the boundaries of general governments.

Each major kind of government – general, boards and commissions, and special purpose governments – has advantages and disadvantages for performing different functions. Before turning to the usefulness of these different kinds, plus hereditary governments, for First-Nations, it is useful to examine important characteristics of the relationships among governments, both for their importance in how First-Nations governments relate to one another and to understand how First-Nations governments could fit into Canada.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG GOVERNMENTS

Governments have many cooperative and competitive relationships with one another. In this section only a few relationships are clarified – relationships where the use and meaning of some terms differ in Canada from elsewhere.

Federalism

The key characteristic of federalism is that citizens are simultaneously citizens (or members) in more than one government and citizens interact directly with the different governments. The jurisdiction of different governments is set out in a constitution, and

disputes among governments are resolved in a "neutral" forum, such as a court. The basic idea of federalism can be extended to include local governments (as it has been in some U.S. states), and Indian governments as well as national and provincial governments.

Confederation

The key characteristic of a confederation (as the term is used in political science) is that citizens are members of a basic government and those basic governments, not citizens directly, interact with another larger government. The basic governments are themselves essentially independent countries, where the confederation government is created by a treaty among the basic governments. This treaty may be equivalent to a constitution.

A confederation-type relationship would exist if provincial governments created and ran a national government instead of citizens voting for national officials directly. Indian governments would have a confederation-type relationship with the national government if Indian citizens only elected band officials and only those officials dealt with the Canadian national government. Many tribal councils are confederations of bands, where bands retain basic authority but have agreed with other bands to delegate some of that authority to the tribal council.

Delegation

Delegation exists when a government delegates jurisdiction to another government, but the delegating government can revoke the delegated authority at its own discretion. Delegation can be used to create a system that operates like a federal system (as with local governments in some U.S. states and most Canadian provinces). Delegation also creates some operational characteristics of a federal system where Indians deal directly with Indian governments for some services, but with provincial or the national government for others. Of course, philosophically and in major conflicts, a delegated system is much different than a true federal one where each government possesses its own constitutional jurisdiction that cannot be unilaterally changed by either government.

Indian governments currently possess ambiguous status in Canada. For the most part, Indian governments possess jurisdiction as delegated by the national government and individual Indians interact directly with both Indian and non-Indian governments in a federalism-type manner. For a few other activities, however, individual Indians have constitutionally specified aboriginal rights which non-Indian governments must recognize (e.g. fishing) in a true federal manner. Finally, in still other activities, Indian governments negotiate treaties with non-Indian governments, and relationships are like those among independent countries. Indian governments also use confederation-type relationships among themselves, as when a group of band governments forms a tribal council.

Understanding the differences among these relationships is important for the future because there will be major differences for Indians depending on whether the development of First-Nation government evolves toward integration in a federal system where Indian governments possess constitutionally specified jurisdiction on some matters but Indians continue to deal with other governments on other matters, or whether a treaty based confederate-type system emerges where Indians deal with Indian governments and those governments in turn deal with non-Indian governments.

ISSUES FOR FIRST-NATIONS

Within and among First-Nations governing structures are evolving. Some have been imposed by the Canadian national government, others are based on tradition and others are emerging in response to opportunities that arise to solve a particular problem or take advantage of an opportunity. All models of government are included in this evolution: general governments, boards and commissions, special purpose governments and relationships among governments include federal, confederal and delegated jurisdiction. Within this evolution, several issues need explicit discussion and analysis. The issues I have selected may not include every issue that is important to all First-Nations, but they are issues that arose in researching *Indian Government: Its Meaning and Practice*.

Hereditary or Traditional Governments

Many First-Nations have continued to use, or have expressed a strong preference to return to, traditional governing structures. Some of these structures involve hereditary selection of leaders, others are based on other selection procedures within families, clans, houses or tribes. These traditional governing processes can perform the functions of either general or special purpose governments, but one needs to pay attention to the division of labour and knowledge between traditional leaders and other citizens so that the interests and skills from all can be utilized. When considering a division of labour, it must be recognized that traditional leaders may well have been raised to emphasize particular aspects of Indian culture. For example, future leaders may be raised to assure that they understand the relations of their people to traditional resources such as fisheries, wildlife, and forestry, but these leaders may not be particularly knowledgeable of or interested in the problems of running a water system or street lighting system for a village or of developing and running an alcoholic rehabilitation centre. Thus, within hereditary systems, it is extremely important to create either boards or commissions or special purpose governments so that those citizens who are not leaders in a traditional sense have the opportunity to play a leadership role in the functions they are interested in. The result will be a dispersion of authority among a larger number of citizens and more citizens will play important decision-making roles in the community.

Territorial and Citizen-based Governments

For some functions, an Indian government would exercise those functions within a particular territory, e.g., the provision of roads or water supply. For other functions, the Indian government would exercise authority over their citizens even though those citizens resided outside the territory, e.g., family law and adoptions. These jurisdictional responsibilities cause no particular problems.

A question that is often raised by non-Indian governments is how non-Indians residing on Indian territory are to be treated, and how are their concerns to be taken into account in governing processes. This issue was, for example, an issue in the Sechelt

agreement between the Sechelt Band and the Government of British Columbia. This issue requires an answer, but I do not believe it is a particularly difficult one.

All countries, including Canada, follow the practice of permitting non-citizens to reside within their territory without giving those residents a voice or vote in governmental matters. At the same time, it is required that such residents are treated fairly. I see no reason why First-Nation governments cannot follow similar practice. First-Nations are not "ethnic" governments where problems could arise with the Charter of Rights; First-Nations are like any other government where citizenship is based on legal status as defined by the First-Nation itself. Non-citizens who reside within their boundaries do not need to be allowed to vote, any more than Canada or provincial governments allow non-citizens to vote.

The Size of First-Nation Governments

No government is the right size and covers the appropriate geographical area to perform every function well. This is why, over time, more and more larger and smaller and special purpose governments are created to supplement basic general governments. In addition, more governments or boards and commissions provide greater opportunity for citizens to play important roles in their community.

Most general Indian governments are small. This means that the major reason for creating boards or commissions just to serve that government's citizens will be to provide a special focus on a particular function such as education or economic development. The second reason for creating boards, commissions or special purpose governments will be to undertake activities over a larger area in cooperation with other governments. For example, a board may be created to provide social services to several bands or an economic development commission may be created cooperatively by several bands and non-Indian municipalities to promote economic development within a region. Tribal Councils are also an example of a larger government, usually created on a confederation basis by bands to provide services or represent bands on a larger scale than any single band can do on its own. The same is true of provincial and national Indian associations.

First-Nations should anticipate the use of a variety of governing institutions. The variety will be necessary to deal with the wide variety of functions First-Nations will perform, and in many cases bands, commissions or special purpose governments will be the appropriate way to organize the provision of services jointly with non-Indians.

Balance Among Elected (or Hereditary), Appointed and Administrative Officials

One of the most important decisions for any government is the division of responsibility between elected, appointed and administrative officials. The trade-offs are reasonably clear: as a government grows in size and in the number of functions it performs, it is both increasingly difficult for elected officials to be involved in each activity and it is relatively more important for officials to be experts in their specialized area of work. Thus, the relative influence of elected officials declines relative to the influence of administrators. While the expertise of administrators is needed, it must be recognized that administrators usually bring to their work the perspective of a producer and not that of a consumer. Possessing a producer's perspective is usually preferred when dealing with technical functions such as water systems, sewage disposal or road construction, but for human services and culturally sensitive services maintaining a consumer's perspective is critical. The critical role of the elected official is to maintain a balance between the perspective of citizens who receive services and administrators who produce them. Some understanding of both perspectives is necessary.

As governments grow, the way elected officials remain knowledgeable about specific services is by dividing responsibility among themselves by techniques such as assigning each elected official to be responsible for different functions either through a portfolio system or through committees of council. And for some very important functions, council may prefer to create an appointed board or commission comprised of some council members and other citizens to reduce the burden on council and provide supervision over service provision. This expansion of representation of citizen-consumers helps maintain a citizen-consumer perspective in government.

<u>Relationships Among Citizens and Non-Indian Governments</u>

The relationship between individual Indians and non-Indian governments can take two directions. If First-Nation governments are viewed as part of the Canadian federal system, Indians would deal with First-Nation governments on functions where First-Nation governments possess jurisdiction and with non-Indian governments on other issues. For example, if the Canadian national government maintained jurisdiction over licensing of airplane pilots, an Indian who wished to become a pilot would deal directly with the appropriate Canadian government agency. This is the approach taken in <u>Indian Government: Its Meaning in Practice</u>.

In contrast, if First-Nations were to adopt a confederation instead of a federal model, individual Indians would always deal with a First-Nations government, which would in turn deal with other governments in Canada. Because of the relative smallness of Indian governments, it is very likely that under a confederation model the major role of First-Nations governments would be negotiations with other governments. A preoccupation with confederate, or in an extreme, foreign relations is not generally conducive to well managed domestic activity, and in the extreme, a focus on foreign relations can lead to neglect of important services for Indian people.

<u>The Centralizing Tendencies of Conflict</u>

The government systems which appear to be most responsive to citizens include many different governments and many opportunities for citizens to participate in positions of responsibility. Such systems have evolved in non-Indian society, are evolving among First-Nations, and are needed within First-Nations because of the great variety of functions First-Nations need to be responsible for. Such multi-centred systems, however, are difficult to maintain in the face of external threats where survival itself requires a martialling of virtually all resources just to deal with the external threat. The most extreme example of external threat is "war", but continued adversarial relations with provincial and the national government over land claims or involvement in major court cases can also create an environment where all of a community's resources are needed to sustain that conflict. This is an environment where there is a tendency to want

to centralize authority and resources in one government, and to neglect other functions. Some leaders also have a preference for such and environment, which enhances their stature and visibility.

While many First-Nation governments in Canada have been on an adversarial footing with non-Indian governments, centralization has not occurred to as great a degree as might have been anticipated. Many different First-Nation governments, not only band governments, but boards and commissions and special purpose governments (including agreements with non-Indian governments) have continued. This network will be extremely valuable, and should be expected to grow, as the position of First-Nations in Canada becomes more secure.

CONCLUSIONS

In this presentation on community models of Indian government, I have focused on issues that my past work has indicated are important for the development of First-Nation governments, while recognizing that Indians themselves must ultimately decide what issues are most important to them.

I have tried to make my perspective clear. I believe the evidence indicates that decentralized systems where different governments are used to perform different functions and which provide many opportunities for citizens to assume responsible positions as officials perform best in meeting citizen needs – and I believe this perspective fits the nature of First-Nation communities as I have come to know them. And it is the tradition that very participatory First-Nation governments will find most compatible as they assume more and more responsibility. Building on this recognition, I have explained some of the variety of functions First-Nation people need to organize to provide, and some characteristics of different models of governments, including general governments, boards and commissions and special purpose governments. I have also tried to clarify relationships among governments – especially the difference between federal and confederal systems. Finally, I have tried to bring out some special issues for First-Nation governments. I pose these issues as questions to be considered, not as a set of

answers. I hope raising these issues is of use to you in your own deliberations because ultimately, it is you, who are responsible for creating the institutions under which you and your children will be governed in the future.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONNAIRE ON FIRST-NATION
SELF GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS

REGULATION WITHIN FIRST-NATION TERRITORY

Function	Critical	Important	Useful	Not Necessary
Air Pollution Control	_____	_____	_____	_____
Airport & Air Traffic Controls	_____	_____	_____	_____
Animal Control	_____	_____	_____	_____
Business Licenses	_____	_____	_____	_____
Business Practices (weights, measures, taxi meter checking, consumer lending, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Building Codes (including electrical and plumbing)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Communications (TV reception, re-broadcasting & Radio broadcasting	_____	_____	_____	_____
Criminal Law	_____	_____	_____	_____
Civil Law	_____	_____	_____	_____
Firearms	_____	_____	_____	_____
Fisheries Regulation	_____	_____	_____	_____
Food & Drugs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Forestry Practices	_____	_____	_____	_____
Fire Inspection	_____	_____	_____	_____
Labour Market Regulation (minimum wage, unions)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Land Use (zoning, sub-division control)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Liquor Sales and Use	_____	_____	_____	_____
Motor Vehicle (ownership, operation, insurance)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Noise	_____	_____	_____	_____
Property Law (land titles, sales mortgages)	_____	_____	_____	_____

Function			
Water Pollution	_____	_____	_____	_____
Weed Control	_____	_____	_____	_____
Wildlife Regulation	_____	_____	_____	_____

REGULATION OF FIRST-NATION CITIZENS, INCLUDING NON-RESIDENT CITIZENS

Function	Critical	Important	Useful	Not Necessary
Citizenship	_____	_____	_____	_____
Family Law (marriage, divorce, inheritance, adoptions)	_____	_____	_____	_____

PUBLIC SERVICES WITHIN FIRST-NATION TERRITORY

Function	Critical	Important	Useful	Not Necessary
Cemeteries	_____	_____	_____	_____
Courts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cultural Centre	_____	_____	_____	_____
Economic Development Programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Education (schools, adult education, apprenticeships)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Electricity Production and/or Distribution	_____	_____	_____	_____
Fire Suppression	_____	_____	_____	_____
Hospitals	_____	_____	_____	_____
Libraries	_____	_____	_____	_____
Museums	_____	_____	_____	_____

Function	Critical	Important	Useful	Not Necessary
Parks	_____	_____	_____	_____
Policing	_____	_____	_____	_____
Public Health	_____	_____	_____	_____
Public Transit	_____	_____	_____	_____
Recreation Programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Streets, Sidewalks, Streetlights	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sewers & Sewage Disposal	_____	_____	_____	_____
Solid Waste Collection & Disposal	_____	_____	_____	_____
Water Supply	_____	_____	_____	_____
Workers' Compensation Insurance	_____	_____	_____	_____

PUBLIC SERVICES FOR FIRST-NATION CITIZEN INCLUDING NON-RESIDENT CITIZENS

Function	Critical	Important	Useful	Not Necessary
Child Welfare (daycare)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Higher Education (colleges and universities)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Welfare Programs	_____	_____	_____	_____

OTHER REGULATIONS OR PUBLIC SERVICES

Function	Critical	Important	Useful	Not Necessary
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

GUIDELINES FOR SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION FOR IMPLEMENTING FIRST NATION JURISDICTION OVER A FUNCTION IDENTIFIED AS CRITICAL OR IMPORTANT TO SELF-GOVERNMENT

FUNCTION:_____

FOR:_____
      (define the "group")

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR ACTIVITIES COMPRISING THE FUNCTION (For example, policing is comprised of patrol, homicide investigation, crime labs, information systems, jails, etc. Fire Services include suppression, prevention and investigation. Activities are often performed by different organizations.)

CURRENT RESPONSIBILITIES (Function or a couple major activities):

      Source of formal jurisdiction:

      For provision decisions:

      For financing:

      For production or regulation:

      Who benefits?

      Who bears the costs?

      Is there fiscal equivalence?

      How are officials held accountable?

PROPOSED JURISDICTION AND RESPONSIBILITY:

Jurisdiction:

Provision decisions:

Financing:

Production or regulation:

Who benefits?

Who bears the costs?

Is there fiscal equivalence?

How will officials be held accountable?

RELATIONS TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS AND NEIGHBOURS

Overlaps or gaps in jurisdiction over people with another government?

How does jurisdiction relate to non-natives in the geographic area?

HOW SHOULD PRODUCTION OF THE SERVICE OR ENFORCEMENT OF THE REGULATION BE UNDERTAKEN?

Do FN members possess the management and operational skills to undertake production?

Can training programs be developed to provide necessary skills?

Is there another government agency with which an intergovernmental agreement or contract may be useful?
If so for which activities comprising the function?

Would a contract with a private business (perhaps one owned by a member) or non-profit society be useful?

What kind of costs are likely for the preferred option?

WHAT OBJECTIONS DO YOU ANTICIPATE WILL BE FORTHCOMING IF THE FN ASSUMES JURISDICTION OVER THIS FUNCTION?

ARE THE OBJECTIONS PRIMARILY RELATED TO TURF? PATERNALISM? OR POTENTIAL NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES FOR OTHERS?

FROM THE INFORMATION DEVELOPED IN ALL SECTIONS ABOVE, WHAT ARE THE MOST DIFFICULT PROBLEMS FOR FN JURISDICTION?

WHAT ARE SOLUTIONS?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bish, Robert L., <u>A Practical Guide to Issues in Gitksan-Wet'Suwet'en Self Government</u>.
    Prepared for the Gitksan-Wet'Suwet'en Tribal Council. School of Public
    Administration, University of Victoria, Victoria, B. C.: March 21, 1986. (Specific
    questions concerning the development of First-Nation governments)

Bish, Robert L., <u>Local Government in British Columbia</u>. Union of B.C. Municipalities,
    Richmond, B.C., 1987. (An examination of how different kinds of governments
    are used for different functions)

Cassidy, Frank and Robert, L. Bish, <u>Indian Government: Its Meaning and Practice</u>.
    Oolichan Books and the Institute for Research on Public Policy, 1989. (An
    analysis of the evolution of First-Nation governments within the Canadian federal
    system and development of a federal model which includes constitutional status
    for First-Nation governments)

Ostrom, Vincent, Robert L. Bish and Elinor Ostrom, <u>Local Government in the United
    States</u>. Institute for Contemporary Studies, San Francisco, 1988. (An explanation
    of the philosophy and development of a multi-centred governmental system,
    including evidence that such systems outperform more centralized ones)