

SELF-GOVERNANCE FOR FIRST NATIONS

Beyond the Nisga'a Experience—Self-Governance and Its
Perceived Benefits for the Cree of Northern Quebec
and the First Nations of Westbank (Kelowna),
Sechelt (Sunshine Coast), and Yukon

BY JANE ENRIGHT, HALINA SAPEHA, AND CONRAD WINN | NOVEMBER 2015



Ideas that change your world | www.fcpp.org



Media Inquiries and Information:

Deb Solberg

Tel: (403) 919-9335

Development Inquiries:

Samantha Leclerc

Tel: (403) 400-6862

The Frontier Centre wishes to acknowledge the generous support of the Lotte & John Hecht Memorial Foundation, without whom this project would not have been possible.

Disclaimer:

The opinions expressed in this paper are exclusively those of the independent author(s) and do not reflect the opinions of the Frontier Centre for Public Policy, its Board of Directors, staff and/or donors.

ISSN # 1491-78 ©2015

Research conducted by the Frontier Centre for Public Policy is conducted under the highest ethical and academic standards. Research subjects are determined through an ongoing needs assessment survey of private and public sector policymakers. Research is conducted independent of Frontier Centre donors and Board of Directors and is subject to double-blind peer review prior to publication.

ABOUT THE FRONTIER CENTRE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

The Frontier Centre for Public Policy is an innovative research and education charity registered in both Canada and the United States.

Founded in 1999 by philanthropic foundations seeking to help voters and policy makers improve their understanding of the economy and public policy, our mission is to develop the ideas that change the world.

Innovative thought, boldly imagined. Rigorously researched by the most credible experts in their field. Strenuously peer reviewed. Clearly and aggressively communicated to voters and policy makers through the press and popular dialogue.

That is how the Frontier Centre for Public Policy achieves its mission.

JANE ENRIGHT

Jane Enright is an expert in marketing and marketing research, a visiting lecturer at McMaster University, and COMPAS COO. Having lived and taught in remote First Nations communities, she has worked with, consulted for, and carried out research among First Nations peoples for over two decades.

HALINA SAPEHA

Halina Sapeha (PhD, McMaster University) is a research methodologist who publishes extensively on labour market issues. She previously held posts in international agencies in Europe and has worked on surveys in Canada and abroad for COMPAS.

CONRAD WINN

Conrad Winn (PhD, Wharton School), COMPAS founder, is professor of political science at Carleton University. Author of many books and professional articles, he co-authored the precursor FCPP study of Nisga'a and Tsimshian responses to the Nisga'a Treaty (2011).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5	Executive Summary
6	Introduction
7	A Follow-Up Study Among Four First Nations
8	Promise-Keeping – Four First Nations More Trusted than Nisga'a, Nisga'a More Trusted than Tsimshian
10	Honesty – Higher among Four First Nations than Nisga'a, Higher among Nisga'a than Tsimshian
11	Consulting People – Much Higher among Four First Nations than Nisga'a or Tsimshian
12	Health, Schooling, and Economic Performance – QC Cree, Yukon, and Sechelt ahead of Westbank and Nisga'a
13	Democracy – Awareness, Performance, and Value
15	Conclusion
16	Endnotes
18	Bibliography

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- COMPAS Research carried out interview-based measurement of the perceived impact of self-government on the quality of governance and services among the Westbank First Nation (Kelowna, B.C.), Yukon First Nation, the Cree of Northern Quebec, and Sechelt First Nation (Sunshine Coast, B.C.).
- This 2015 project built on the 2011 Frontier-sponsored study among the self-governing Nisga'a and the Tsimshian, a control group without self-government.¹
- Both studies were "qual-quant"—they reported findings quantitatively while their sample sizes were too small to truly qualify as quantitative. Each study involved about 100 respondents interviewed by phone, chosen randomly, and asked the same questions.
- The 2011 and 2015 studies were limited in that they gauged *perceived* effects of self-government. The studies did not analyze administrative data or other non-perceptual types of information.
- The 2011 study suggested that the self-governing Nisga'a were likely perceived as outperforming their Tsimshian cousins in delivering health and education services and in being perceived as trustworthy and honest.
- Data from the four First Nations interviewed in 2015 suggest that these four are likely perceived as more trustworthy, more honest, and consulting their people more than the Nisga'a government in 2011.
- Of the four First Nations surveyed in 2015, the three with a greater duration of self-government (Sechelt, Quebec Cree, and Yukon) are apparently perceived as providing better services than the fourth, Westbank, or than Nisga'a (2011). The self-governance experiences of Westlake and Nisga'a were shorter than the others'.
- This pattern lends support to the view that the duration of self-government may matter. By this logic, self-governing First Nations may need the passage of time to acquire the skills necessary to earn public perception of delivering quality services.
- Considered together, the findings from the two studies lend support to a mixed picture. On the one hand, the absence of self-governance does not appear to provide a fruitful experience for residents, according to their perceptions. On the other hand, self-governance on its own may not guarantee a productive future according to the perception data we collected. This mixed portrait is consistent with the findings from research on American Indian communities that both self-governance and the specific culture of a given community contribute to the quality of governance.²
- Our two studies cannot yet provide guidance for how to accelerate a self-governing Aboriginal community's perception that its governance is effective. Achieving that goal would require a broader study involving more Aboriginal communities as well as a deeper study exploring the details of community life during and following a transition to self-governance.
- The 2015 project went beyond the 2011 study in exploring the democratic knowledge and values of First Nations communities. Respondents were asked if they were aware of the claims that democracies make about themselves, how well democracies actually perform, and how much respondents would value various attributes of democracy when delivered well. The responses suggest that these communities have the cultural preconditions for democracy.

INTRODUCTION

The Nisga'a self-government agreement of 1998 set off a firestorm of controversy. Some thought it granted too many powers to the small First Nation community. Some feared that devolution of powers would not achieve the intended results in terms of heightened social and economic performance as well as good governance.

The idea of Aboriginal self-government has not been a consensual issue among the Canadian public, while it has drawn a lot of support among people with a special interest in Aboriginal matters. First Nations activists, Aboriginal community leaders, and their supporters both inside and outside Aboriginal communities have advanced the idea of self-government as a way out of many socio-economic problems.³ Academics commenting on the issue often shared their perspective.⁴

Some academics and commentators have advanced a self-government theory of progress that holds that advancement of First Nations requires some form of autonomy, devolution, quasi-sovereignty, or a kind of collective self-actualization.⁵ Other academics and commentators subscribe to a cultural development theory of advancement that deems psycho-cultural progress as the essential requirement for economic progress.⁶

Between the two camps lie individuals who just want evidence to help settle the discussion. Author and former B.C. Liberal leader Gordon Gibson forthrightly advanced the idea that objective research needed to be undertaken to gauge the actual effects of self-government. Eyeing the Nisga'a agreement in particular, he said that it was "held out as an example of the right way to settle Indian claims and *yet we simply do not know how it is working...*and cannot trust any of the three governments involved to tell us of problems."⁷

With the goal of providing objective evidence, the Frontier Centre for Public Policy engaged COMPAS Research in 2011 to carry out some interview-based measurement.⁸ One unexpected finding was some degree of flight by Nisga'a refugees. Dissatisfied Nisga'a and opponents of the treaty sought and obtained band membership in a nearby Tsimshian community. These new Tsimshian residents identified themselves as Nisga'a, maintaining close cultural ties with their community of origin. They nonetheless continued to repudiate the treaty and remained uninterested in participating in Nisga'a political life.

The loss of the Native tax exemption was the main catalyst for their departure. Many thought Nisga'a had "sold out" when signing the treaty that led to the loss of the tax indemnity. For many of these Nisga'a residing in Tsimshian communities, the tax exemption was a part of their heritage, not to mention an economic benefit that they did not want to lose.

To provide a sense of the impact of autonomy, the 2011 COMPAS study for Frontier⁹ undertook a small-scale quantitative survey of Nisga'a along with a qualitative study of a smaller sample of the Tsimshian as a control group. The report produced mixed results.

On the positive side, self-government did not appear to harm the quality of Nisga'a governance. The interview data lent support to the idea that self-governance produced a First Nations government that was more accountable, more honest, and better at promise-keeping than other levels of government. The Nisga'a government appeared to outperform the Tsimshian government in delivering health and education services and in being perceived as trustworthy with respect to delivering on promises.

On the negative side, frequency of public consultation appeared to have declined since the acquisition of self-governance, while economic conditions did not improve.

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY AMONG FOUR FIRST NATIONS

To follow up on the 2011 Nisga'a study, Frontier engaged COMPAS Research in 2015 to survey the residents of four other First Nations that had also negotiated self-government. To that end we carried out 100 interviews among the Westbank First Nation (Kelowna, B.C.), Yukon First Nation, the Cree of Northern Quebec, and Sechelt First Nation (Sunshine Coast, B.C.).¹⁰ The Yukon, Northern Quebec Cree, and Sechelt had each received autonomy prior to the Nisga'a, while Westbank acquired self-government around the time of the Nisga'a agreement.

The analysis that follows compares the experiences of Nisga'a (a quantitative sample), Tsimshian (a smaller, qualitative sample), the four communities as a whole (a quantitative sample), and Westbank (a qualitative sample). The Westbank sample was purposely a little larger to permit a slightly more robust qualitative comparison—33 interviewees as compared to 20-24 from each of the three other communities¹¹ in the 2015 Four First Nations study. Except for questions on perceptions of democracy, which were asked only in the 2015 study, all other questions were identical across the two studies and six communities.

FIELDWORK STATISTICS

Our senior interviewing team made random calls to residential phone numbers in the four First Nations communities for the purpose of completing 100 interviews.

Of 1,841 numbers dialed, 686 reached a human; 1,155 did not.

Of the 1,155 not reaching a human, there were 582 answering machines, 288 no answers or constant busy signals, 268 invalid numbers, and 17 fax machines.

Of the 686 reaching a human, 49 (7%) did not qualify, living outside the First Nations community. One hundred (15%) completed the survey, while the remaining 537 (78%) did not. The largest share not completing the survey refused before hearing the purpose of the call (319).

PROMISE-KEEPING—FOUR FIRST NATIONS GOVERNMENTS MORE TRUSTED THAN NISGA'A, NISGA'A GOVERNMENT MORE TRUSTED THAN TSIMSHIAN

If self-governance were key to causing people to trust their local First Nations government, the research would show equally high rates of trust across the four First Nations, Westbank, and Nisga'a, while trust would be lower among the Tsimshian.

If the duration of self-governance were key, one might expect trust in First Nations governments to be lower among Nisga'a and Westbank residents because their experience of self-governance was shorter than that of the three of the four communities in the 2015 study other than Westbank. If lack of self-governance depressed trust, one would expect the Tsimshian scores to be lower than all the other scores.

In practice, the Tsimshian scores seem to be lower than all the others, as shown in Table 1. If one examines only the extreme scores on the trust scale (7 vs. 1), the degree of strong trust among the Tsimshian is half of what it was among Nisga'a and less than half of what it was among the four First Nations studied in 2015. Meanwhile, extreme

mistrust among the Tsimshian was about twice the rate among Nisga'a and about 11 times the rate among the four First Nations studied in 2015.

One reasonable inference from the data on trust is that lack of self-governance may well breed a situation in which people have less confidence or trust in their First Nations government.

Unfortunately, no ready explanation comes to mind to account for why trust appears to have been less among Nisga'a than among Westbank residents. These two communities had similar time periods of self-governance—less than those of the Northern Quebec Cree, the Yukon First Nation, and Sechelt. If we assume the data to be true, the more moderate trust among Westbank and Nisga'a populations in comparison to the other autonomous First Nations may be attributable to unique features of Westbank and Nisga'a governance.

Respondents were asked not only how much they trusted

Table 1: Trusting Governments to Keep Their Promises (in per cent)¹³

		Mean on a 7pt. scale	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	DNK
Local	All Four First Nations, 2015	5.3	21	28	26	16	4	3	2	2
	Westbank, 2015	5.2	15	36	27	9	6	0	6	0
	Nisga'a, 2011	4.3	16	16	13	20	12	7	13	3
	Tsimshian, 2011	3.7	8	15	15	8	15	4	23	12
Fed.	All, 2015	3.2	4	5	17	18	12	19	23	2
	Westbank	3.2	3	3	22	16	13	28	16	3
	Nisga'a	3.4	5	3	16	21	20	13	16	7
	Tsimshian	3.3	4	8	12	19	27	0	27	4
Prov.	All, 2015	3.7	3	10	20	23	20	7	16	1
	Westbank	3.9	3	9	27	21	24	6	9	0
	Nisga'a	3.2	5	6	18	16	13	12	28	3
	Tsimshian	2.5	0	8	8	15	15	0	50	4

their local government (Table 1) but also whether promise-keeping had risen or fallen in preceding years (Table 2). The data suggest that local First Nations governments had delivered more on their promises among the four First Nations interviewed in 2015 than among the Nisga'a and Tsimshian (2011).¹² These findings suggest that self-governance on its own did not guarantee quality of promise-keeping, and that promise-keeping may have been affected in part by economic conditions that were perhaps beyond the ability of self-government to affect.

Table 2: First Nations Government Promise-Keeping (in per cent)¹⁴

	All, 2015	Westbank	Nisga's	Tsimshian
More likely to carry out its promises	60	61	46	42
Less likely to carry out its promises	12	12	35	31
Unprompted: No change	17	15	12	15
Unprompted: Don't know/refuse	11	12	7	12

HONESTY—HIGHER AMONG FOUR FIRST NATIONS GOVERNMENTS THAN NISGA'A, HIGHER AMONG NISGA'A THAN TSIMSHIAN

Our analysis compares the perceived honesty in hiring and spending among First Nations governments. The data suggest that the four First Nations researched in 2015, including Westbank, are perceived as more honest than the Nisga'a government in 2011, which was perceived as more honest than the Tsimshian, as shown in Table 3.¹⁵

Perceptions of changes of honesty seem to reveal a similar pattern, as shown in Table 4. The four First Nations examined in 2015 appear to be perceived as more honest in hiring and spending than the Nisga'a government, which may have been perceived as more honest than the Tsimshian. The pattern in changes in honesty is nonetheless not strong or extreme.

Table 3: Honesty in Hiring and Spending (in per cent)¹⁶

	Mean on a 7pt. scale	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	DNK	
Local	All, 2015	4.5	13	21	23	14	11	7	10	10
	Westbank	4.5	10	26	29	10	10	3	13	6
	Nisga'a	3.9	16	16	13	20	12	7	13	3
	Tsimshian	3.2	4	8	12	12	19	0	27	19

Table 4: Any Change in Honesty Since the Agreement (in per cent)

	All, 2015	Westbank	Nisga's	Tsimshian
More honest—that is, its hiring and spending decisions treat everyone more fairly than before	53	52	41	31
Less honest—that is, its hiring and spending decisions favour local government leaders and their friends	12	12	41	31
<i>Unprompted:</i> No change	26	27	10	19
<i>Unprompted:</i> Don't know/refuse	9	9	9	19

CONSULTING PEOPLE—MUCH HIGHER AMONG FOUR FIRST NATIONS GOVERNMENTS THAN NISGA'A OR TSIMSHIAN

Major differences seem to emerge between the four First Nations on the one hand and Nisga'a and Tsimshian on the other with respect to their patterns of consulting their publics. By a factor of at least 3:1, interviewees among the four First Nations, including those in Westbank, believe that their local First Nations government is consulting people more often rather than less often compared to the past, as shown in Table 5.

By contrast, opinion among Tsimshian is about evenly divided on whether consultation is on the upswing or in decline.

Among Nisga'a, slightly more people believe that there is less consultation today than in the past—51% vs. 39%. Nisga'a see at least as great a decline in consultation as do Tsimshian and far more than in the Westbank, Yukon, and Sechelt communities, as shown in Table 5.

The surprising pattern among Nisga'a may mean that patterns of consultation are explained as much by a community's traditions and its own culture of consultation or non-consultation as by the duration of self-governance.

Table 5: Level of Local First Nations Government Consultation With the Public Compared to 10 Years Ago (in per cent)

	All, 2015	Westbank	Nisga's	Tsimshian
More often	49	45	39	42
Less often	15	12	51	35
<i>Unprompted:</i> No change	22	30	3	8
<i>Unprompted:</i> It does not consult everyone	2	3	2	0
<i>Unprompted:</i> It never consulted everyone and it doesn't today	1	3	1	4
<i>Unprompted:</i> Don't know/refuse	10	6	4	12

HEALTH, SCHOOLING, AND ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE—QC CREE, YUKON, AND SECHELT GENERALLY AHEAD OF WESTBANK AND NISGA'A

Health, schooling, and economic performance can provide the best case that self-governance works and that length of self-governance is itself important too. The Tsimshian appear to underperform all the others on all measures, at least in terms of perception. Their health services, schooling quality, and financial opportunities seem to be perceived as having declined, as shown in tables 6-8. Taken as a whole, the findings tend to support the view that self-government enhances the lives of those who are affected by it.

The two communities with the shortest periods of self-governance—Westbank and Nisga'a—appear to outperform the Tsimshian while underperforming compared to the older self-governing communities:¹⁷

- Respondents in Westbank and Nisga'a are about evenly divided in saying that health and schooling services have improved or declined, while the scores for the four communities interviewed in 2015 are decidedly favourable overall and the scores for the Tsimshian, unfavourable;
- A similar pattern emerges in the case of financial opportunity.

This pattern lends preliminary¹⁸ support to the view that the duration of the experience of self-government has value, too. By this logic, First Nations communities not only need autonomy but also need some passage of time to acquire the skills necessary for the delivery of quality services.

Table 6: Health Services Compared to 10 Years Ago (in per cent)

	All, 2015	Westbank	Nisga's	Tsimshian
Better	55	30	46	19
Worse	18	30	41	50
<i>Unprompted: No change</i>	20	27	10	27
<i>Unprompted: Don't know/refuse</i>	7	12	3	4

Table 7: Schooling Compared to 10 Years Ago (in per cent)

	All, 2015	Westbank	Nisga's	Tsimshian
Better	40	27	41	19
Worse	14	21	42	61
<i>Unprompted: No change</i>	20	6	10	4
<i>Unprompted: Don't know/refuse</i>	26	45	7	15

Table 8: Amount of Money People Have Compared to 10 Years Ago (in per cent)

	All, 2015	Westbank	Nisga's	Tsimshian
More Money	51	48	19	8
Less Money	27	36	60	85
<i>Unprompted: No change</i>	10	3	12	8
<i>Unprompted: Don't know/refuse</i>	12	12	9	0

DEMOCRACY—AWARENESS, PERFORMANCE, AND VALUE¹⁹

The 2015 project went beyond the earlier study in exploring the democratic competencies of First Nations communities. Respondents were asked about their awareness that democratic societies make certain claims about themselves. They were then asked how well the democracies deliver on their claims. Finally, they were asked to score the value of these features of democracy if and when delivered well.²⁰ Responses tended to be very similar across all four communities.

Irrespective of community, respondents showed high awareness of all eight features about which they were queried,

as shown in Table 9. Such awareness suggests that First Nations communities may well have the cultural foundation or requirements for expectations of good governance.

Asked how well democracies actually perform, respondents across all four communities were much more confident that they protect the right to own private property and offer free elections than that they provide honest judges or transparent government, as shown in Table 10. Meanwhile, respondents were virtually unanimous in assigning maximum value to each of the features about which they were asked, as shown in Table 11.

**Table 9: Awareness of Selected Features of Democratic Countries²¹
(7=high awareness) (Patents pending)**

	Mean All=58	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Free elections	5.6	31	29	19	14	2	2	3
Right to criticize government	5.5	29	29	21	14	2	2	3
Honest judges	5.5	29	28	22	14	2	2	3
Transparent government	5.4	26	31	22	12	3	2	3
Peaceful society	5.4	26	31	21	16	2	2	3
Good schools	5.4	29	29	19	14	2	2	5
Good health care	5.4	29	29	19	14	2	2	5
Right to own private property	5.4	29	29	19	14	2	2	5

**Table 10: Actual Achievements of Democratic Countries²²
(7=high achievement) (Patents pending)**

	Mean All	Mean Westbank	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Right to own private property	5.3	5.4	24	20	35	13	7	0	2
Free elections	4.9	5.4	23	7	35	19	11	2	4
Good schools	4.7	4.5	7	20	31	25	9	5	2
Right to criticize government	4.6	4.9	11	20	29	20	7	5	7
Good health care	4.5	4.3	4	15	33	31	9	6	2
Peaceful society	4.2	4.3	11	7	23	30	18	7	5
Honest judges	4.2	3.9	7	9	30	23	14	13	4
Transparent government	3.5	3.8	5	4	20	21	21	16	13

**Table 11: Perceptions of Value²³
(7=high value) (Patents pending)**

	Mean All	Mean Westbank	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Peaceful society	6.7	6.6	89	2	5	2	0	2	0
Honest judges	6.7	6.6	89	2	5	2	0	2	0
Right to criticize government	6.7	6.6	89	2	5	2	0	2	0
Good schools	6.7	6.6	89	2	5	2	0	2	0
Good health care	6.7	6.6	89	2	5	2	0	2	0
Free elections	6.7	6.6	88	4	5	2	0	2	0
Right to own private property	6.7	6.6	88	4	5	2	0	2	0
Transparent government	6.7	6.6	86	5	5	2	0	2	0

CONCLUSION

The data lend support to a mixed picture. On the one hand, the findings suggest that the absence of self-governance does not provide a positive experience for residents—at least not according to their own perceptions. On the other hand, self-governance cannot on its own guarantee a productive future as perceived by residents.

If self-governance were all that is required, there would be common or shared perceptions of achievement among all the communities that experienced self-governance. But their only common thread is that their perceived experiences appear to be better than that of the one community studied that lacks self-governance, the Tsimshian. The self-governing communities studied so far appear to have positive experiences according to their publics, but not consistently or predictively so.

A major study of American Indian communities found that “there is no one solution that fits every tribe.”²⁴ Each community, say the authors, will require “tribally specific” cultural ways of satisfying the transparency, honesty, and performance requirements of good, fruitful governance.

If self-governance had been problematic for First Nations in Canada, the 2011 and 2015 Frontier/COMPAS studies of perceptions in six communities would likely have produced findings that cast a poor light on self-governance. These two studies yielded no such negative findings. To the contrary, the burden of findings from these two studies is that the presence of self-governance is more likely to increase community trust and satisfaction than its absence.

Unfortunately, our two studies cannot yet provide guidance for how to enhance or accelerate the perceived effectiveness of self-governance. Achieving that goal would require a broader study involving more Aboriginal communities and a deeper study exploring more details of community life both during and following a transition to self-governance.

We can nonetheless share some verbatim thoughts provided by respondents in the 2015 study on why their own communities might be doing better or worse than other self-governing First Nations communities.²⁵ The verbatim quotes listed in the sidebar above tend to point to the quality of individual community leaders or councils as key reasons for success or failure in self-governance.

VERBATIMS—WHY RESPONDENT'S OWN COMMUNITY IS DOING BETTER OR WORSE THAN OTHER SELF-GOVERNING COMMUNITIES

We're doing much better—we have a new chief and council (Quebec Cree).

Millions of dollars that were provided for land settlement were spent not that wisely. People have no employment, we had suicidal cases here, and there [are] not enough Aboriginal/cultural programs. They are awarding word-of-mouth contracts (Yukon).

Our community is doing better; we started changing the laws and we care better about the environment (Yukon).

We are doing way better—the chief is good here (Westbank).

We are doing a lot better than some of the communities in the south. We have many departments within our government to deal with different affairs, like for example land department, economic planning and so on, and many cultural elements are incorporated into the government structure (Yukon).

We're doing better because we have access to roads, we can go south, and food is not that expensive as in other northern communities (Quebec Cree).

We're doing better because the (First Nations) government follows through on its initiatives and has good financial management (Yukon).

ENDNOTES

¹Joseph Quesnel and Conrad Winn, *The Nisga'a Treaty Self Government and Good Governance: The Jury Is Still Out*, (Winnipeg: Frontier Centre for Public Policy, 2011), http://archive.fcpp.org/files/1/PS108_NisgaaTreaty_JN25F2.pdf.

²See conclusion in Stephen Cornell and Joseph P. Kalt's "Where's the glue? Institutional and cultural foundations of American Indian economic development," *Journal of Socio-Economics* 29 (2000): 443–470.

³Mohawk activist Gerald Taiaiake Alfred, director of Indigenous Governance at the University of Victoria, has called on Aboriginal communities to assert their inherent rights without seeking recognition from other governments. See Alfred's *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom* (Toronto: Broadview Press, 2005).

⁴Professors Kiera Ladner, John Borrows, Kent McNeil and many others have advocated Aboriginal self-government as a solution to First Nation problems. See Ladner, "Visions of Neo-Colonialism? Renewing the Relationship with Aboriginal Peoples," *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* XXI, (2001): 105–135; McNeil, "The Inherent Right of Self-Government: Emerging Directions for Legal Research," prepared for the First Nations Governance Centre, Chilliwack, B.C. (2004); Borrows, "Tracking Trajectories: Aboriginal Governance as an Aboriginal Right," *UBC Law Review* 38 (2) (2005): 285–314; and Frances Abele with Michael J. Prince, "Four Pathways to Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada," *American Review of Canadian Studies* (2008).

⁵Alfred argued eloquently for this side of the argument. See also the preceding note.

⁶For the cultural development theory of progress, see Samuel P. Huntington and Lawrence E. Harrison in *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress* (New York: Basic Books, 2000). See also Frances Widdowson and Albert Howard, *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry: The Deception Behind Indigenous Cultural Preservation* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008). Nobel Laureate Douglass C. North wrote extensively about the cultural foundations of economic development. See, for example, his *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance* (Cambridge University Press, 1990). For an important study of culture as a driver of development among American Indian communities, see Cornell and Kalt, 443–470.

⁷Gordon Gibson, *A New Look at Canadian Indian Policy: Respect the Collective—Promote the Individual* (Vancouver: Fraser Institute, 2009), 180. Emphasis in the original.

⁸Quesnel and Winn.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰The sample as a whole can be treated as quantitative subject to the proviso that the distribution of respondents across the four communities was not reflective of their sizes. The Cree and Yukon populations are far larger than those of Westbank and Sechelt. The sub-samples of interviewees among the four communities were purposely about equal to allow the study to reflect about equally the experiences of the four separate First Nations. Interviewing was completed in September 2015.

¹¹The four communities and the number of respondents in each are: Westbank First Nation (Kelowna, B.C.) 33, Yukon First Nation 24, Crees of Northern Quebec 23, and Sechelt First Nation (Sunshine Coast, B.C.) 20. The gender split was 48:52 male-to-female with a mean age of 59.

¹²Statistically significant at the 0.05 level or better in both t-tests and Anova.

¹³"How much do you trust the [local First Nations/federal/provincial] government to do what it promises? Please use a 7-point scale where 1 means you don't trust them to do what they promise and 7, you do trust them to do what they promise."

¹⁴In 2015: Promise-keeping up compared to 10 years ago. In 2011: Promise-keeping up over the past 13 years.

¹⁵Tsimshian responses are significantly different from those of the four First Nations studied in 2015 at the 0.05 level or better in both t-tests and Anova. Nisga'a responses are significantly different from the four First Nations in t-tests at the 0.05 level, but only at the 0.1 level in the Anova-Tukey test.

¹⁶"How much do you trust officials of the local First Nation government to be honest and not to favour themselves or their friends when hiring or spending money? Please use a 7-point scale where 1 means you don't trust them to be honest and 7, you do trust them to be honest."

¹⁷Westbank and Nisga'a scores are lower than for all four First Nations studied in 2015. If the Westbank data had been removed from the combined results for the four communities interviewed in 2015, the results for the remaining three communities would have been higher.

¹⁸We qualify the finding as "preliminary" or tentative because of the possibility that administrative and implementational aspects of these services affected some of the responses.

¹⁹The questions on democracy are proprietary and subject to patents pending.

²⁰As a transitional question, respondents were asked the following: "Thinking of the idea of 'democracy' or 'democratic political system,' is this something you feel that you understand (in per cent)?" About four-fifths of respondents claimed some degree of awareness.

²¹"Some countries in the world call themselves democratic and say that they have the following democratic features. To what extent have you been aware that they claim to have these features? Please use a 7-point scale where 1 means no awareness that democracies claim each of these features and 7, high awareness."

²²"How much have the democratic countries got done or achieved with respect to these features? Please use a 7-point scale where 1 means no or little achievement and 7, high achievement."

²³"How valuable do you find each of these features? Please use a 7-point scale where 1 means no or little value and 7, high value."

²⁴See conclusion in Cornell and Kalt, 443–470.

²⁵"Have you an opinion about whether your community is doing better or worse than other First Nations communities that have self-governance, too?" (Open-ended.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abele, Frances, and Michael J. Prince. "Four Pathways to Aboriginal Self-Government in Canada." *American Review of Canadian Studies* (2008).
- Alfred, Taiaiake. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Toronto: Broadview Press, 2005.
- Borrows, John. "Tracking Trajectories: Aboriginal Governance as an Aboriginal Right." *UBC Law Review* 38 (2) (2005): 285-314.
- Cornell, Stephen and Joseph P. Kalt. "Where's the glue? Institutional and cultural foundations of American Indian economic development," *Journal of Socio-Economics* 29 (2000): 443-470.
- Gibson, Gordon. *A New Look at Canadian Indian Policy: Respect the Collective—Promote the Individual*. Vancouver: Fraser Institute, 2009, 180.
- Huntington, Samuel P. and Lawrence E. Harrison. *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Ladner, Kiera. "Visions of Neo-Colonialism? Renewing the Relationship with Aboriginal Peoples." *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* XXI (2001): 105-135.
- McNeil, Kent. "The Inherent Right of Self-Government: Emerging Directions for Legal Research." Prepared for the First Nations Governance Centre, Chilliwack, B.C. (2004). <http://portal.publicpolicy.utoronto.ca/en/ContentMap/AboriginalAffairsCanada/Aboriginal%20Policy%20and%20Governance%20Documents/Inherent%20Right%20to%20Self%20Government%20-%20Emerging%20Directions%20for%20Legal%20Research,%20McNeil,%202004.pdf>.
- North, Douglass C. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Quesnel, Joseph and Conrad Winn. *The Nisga'a Treaty Self Government and Good Governance: The Jury Is Still Out*. Winnipeg: Frontier Centre for Public Policy, 2011. http://archive.fcpp.org/files/1/PS108_NisgaaTreaty_JN25F2.pdf.
- Widdowson, Frances and Albert Howard. *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry: The Deception Behind Indigenous Cultural Preservation*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008.

