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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines 21 First Nations in Canada who scored highly on the 2011 Community Well-being Index (CWB), which is computed by researchers at the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs (INAC) after each census. The CWB Index includes Statistics Canada data related to incomes, labour market participation, educational achievement and housing quality. 11 of these 21 high-achieving First Nations are located in British Columbia, well above the province’s share of First Nations nationally (32 percent). The others are scattered throughout Canada, showing that high achievement for First Nations is not limited to any single region.

The authors discuss commonalities to many of the 21 successful First Nations, including geographical proximity to non-Aboriginal municipalities, willingness to capitalize economically on whatever local advantages exist, a smaller average population than other First Nations, their use of land as an economic asset, fiscal responsibility, good governance, trust in talented leaders and independence from INAC. They conclude the following as the seven habits of highly-effective First Nations:

1. Recognizing the economic potential of land.
2. Taking advantage of local opportunities.
3. Remaining flexible through diverse investments.
4. Respecting and supporting effective leaders.
5. Running a businesslike, economic government.
6. Taking control of decision-making from INAC.
7. Willingness to cooperate with others, including non-First Nations communities.

The authors acknowledge that “many First Nations, particularly those in remote northern and rural locations, may have none of these advantages and thus may have to look for other pathways to success. But even in such situations, there can be promising opportunities.” Where implementable, the “seven habits of highly-effective First Nations” constitute a template for progress.
INTRODUCTION

Much has been written about the difficulties faced by First Nations in Canada, but less about those First Nations that are succeeding in raising their standard of living to general Canadian norms. Earlier research has highlighted the importance of stable governance adhering to the rule of law and respect for property rights. Here we want to go farther by putting the spotlight on a sample of First Nations that are demonstrably doing very well for themselves. This research strategy assumes that the study of success will generate lessons that can be applied by other First Nations as they work towards improving their own standard of living. Popular culture has absorbed the phrase “the seven habits of highly effective people” from Stephen R. Covey’s best-selling book of the same title. In this paper, we are looking for “seven habits of highly effective First Nations” (we drop the article “the” because we do not want to imply that there are only seven habits characterizing successful First Nations).

The original plan for this research was to look at the “Top 20” First Nations as measured by their score on the 2011 Community Well-being Index (CWB). The CWB is computed by researchers in the Department of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) after every quinquennial census. It aggregates data collected by Statistics Canada about incomes, labour market participation, educational achievement, and housing quality. Each of these four dimensions is normalized and weighted equally to produce an overall score, the CWB, ranging in principle from 0 to 100.

Note that the CWB is a community measure; it does not include information on members of a First Nation who live off reserve. Other research strategies are required to study the individual well-being of those people. Also, the CWB measures certain things but not others; it does not include data on cultural integrity, community solidarity, language retention, health and longevity, and many other things that First Nations people may value highly. But even if the CWB does not measure everything, what it does measure is universally admitted to be important. First Nations leaders unanimously speak about the importance of higher incomes, more jobs, better education, and better housing. Success in these areas is not incompatible with retention of cultural values and may even be helpful; for example, a more prosperous community will have more to spend, if it chooses to do so, on linguistic and cultural preservation.

Chart 1 shows CWB scores for First Nations and non-aboriginal communities over the years 1981-2011.
Average scores have been improving for both First Nation and other communities during this 30-year period, but the 20-point gap between the two has remained more or less constant, after appearing to close a little towards the end of the 20th century. First Nations on average lag behind other Canadian communities, but there is also much variation among First Nations themselves. For 2011, their CWB scores ranged between 39 and 78 (after eliminating the 2.5% outliers at either end of the distribution). At the upper end, the CWB of First Nations is very close to the Canadian average.7

CWB scores for the First Nations examined in this study range from 73 to 83 (high-end outliers were included). The sample is comprised of 21 rather than 20 cases because seven First Nations were tied at 73 and we didn’t want to arbitrarily exclude any of them. The 21 cases are listed in the Appendix. It should also be noted that the sample was drawn from a database compiled for earlier research that includes a large number of variables relevant to governmental and economic performance, variables that are central to this analysis.8 Some high-scoring First Nations are not in that database because we could not obtain information on all relevant variables. Thus this group may not be literally the “Top 21,” but it is certainly a set of 21 First Nations that have been successful in raising their standard of living and whose performance is worthy of close study.

The research is based on publicly available information found in websites and media reports about the Top 21, supplemented by statistical information as mentioned above. It fills a gap in the literature between individual case studies, which rely on site visits and interviews, and statistical studies of the entire set of First Nations. It is meant to be a group portrait of outstanding success.

A somewhat similar piece of research was published by INAC in 2013.9 That study was based on a sample of 25 First Nations with above-average CWB scores, five of which are also included in this report. However, the researchers did not employ statistical methods. They interviewed chiefs and other community leaders to collect their opinions about economic development and distilled their impressions into generalizations. As with this study, they discovered the importance of usable property rights and stable, businesslike governance. They also emphasized ways in which the Indian Act and INAC regulations often impede First Nations from making progress in the world of business. Though the present study takes a more statistical approach towards establishing empirical generalizations, its findings are consistent with those of the INAC project.
PLACES AND PEOPLE

Eleven of the 21 First Nations in the sample are in the province of British Columbia, whereas the remaining ten are scattered across six other provinces and the Northwest Territories. Why the concentration in British Columbia? For one thing, that province has a disproportionate number of First Nations — 198 out of 617, or 32% of the Canadian total. But the discrepancy in our sample (11/21 = 52%) is even greater than that. One possible explanation is that no treaties were negotiated in most of British Columbia. A study by INAC researchers found that First Nations in British Columbia and elsewhere who never signed "Historic Treaties" (i.e., 19th century land-surrender agreements) tend to have higher CWB scores and higher rates of improvement than those who did sign such treaties. The causality behind this finding is unclear but may have something to do with the way in which the 19th century treaties promoted a culture of dependency. That would be deeply ironic: the absence of treaties in British Columbia and the Atlantic provinces has been one of the main grievances of the modern aboriginal rights movement, and yet maybe First Nations were better off without them.

Another explanation may lie in the realm of culture and geography, i.e., the characteristics of British Columbia’s First Nations and the way that land reserves were allocated by the colonial government. Most BC First Nations relied on fisheries, especially salmon, either on the Pacific Coast or along the shores of inland lakes and rivers. The colonial government awarded them a large number of small reserves located near fishing stations rather than a smaller number of big reserves. As a result, aboriginal peoples were broken up into numerous bands for administrative purposes, and these bands became today’s First Nations. For example, the Shuswap (Secwepemc) people are one cultural and linguistic nation, yet they are divided today into 17 bands or First Nations scattered around the mountains of southeastern BC. That, in a nutshell, is why BC has a disproportionate number of Canada’s First Nations. Moreover, the creation of Indian reserves around fishing stations led many reserves to be located near cities or towns, because the new settlers also wanted to exploit the fisheries and take advantage of transportation by water in such a mountainous province.

Every one of the 11 BC First Nations in the Top 21 is located either within or not far from a municipality. The Musqueam Indian Band is within the city of Vancouver, and the Tsawout First Nation is only 15 minutes north of Victoria. Other members of the group on Vancouver Island are located near the towns of Sooke and Campbell River. On the mainland but not far from the coast, member First Nations will be found near the cities of Mission and Chilliwack; and in the interior, near Osoyoos, Invermere, and Barriere. None of the 11 BC First Nations in the sample is in a situation even remotely comparable to the often impoverished First Nations in the northern parts of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario, hundreds of kilometres from any urban settlement and reachable only by airplane or winter road.

Location near a town or city offers many advantages for economic progress, including the following:

- Jobs;
- Consumer goods whose price is lower because of retail competition;
- Markets for the fish, game, and agricultural produce of the reserve;
- A much wider range of educational opportunities than the small schools on Indian reserves can offer;
- Availability of professionals, such as lawyers and accountants, needed by entrepreneurial First Nations;
- Demand for land that can be used for industrial, commercial, residential, and recreational purposes.

Thus it is not surprising that BC First Nations located near towns or cities are the largest group in this sample of successful First Nations.
The location variable is more complicated outside of British Columbia. The Membertou First Nation occupies an urban reserve in Sydney, Nova Scotia; and the Madawaska Maliseet First Nation is situated close to Edmundston, New Brunswick. The other eight First Nations in our group are in a variety of locations, sometimes quite far from any town or city other than their own community. But there are some recurrent themes. Several are in prime recreational country, such as the Buffalo Point First Nation on the Lake of the Woods, and the Whitefish River First Nation on Georgian Bay. The Chippewas of Rama First Nation are on the shore of Lake Couchiching, near Orillia, and even more importantly are licensed to operate a major casino. Others are taking advantage of local resource development plays, such as the Fort MacKay First Nation on the Athabasca River in the Alberta oil sands, and the Matachewan First Nation, located in the mining and forestry country north of Temiskaming, Ontario.

Pulling these situational features together results in the generalization that successful First Nations capitalize on whatever locational advantages they have, typically including one or more of the following:

- Multiple business advantages offered by location within or near a town or city;
- Recreational country, especially on waterfront;
- Nearby resource development, which can include oil and gas, hard-rock mining, forestry, and specialized agriculture, such as grape-growing and wine-making.

There is no single path to progress except to make use of whatever advantages are available.

It is perhaps noteworthy that these 21 First Nations are considerably smaller than average. Their mean membership total is 910, versus 1556 for the entire database. Other things being equal, it may be easier to raise the standard of living of a smaller group using the territorially based development strategies pursued by these First Nations. Land and location are their major resources, so the benefits of exploiting these resources would be more thinly spread among a larger population. Larger population would be an asset if a First Nation were pursuing an Asian-style development strategy based on cheap labour and manufacturing, but that is not happening in Canada. So, for the foreseeable future, smaller than average First Nations, assuming they have locational advantages, may improve their CWB scores more rapidly than larger ones would be able to do. This finding, however, should be considered quite tentative. The Top 21 sample does not include large and prosperous Iroquois First Nations in Ontario and Quebec that do not allow Statistics Canada to conduct a census enumeration.

Because British Columbia First Nations are so numerous in this group, Coast and Interior Salish linguistic-cultural backgrounds are especially well represented. But the group of 21 also includes Dene, Cree, Ojibwa, and Algonquian (Mi’kmak and Maliseet) First Nations. Such ethno-cultural dispersion suggests that success as defined here is not narrowly tied to any particular tribal heritage and should be attainable by many First Nations if other conditions are favourable.
THE WEALTH OF FIRST NATIONS

The economic development of the Top 21 has brought with it not only more revenue for those First Nations but greater independence. They have financial assets (mostly in INAC trust accounts but some in conventional financial instruments): an average of $8.49 million for the Top 21 in 2013-14, versus a mean of $4.2 million for the entire database. They are generating more own-source revenue from property taxes and business operations: an average of 39% of their annual budgets, versus 28% for all the First Nations in the database (Note: the percentage of own-source revenue would never reach 100% because First Nations, like other municipalities in Canada, receive various transfers from senior governments.)

Business success has turned these First Nation governments into serious economic players, with money in the bank, reliable credit histories, and substantial cash flows coming primarily from government but bolstered by their own-source revenues. The benefits also show up in CWB scores, which measure not the wealth of the First Nation government but the standard of living of the whole community, including personal income, labour force participation, education, and housing.

What exactly are they doing to earn this additional revenue and enhance their standard of living? Although there is no single business strategy, certain themes frequently appear.

First and foremost is the use of land as an economic asset. At least half a dozen of these First Nations have marketed residential developments, which can be either seasonal recreational dwellings or permanent homes. This brings in money up front in the form of pre-paid leases as well as an annual income flow through property taxes and service fees. Beyond this, almost all of the Top 21 are in the commercial real estate market, leasing land for small retail stores as well as large shopping centres. Perhaps the most unusual leasing project is the contract by the Osoyoos Indian Band to host a British Columbia provincial prison.

A great deal of the economic activity falls into the interrelated categories of hospitality and recreation. These First Nations have numerous hotels, conference centres, restaurants, golf courses, marinas, and campgrounds. There are four major casinos plus smaller establishments such as bingos. Some deliberately invite tourism by holding cultural events and promoting native arts and crafts. All these activities involve using land as an economic resource (sometimes leased to outside operators), but they also involve members of the First Nation as workers and entrepreneurs. When band members are earning income, not just receiving rents or government transfers, there are positive effects on education and housing.

Some First Nations also generate income from their reserve lands or traditionally used lands and waters by exploiting natural resources. The Lidlii Kue, Matatchewan, and Simpcw First Nations are involved in hard-rock mining by furnishing workers as well as investing in projects. The Fort MacKay First Nation is known for participating in the oil sands through local service and labour contracting agreements. Wee Wai Kai pursues fish farming in Pacific waters, while the Membertou First Nation has a commercial fishing enterprise in the Atlantic. The Osoyoos Indian Band is famous for its production of grapes and wine — a specific form of agriculture.

It is noteworthy that Fort MacKay is the only one of the Top 21 to base its business strategy on the petroleum industry. Dozens of First Nations in western Canada have been earning royalties from oil and gas for decades. Sometimes the amounts have been very large and have led to major business developments, such as the creation of Peace Hills Trust by the Samson Cree Nation. Yet oil-rich bands have not generally achieved high scores on the CWB index. This phenomenon is worthy of further investigation, but Indian Oil and Gas Canada, which manages all oil and gas resources on behalf of First Nations, puts little information in the public domain. One hypothesis worth pursuing is that the paternalistic approach taken by Canada in this area (management of resources by a government agency) has not stimulated entrepreneurship and workforce participation as much as the bottom-up, self-determination strategies pursued by the Top 21.

Some of the Top 21 have approached natural-resource exploitation differently, taking advantage of current trends in environmentalism. The Tsou’ke, Alderville, Whitefish River, and Simpcw First Nations are developing various forms of green energy — wind, solar, and run-of-river hydro — depending on circumstances. The Leq’a:mel First
Nation is making a business of environmental monitoring. Finally, many of these First Nations have set up their own programs of job training, sometimes in connection with their own enterprises, such as construction companies, sometimes as part of their labour-force contracting with outside business partners.

In short, these First Nations have developed business strategies to take advantage of their lands and location. Lacking large populations for manufacturing, or highly skilled work forces for technology, or large pools of capital for investment, they are capitalizing on the one factor of production in which they are relatively strong — land, with attendant location and resources. Control of land can lead to real estate leasing, then to hosting hospitality and recreational industries, and in some cases to development of natural resources. Also, these First Nations are trying to leverage their lands and resources in order to foster entrepreneurship and job creation, rather than simply collecting rents.
GOVERNANCE

Eleven of the top 21 First Nations have an Indian Act form of local government, with elections for chief and council every two years. The other ten have customary government, in which the chief and council are chosen in various ways, including inheritance, elite co-optation, and various forms of election. In previous quantitative studies with larger samples, Flanagan has tested the Indian Act/custom government difference as a variable and has never found it to achieve statistical significance as an explanatory factor. It seems the most important thing is what government does, not how it is chosen. This is consistent with the finding of the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development that native government works best when it is “culturally appropriate.”

On the Aboriginal Governance Index (AGI) developed by Flanagan and Johnson, the Top 21 have an average score of 33.8, versus 25.5 for the entire database. This was to be expected because the AGI was calibrated against CWB scores to test its validity. It was, therefore, a foregone conclusion that the Top 21 would have above-average scores on the AGI.

The results become more meaningful when we drill down more deeply into the data. One important dimension of the AGI is recognition of the economic value of land and respect for property rights, to the extent that is possible within the limited confines of the Indian Act. Of these 21 First Nations, 15 have adopted some form of local taxation, mostly property tax applied to leaseholds. Such taxation can be an important generator of own-source revenue for bands. Nine of these First Nations have entered the First Nations Land Management Agreement, and seven others are working towards that goal. Being accepted into the Agreement allows a First Nation to escape the strictures of the Indian Act and manage its reserve lands without constant recourse to INAC for approval of transactions.

These First Nations also make greater use of Certificates of Possessions (CPs). The CP is the highest form of private property available on Indian reserves under the Indian Act. It is similar to ownership in fee simple except that the holder can transfer the CP only to another member of the same First Nation. Only four of these First Nations have no CPs at all. The overall prevalence of CPs in this group is about two and a half times as high as for First Nations as a whole. Earlier work shows that the prevalence of CPs on a reserve is strongly correlated with higher housing quality, as CPs allow some of the advantages of home ownership, although not including increase of equity because of the restricted re-sale market.

Another dimension of the AGI is fiscal responsibility, and here our group of 21 also performs very well. Only one, Buffalo Point First Nation, was in any level of default management at the time of data collection. In other words, these First Nations balance their budgets and pay their bills on time. Even though there is nothing intrinsically wrong with borrowing money for capital projects and business investment, the limited fiscal base of First Nations governments gives them good reason to be cautious. Only three of these 21 (Membertou, Cape Mudge, and Osoyoos) have entered the borrowing facility of the First Nations Finance Authority.

Interestingly, the Top 21 economize on paying their leaders, even though these leaders seem to be running successful governments. Returns for 2013-14 filed under the First Nations Financial Transparency Act show that the Top 21 spent an average of $4309 per on-reserve resident in compensating chief and council, compared to an average figure of $5371 for the entire database. This is consistent with earlier research showing that, after controlling for the effect of several other factors, level of compensation is negatively correlated with CWB scores. It is even more impressive considering that these First Nations are smaller than average and thus do not have the advantage of economies of scale. Overall, successful First Nations tend to spend more money on business investments and services for their members and less on making their leaders wealthy. Some chiefs and councillors who exercise executive functions are indeed highly compensated, but overall payment to political leaders is kept within bounds.

An important generalization is that the Top 21 have taken steps to escape the control of the Department of Indigenous and Northern Affairs. Approving certificates of possession gives individual band members control over parcels of land. Participating in a land management
agreement gives a First Nation more discretion in the use of its reserve lands. Instituting local taxation generates revenue in addition to federal transfers. Running a balanced budget gives the Department no reason to appoint outside managers. These First Nations are exercising sovereignty and self-determination in a day-to-day practical sense by managing their own business affairs responsibly and profitably.

Another generalization that virtually leaps off the page is the importance of leadership. Some of the Top 21 leaders are nationally known public figures. The transformative impact that Chief Clarence Louie has had upon the Osoyoos Indian Band is almost legendary. Also well-known is the role that Bernd Christmas, the first Mi’kmaq to graduate from law school, played along with Chief Terry Paul in bringing prosperity to the Membertou First Nation. Having this kind of effect requires time. Clarence Louie has been the Osooyos chief since 1991. Bernd Christmas took ten years away from his law career, starting in 1995, to run the Membertou development corporation.

Other Top 21 leaders may not have the public profile of Louie, Christmas, and Paul but have spent years and even decades as chiefs pushing the development of their First Nations. In at least 13 of these 21 First Nations, the same chief has been in office for ten years or more. A few examples: Ernest Campbell in the Musqueam Indian Band, 2000-2014; Joanna Bernard, Madawaska Maliseet First Nation, 2003-2013; Sharon Henry, Chippewas of Rama First Nation, 2000-2014. A few have even been in power for decades. For example, John Thunder, and before him his father, have led the Buffalo Point First Nation for more than 40 years. Jim Boucher has been chief of the Fort MacKay First Nation for 27 of the last 32 years.

Tabulating years spent as chief does not do full justice to the continuity of leadership observed in the Top 21. Long-serving chiefs were frequently councillors before assuming the top job. They also often serve as executive director of the First Nation’s government and/or CEO of the band’s development corporation before, during, or after their tenure as chief. This kind of double-duty would be considered conflict of interest in the larger Canadian society but is probably unavoidable in the small world of First Nations. A community of a few hundred people is lucky to find even one talented, hard-driving leader in its midst.

Of course, governance is not perfect, even among this high-performing group. Successful First Nations have not created utopia; they live in the real world of aboriginal politics, in which many structural features promote factionalism, corruption, nepotism, and conflict of interest. Thus leaders sometimes get into dubious situations. For example, Buffalo Point hereditary chief John Thunder has been embroiled in multiple conflicts since 2013 — with a dissident faction in the band that wants to oust him; with cottage owners complaining about the level of property taxes on their leaseholds; and in a personal feud with Senator Don Plett, which led to the chief’s conviction and conditional discharge on a charge of criminal harassment. Another example is Chief Paul Sam, who headed the Shuswap Indian Band for more than three decades. He was denied re-election in 2014 after revelations that he and his ex-wife were both being paid more than $200,000 a year, and his son was earning more than $500,000 a year as head of the Kinbasket Development Corporation.

Long tenure in office and close relationships among people in small communities can certainly create problems. Individualized leadership may also create future problems. Will the Osoyoos Indian Band continue to be so successful once Chief Clarence Louie retires? On balance, however, it is clear that strong and durable leadership has been one of the keys to success for First Nations.
SEVEN HABITS OF HIGHLY EFFECTIVE FIRST NATIONS

It might be objected that what these First Nations have done has little to do with their success. Maybe they were just lucky because their prosperity arises from being situated near urban areas, or in an attractive recreational location, or near natural resources that were ready for exploitation. But fortunate location cannot be the only cause of success because some of the Top 21 were in rocky shape less than 25 years ago. The Osoyoos Indian Band was under third-party management when Clarence Louie became chief in 1991. Membertou had been running budget deficits for a decade before the team of Chief Terry Paul and CEO Bernd Christmas took over in 1995. "Luck is only helpful to the prepared mind," said Louis Pasteur. Good location is certainly important, but it takes intelligence, leadership, and discipline to recognize opportunities and turn them into actual advantages.

Here, then, are "seven habits of highly effective First Nations" as they emerge from the collective portrait painted in the preceding pages. Highly effective First Nations:

1. **Recognize the economic potential of land.** This is not always easy for First Nations because of their emotional investment in land. Having lost so much land already, they naturally see what remains to them not just as real estate but as a national homeland. Yet their land, location, and natural resources are also their most significant economic assets. Without surrendering ownership, the Top 21 are converting these assets into wealth and income.

2. **Take advantage of opportunities.** The Top 21 pursue quite different development strategies depending on where they are located. Those situated near towns and cities host housing estates, shopping centres, office parks, and golf courses. Those near water have campgrounds, marinas, and vacation homes. Those near natural resources enter into partnerships with forestry, mining, and oil companies.

3. **Remain flexible.** The Top 21 are still in the early stages of economic development, and their comparative advantages are far from clear. Thus, they experiment with different types of investment. They are also aware that they are seeking not just the highest rate of return on investment, they are also trying to create opportunities for jobs and entrepreneurship for their members. A diversified portfolio of investments will offer a wider range of opportunities for members with different talents, skills, and levels of education.

4. **Respect transformative leadership.** The members of these First Nations vote for and in other ways support effective leaders, giving them a decade or more to implement their vision of a better future.

5. **Run a businesslike, economical government.** The Top 21 keep their budgets in balance and do not overpay their chiefs and councillors, though they may reward those in executive positions. They will turn against leaders who exploit their positions for purely personal rewards.

6. **Take control.** Highly effective First Nations have taken over the levers of decision-making from INAC. They manage their own lands and levy their own property taxes, thus exercising sovereignty and self-determination in a practical, everyday way. This allows them to move “at the speed of business,” not the speed of government.

7. **Cooperate with others.** One of Stephen Covey’s seven habits, "think win/win," is particularly important in this context. First Nations people make up about 2% of Canadians; those living on reserve, who are the focus of this research, are about 1%. They can only prosper by entering into cooperative relations with other Canadians. Put in simplest terms, First Nations have to sell things that other Canadians want — their labour, their resources, the advantages
of their location — to obtain a contemporary Canadian standard of living. Cooperation demands a degree of mutual trust, and First Nations have many reasons to be mistrustful of other Canadians. Yet the Top 21 have been able to reach out — to hire the advisers and managers they need, to find investment partners, to invite other Canadians to do business, to enjoy themselves, sometimes even to live on their reserves. These seven behavioural principles will not serve to elevate all First Nations out of poverty. They were distilled by analyzing the success of First Nations capitalizing on their land, location, and natural resources. Many First Nations, particularly those in remote northern and rural locations, may have none of these advantages and thus may have to look for other pathways to success. But even in such situations, there can be promising opportunities. For example, the urban reserve initiative in Saskatchewan has been successful in allowing some rural First Nations to make measurable economic progress. Where opportunities exist, the “seven habits of highly effective First Nations” constitute a template for progress.
# List of “Top 21” First Nations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Nation</th>
<th>CWB</th>
<th>Province/Territory</th>
<th>Located in or near:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musqueam Indian Band</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Point First Nation</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Lake of the Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liidlii Kue First Nation</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>Fort Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuswap Indian Band</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Invermere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madawaska Maliseet First Nation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>Edmundston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort MacKay First Nation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Fort McMurray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsou’ke First Nation</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Sooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsawout First Nation</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderville First Nation</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Rice Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tzeachten First Nation</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We Wai Kai (Cape Mudge)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Campbell River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitefish River First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Georgian Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matatchewan First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Temiskaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewas of Rama First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Orrillia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membertou First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miawpukek First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>Conne River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skowkale First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpcw First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Barriere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osoyoos Indian Band</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Osoyoos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leq’a:mel First Nation</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell River Indian Band</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Campbell River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ENDNOTES


7. Ibid.


15. The Indian Oil and Gas Canada website has a contact list of First Nations but publishes no information about production or revenues, http://www.pgic-iogc.gc.ca/eng/1100110010161/1100110010162.


