

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, A HAIDA CASE STUDY: IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIVE PEOPLE OF THE NORTH

CATHERINE SHAPCOTT,
#3 — 6 Washington Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario,
Canada, M5S 1L2.

ABSTRACT / RESUME

The relevance of conventional environmental impact assessment (EIA) to Native people is limited by the values of the dominant culture's world view, and the structures and policies created out of them. The traditional Native world view, as exemplified by the Haida, links people with their land base, and is community oriented and consultative.

La pertinence de l'évaluation de l'effet écologique classique (EEE) pour les autochtones est limitée par les valeurs des idées de la culture dominante sur le monde, et par les structures et la politique qui en découlent. Les idées traditionnelles autochtones sur le monde, comme les montrent les Haida, relient les gens à leur terre, et s'orientent vers la communauté, et procèdent de manière consultative.

Introduction

This paper focuses upon environmental impact assessment (EIA), resource management, and the relevance of these notions to Native people. The participation of Native people within established environmental impact assessment process and practice is examined, along with scenarios which might be more appropriate in the event greater numbers of Aboriginal people gain sovereignty over their lands. The James Bay Cree and Inuit, the Inuvialuit of the MacKenzie Delta and Alaska Natives are among those whose claims were settled in past decades. The Council of Yukon Indians and Dene of the MacKenzie Valley have signed agreements-in-principle; the Inuit of the Eastern Arctic are still negotiating the Nunavut claim.¹

Questions about the impacts of non-renewable resource development and renewable resource management are critical across the North, where Native people constitute a majority. Although it might be argued that the experience of the Haida Indians — the dominant Native social group on the Queen Charlotte Islands — has limited relevance for northern Native people, there are many commonalities. The Haida, as in the case of Native Northerners, are isolated by virtue of living on Haida Gwaii, the name given by the Haida to the Charlottes. The fact that they are subject to resource development pressure, within a context of unresolved land claims, also creates significant parallels with other Native people of the North.

Discussing how Native people relate to environmental impact assessment is a bit like putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Land claims are a priority for many Native people across the North and throughout British Columbia, and until these are settled, Native interpretations of EIA and resource management are not matters of urgency — at least not yet in the case of the Haida. With the settlement of the Inuvialuit claim, with land now under Native jurisdiction and control, EIA processes and rules are being developed which make sense for Native people.

Critics point out that the federal Native claims process is excessively cumbersome, lengthy and ineffectual. To suggest that Native Bands and Councils wait for claims to be settled before examining, developing and utilizing tools such as EIA, argue the critics, is to put them on hold for another century while others decide their fate.

The claims process is a political chess game, in which both sides are playing for time. In the case of the James Bay Agreement, the Inuvialuit settlement and the Dene Agreement-in-Principle, holding out was a strategy which Native people used to hasten settlement of their claims. It seems clear that Native people are not only willing to be patient; they may also be rewarded for it.

Although a majority of the population of British Columbia indicated in a public opinion poll that they support resolution of the Haida

title to the Charlottes, and the public generally is more supportive than government of such issues, the sad reality is that Native people continue to occupy marginalized positions within Canadian society. Their views were solicited as part of the Beaufort Sea Environmental Assessment Review Process (EARP) as well as for Lancaster Sound, but what are their opinions of the actual Environmental Impact Assessment process — what are *their* notions of “resource management”?

Many Native sources consulted for this paper were skeptical that their ideas might be used to improve the status quo. This paper, therefore, attempts to honor the insights offered by the Native perspective and in particular, those of the Haida and of non-Natives with relevant experience or insights.

The main issue is whether the current concept and practice of environmental impact assessment is relevant or appropriate for Native people, given their interpretation of a range of concerns, from the ecological and economic, to the cultural and spiritual. On a deeper level, the issue of relevance is related to the clash in values between Native and non-Native cultures which influences their relationships to the natural environment.

The dominant society's world view is not only antithetical but hostile to traditional Native perspectives. The prevailing ideologies in Canada — of liberalism and conservatism — uphold individual property rights and private enterprise. The capitalist mode of production and the class system which shapes and is shaped by it, thrives on hierarchy, competition, centralized authority, and a clear separation between the human and non-human worlds.

Traditional Native cosmology, on the other hand, is characterized by notions associated with the land that sustains human society. In this world view, the environment is a life source, a kind of extended self; in the other, it is the servant of cost/benefit analysis, maximum sustained yields, and profit margins. Through the former lens, people and the environment are part of a unity that is intuitively wise and self-regulating; through the latter, people and environment are both “resources” to be reified (viewed as things) and commodified, their value derived from their utility.

The objective in critically examining environmental impact assessment within the context of Native values is to improve the process of EIA and resource management by encouraging more sensitive and responsible environmental practices; to minimize the adversarial and technocratic orientation of EIA; to maximize the cooperative links between people and nature by honoring the wisdom and experience of Native people.

The research for this paper includes interviews and consultations with Haida leaders and activists, mainly in the Indian communities

of Skidegate and Old Masset. Several non-Native environmentalists, government officials and local residents in Queen Charlotte City and New Masset were interviewed or consulted. EIA practitioners and academics were also interviewed in Toronto, Calgary and Vancouver. In the spring of 1987, I attended herbicide hearings conducted by the provincial Environmental Appeal Board (EAB) over two days in "Charlotte" and Masset, which provided first-hand experience of Native participation in EIA. Articles, documents, clippings and transcripts from environmental hearings and court cases involving the Haida were also reviewed.

Environmental Impact Assessment: A Critical Assessment

Assessing the relevance of environmental impact assessment for Native people requires a basic understanding of how it is conceptualized by government agencies, professionals and practitioners. I argue throughout this paper that there is a misfit between conceptualization and implementation of EIA; more fundamentally, there is a misfit between EIA and the values of Native people which underscores the ideological differences between two cultures.

Environmental impact assessment is often criticized because it is too scientific and technical, or because it does not sufficiently meet the requirements of the "technocratic fix". There is argument about its procedures and its efficiency as a planning tool.

At issue is not just whether environment impact assessment meets its objectives, but whether they make sense in the Native context. The language of EIA literature, with its emphasis on "scientific", "technical" and "procedural" rationality already hints at its handicaps. This is not a language familiar to many Native people.

The Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office (FEARO) reflects the official federal view, and is not to be confused with the perspectives of the 10 provinces. FEARO states that the purpose of the Environmental Assessment Review Process (EARP) is "to implement the government's policy on environmental assessment. Implicit ... is the requirement that the Process should be used as a planning tool..." (Duffy, 1985:2). The language offers revealing insights on the values underlying FEARO's conception of environmental impact assessment. Technical and scientific requirements, for example, hold the potential to make initial assessment "more efficient, cost-effective and result-oriented" (Ibid.:16). The language reflects the world view of the industrialized society; it is not the way Native people speak at environmental hearings.

Basic procedures for determining projects referred for public review as noted in the Federal Government's Guide for Initial Assessment (Duffy, 1985:20) include: establishing "specific criteria for quantifying impacts," determining "the facts on the potential impacts"

and “whether thresholds of public concern may be exceeded”. The inherent contradictions and shortcomings are glaring. “Specific criteria” are assumed to be sufficient to quantify impacts (quantifiable assessment is also assumed to be sufficient). FEARO admits that “it is impossible for an impact assessment to address all potential environmental effects of a project,” yet environment impact assessment requires “accurate impact prediction” (Ibid.:16). As for citizen concerns, who evaluates how much the public can bear, and by what values or “criteria”? How is such subjective evaluation reconciled with the quest for facts? A publication of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council (CEARC, 1985) laments that EIA’s are failing to meet expectations (Munro, Bryant, and Matte-Baker, 1986:1). Perhaps they have been unrealistic.

The problems of environment impact assessment have been well articulated by one of its proponents: “The scarcity of reliable and practical techniques for obtaining data on potential environmental effects of a proposal and its alternatives; the shortage of expertise, time and money; and the lack of knowledge of key cause-effect relationships” (Armour, 1977:8).

William Rees, a critic of environmental impact assessment in Canada, maintains that CEARC does not approach EIA from a procedural basis: “all they’re interested in is technique”. On CEARC’s view of environmental impact assessment as a planning tool, he commented in a 1987 interview:

To see it as part of the planning process is not the same as *being* part of the planning process. It’s an add-on...The process is structured by people of a particular world view...It’s structurally and procedurally biased. We say the environment is important and the process approves development. We’ve bought out the environment. EIA is a facade. The government uses it to seduce the public that its interests are taken into account.

Throughout the last decade, Rees has detailed various “flaws” in the environmental assessment review process. Many of the criticisms levelled against the federal process have also been cited by participants at environmental hearings conducted by the British Columbia Environmental Appeal Board (EAB) in Haida Gwaii. They include: lack of confidence in panel objectivity; the appearance of “afterthought” which seems to rush the process; reluctance by panel chairmen to consider need, alternatives and cumulative or regional impacts (Rees, 1980:360-361). In an interview, Rees argued that EIA’s potential as a planning tool is handicapped both by the policy vacuum in which it operates and by faulty assumptions based upon positivistic science which regards the environment as observable

and predictable.

Public interest and Native organizations, frustrated by a lack of firm procedures in the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office / Environmental Assessment Review Process, have occasionally boycotted the process in one paper, Rees cited as examples the Beaufort region's Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement (COPE), the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the Yukon Conservation Society, all of which declined to participate in the Beaufort Sea Review. He has also observed that for political reasons, outcomes are often foregone conclusions (as in the case of the Beaufort Sea Development) and public input is basically ignored (Rees, 1980; 1985:9). Intervenors have also been frustrated by the reactive or defensive role they are forced to play, and especially in the case of Native people, by project-specific environmental impact assessment which fails to integrate socio-economic and other factors.

The integration of "data", the balancing of fact and value, often eludes the narrow mandate of Environmental Impact Assessment, resulting in a focus on facts. Frank Tester, another Canadian critic of Environmental Impact Assessment, commented: "This is not to suggest that "rational" analysis is unnecessary or useless. However, it is hardly sufficient" (1987:42). What is needed to balance facts and knowledge, Tester argued, is wisdom.

The current orientation of EIA, despite recent re-evaluation of EARP by the federal government, remains heavily invested in the supremacy of "data" and "expertise", that is information validated by science and technocrats. Among its principles of ethics for public hearings, the Study Group on Environmental Assessment Hearing Procedures noted: "All arguments presented...are not of equal value ...Some are better than others, better formulated, with a greater basis in fact" (Walsh, 1988:15).

It seems unlikely, on this basis, that the fact-finding orientation of EIA will find balance with other equally relevant considerations of the heart and spirit. In discussions of environmental impacts on Haida Gwaii and in northern Canada, such considerations are typically offered by Native people, borne out of the wisdom of their life experience with the land.

Relevance And Limitations Of Environmental Impact Assessment to Native People

Environmental impact assessment *is* relevant to Native people, given that they have a vested interest in assessing potentially adverse environmental impacts to preserve and protect their lands. For this reason, the Council of the Haida Nation (CHN) conducted its own internal assessments on a proposal to develop the Consolidated Cinola gold mine near the Yakoun, a key fishing river in Haida

Gwaii. At the same time, environmental impact assessment is not relevant, in view of the jurisdictional dispute over land ownership. Until land claims are settled, externally generated assessments will be exercises in frustration and confusion for many Native people. Their own assessments, without land ownership, will also be of limited value.

Environmental impact assessment in British Columbia is generally structured to aid decision-makers to come to a better informed conclusion on the use of land and resources which does not adversely affect people or the environment. The intention of the process is honorable enough; the problem is with the underlying values of the culture which administers it. That is why the case is consistently argued: land ownership must be settled before environmental impact assessment makes sense for Native people. Otherwise, questions concerning the costs and benefits of development to and for whom are difficult to answer.

Native variations on the EIA theme would be significantly different in process and practice to the extent that they reflect traditional Native values and relationships with the natural environment. As Rees and Boothroyd and others have noted, "the significance of ecological and social impacts is a function of values" (1984:8), and it is on that basis that Native and non-Native interpretations of impacts frequently clash.

Conflicts typically involve economics, illustrated by the observation of an unidentified Environment Canada researcher:

It is extremely difficult to put a value on the fish harvested in the food fisheries, primarily because of the sociological importance that Native people attach (to) their participation in a traditional activity. They consistently maintain that these benefits cannot be evaluated in commensurable monetary terms (Grzybowski and Brown, 1986:12)

In EIA devised by non-Natives, based on cost-benefit analysis, and biased in favour of non-resident "experts", the question of relevance answers itself.

Some Haida opinions of environmental impact assessment are clear from the following:

It's a big sham — a front... It's to ease people's consciences. They can say we did a study and the people didn't object. A lot of decisions aren't made by the people on the panels, but the guys who control the stock market. They're not likely to listen to someone who's been fishing for 40 years, but someone who can do experiments in a tank. That's called scientific (Frank Collison, Vice-Presi-

dent, Council of the Haida Nation).

(EIA assessors) are concerned with the appearance that they addressed public concern...and with cost-benefit — how much will they walk away with in their pockets? (The Haida) are concerned with the long-term impacts on our tables, on our health. You can't separate SIA and environmental impact assessment. If you contaminate the environment, the effect would be on our people (Guu-jaaw, Haida carver and environmentalist).

You can't put a monetary value on your tie with the earth. This society thinks you can buy everything (Diane Brown, community health worker and activist, Skidegate).

Environmental impact assessment can't address all Native concerns — especially cultural and spiritual — unless the government looks at land claims (Charlie Bellis, Haida, member of the West Coast Offshore Exploration Environmental Assessment Panel).

We've registered concerns in previous forums. It appears fruitless to review what's been said. Permits were granted to go ahead and do these types of things (John Yeltatzie, at the British Columbia Environmental Appeal Board herbicide hearing, Masset).

The sentiments expressed by the Haida are reinforced by non-Natives with experience or insights related to the limitations of conventional environmental impact assessment for Aboriginal people.

Following is a sampling of opinion:

Current federal and provincial processes are externally created with little meaningful input by Native people. When they are imposed on Native organizations, they often don't accomplish what they seek to. EIA and the bodies of expertise are exclusively government, university or science community issues. I think there is a huge pond of traditional wisdom in Native communities about stewardship, resources and practical realities (Michael Robinson, Executive Director, Arctic Institute of North America).

The board was restricting itself to technical, scientific questions, legal questions — will it cause unreasonable adverse effects? They weren't looking at the broader

question — the Haidas' concern with the survival of themselves as people...The board is not mandated to look at those issues, and is not predisposed...They also don't look at alternatives. In general, they showed hostility to the concerns of Native people (Calvin Sandborn, counsel representing The Islands Protection Society and the Haida at the British Columbia Environmental Appeal Board herbicide hearing).

These white structures don't fit in well with Native people. They're hard to understand — some terms don't translate well. There's a technological problem, for those who aren't well educated...a lack of political savvy...paternalism...In the language of agreement, the impact review is foreign...The Inuit work on consensus politics — that doesn't work with an alien culture (Nigel Bankes, law professor and Native claims researcher, University of Calgary).

If you view EIA as technique, the difficulty with integrating all these concerns is that technique is oriented toward quantitative analysis. It's difficult to put social issues into a number-crunching process...There's more need to develop the legitimacy of interactive approaches, and to discuss an issue-oriented approach which involves interaction and negotiation (Audrey Armour, York University, and The Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council).

(Native) cultural and spiritual values are directly related to their economic activities. There's a co-mingling of functions — so they don't separate out the social from educational from economic or political or religious. It' all the same. That's difficult for us to deal with (Mary Ellen Tyler, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Vancouver).

The key to making EIA a meaningful Native process is expressed by Margot Hearne of the Islands Protection Society in Masset: "If Native people are involved in setting up the panel, the terms of reference and how the panel is used, environmental impact assessment would be relevant."

As Michael Robinson observes, EIA is of limited value to Native people because it is imposed rather than developed through a process of negotiation. For the reasons cited earlier, the question of who owns the land remains critical to determining how — if at all —

it is to be used.

Native Land Claims, Land Ethic And Ethics

To evaluate the relevance and limitations of environmental impact assessment as it relates to Native people, one must understand their political agenda and the cultural context from which it emerges. For many Native people across the North, and for the Haida, the settlement of claims to territory is central to the examination of whether environmental impact assessment can be a meaningful process. Participation in the process is rejected by some Natives as a legitimization of the status quo that asserts foreign sovereignty, laws and regulations over their land. To not participate, however, means even less control. Either way, they have reason to anguish.

Land claims are a definite “burr” in the environmental impact assessment process. The EIA is inadequate to the task; panels and Ministries of the Environment have no mandate to resolve such policy disputes. The Haida, meanwhile, have become more assertive in their refusal to recognize non-Haida regulations. As of January 1989, Council of Haida Nations President Miles Richardson announced that the Haida had withdrawn from the land claim process and declared themselves a separate nation, complete with passports. In October 1988, the Lubicon Cree of northern Alberta also declared themselves a sovereign nation which does not recognize the authority of Canadian courts.

Traditional attitudes, beliefs and values — in short, ethics — influence the current relationship of Native people to environmental impact assessment and resource management; they will also shape whatever forms of assessment they choose. The most significant ethic is that of sharing. Group survival is more important than personal prosperity, which fosters two central notions; first, people will not take more than they need; second, conservation ensures the survival of future generations.

Frank Collison, Vice-President of the Council of Haida Nations, explains how attitudes to sharing shape two breeds of capitalist: the Western variety, who accumulate goods for their own sake; and the Haida, who through cultural and legal customs such as potlatches, traditionally gave away much of what they acquired. Such generosity was rewarded and reciprocated, spawning new cycles of sharing.

Native people have traditionally described themselves as an integral part of nature, and declared respect for the laws of ecology which govern all life. Guujaaw, a leading Haida activist, carver and environmentalist, explains his sense of the Haida code of ethics toward the land: “Our access to resources is limited by the law of nature and the ability of the land to produce — and common sense.”

Beyond common sense, is the respect and reverence for the land

which sustains many Native people. Diane Brown, a community health worker, is among the most articulate and compelling Haida activists on the subject:

The temperature has to be just right, the tides, the winds, everything has to be all one to produce herring-roe-on-kelp. We're very in tune to these things. If you disturb them, the herring go away. You have to treat things very gently...The Earth gives us everything we got — food to give us energy to survive, to live the spiritual aspect, the mental well-being. You can't have a balance if one of these things is missing.

Brown, one of the protesters arrested in 1985 for obstruction of logging on Lyell Island, speaks for many Haida. They depend on the land as a source of sustenance, culture, spirituality, meaning, identity; they also experience the land as dependent upon them. This symbiosis ensures mutual survival or decimation of the Haida and their homeland. Haida Gwaii, the place — in a very critical sense — is also the people.

Native Process And Practice

Within the formal and regulated confines of community halls and courtrooms run by the “white man”, the Haida have protested the processes and practices imposed upon them. In so doing, they have revealed their own procedures and strategies with a passion and eloquence which has endeared them to the media, the public and the justices of the Supreme Court of British Columbia.

The Haida have demonstrated amazing grace and generosity of spirit in the face of opposition which is often intransigent and self-interested. They have insisted upon negotiation and cooperation, and in private conversations and interviews reassured non-Natives of their willingness to share the “resources” of Haida Gwaii. They have been patient, standing up repeatedly to defend their belief in the integrity of their rights, claims and values. Their attitudes and actions underscore a gentle but tenacious commitment to manage their lands their way.

In 1986, the Islands Protection Society (IPS) appealed three permits approving pesticide applications on the islands; the permits were issued by the Ministry of Forests to a logging company, Mac-Millan Bloedel. By court order, the British Columbia Environmental Appeal Board (EAB) was obliged to conduct public hearings in Queen Charlotte City and Masset in 1987. Although not the same as the federal Environmental Impact Assessment process (administered by FEARO), it can be argued that given the purpose and

procedures of an EAB hearing, the hearing amounted to a form of Environmental Impact Assessment.

Several Haida testified as witnesses for IPS, the only permitted appellant. What Ethel Jones, a Haida elder arrested during the blockade of loggers on Lyell Island, had to say was pure emotion, spoken without apology:

When we speak, we speak as one...I talk from my heart...I'm worried if you put this chemical into the forest — for everyone. The chemical you're talking about (2-4-D and Roundup) is poison ...It's not easy for me to take. I have children and grandchildren and they'll have children. Where will we end up?

Frank Collison said the appeal would not have been necessary if resources were properly managed:

If there were more controls, if logging practices were controlled, we wouldn't have to do this. If you weren't clearcutting and ripping out all the trees, destroying the ecology, there would be no use for these kinds of boards and appeals ...there's something wrong.

In other forums, such as the Joint Canada/British Columbia West Coast Offshore Exploration Panel, the Haida distinguished themselves through their own forms of process and practice. The panel was appointed to conduct a public review of environmental and socio-economic effects of potential petroleum exploration on the West Coast, involving lands claimed by the Haida. The Haida were among those who participated in information hearings and public meetings held during 1984 and 1985.

Throughout the hearings, the Haida emphasized the importance of resolving land disputes, although as Miles Richardson pointed out, their participation was “with some reluctance and a lot of skepticism” at the “very specific” and “very narrow” terms of reference (West Coast Offshore Exploration Assessment Panel, 1984, Volume 12). The Haida continued to “talk from the heart,” but also produced their own expert witness who gave a technical submission on impacts. At the same time, the Haida were developing their own internal studies, and working with the Offshore Alliance of Aboriginal Nations (OS-AAN) to assess impacts. To some extent, therefore, they played the environmental impact assessment “game” by the rules, but as elder Lavina Lightbown observed: “We can't deal just on your rules all the time to create better understanding. You must also look at our philosophy and our culture and our value system” (Ibid., 1985, Volume 14:170).

At the Skidegate community session, the Haida dramatized the point by conducting their own "hearing". Panel members docked at Sandspit, and were greeted as they might have been at an old-fashioned potlatch. Both the Haida and their guests, wearing ceremonial dress, heard the elders describe the official Native position in a form and in a forum which was a uniquely Haida creation.

Larry Wolfe, who was issues consultant for the panel, believes the Haida initiative could set a precedent. In any event, it is not to be discouraged. Procedures should be flexible enough to allow communities to hold such unstructured and informal hearings, not the usually "intimidating environment" of formal EIA hearings, Wolfe stated in a 1987 interview. Such flexibility allows the Haida to set things up in their own way, which permits panel members "to get a lot more feeling for their culture."

The Haida spoke in Skidegate without experts and lawyers. Wolfe, who was also a secretariat member for the Beaufort Sea panel, believes Native people generally fare better without them, and the Haida in particular don't need them: "They're very effective at hearings."

Perhaps the most dramatic and publicized example of Haida process and practice took place at the court hearing at which a logging company, Western Forest Products, sought an injunction to stop the Haida from blockading loggers on Lyell Island. British Columbia Supreme Court Justice Harry McKay waived many rules of procedure, explaining that he wanted to give the Haida an opportunity to vent their frustrations.

The Haida proceeded without counsel, because as Miles Richardson explained, "we don't want to create an illusion of justice". The "testimony" was classic Haida: a woman sang a song from the witness box, and there were powerful, heartfelt testimonials attesting to their intimate link to the land. The Haida lost the court case, but in the wider arena of social justice, won respect and support.

The Lyell Island blockade and hearings dramatically illustrated the differences between the Haida and the rest of Canadian society. Such differences were viewed not as reasons to celebrate, or as opportunities for learning, but as obstacles. Once again, the legal mandate and forum of the court were judged to be inadequate and inappropriate to deal with Haida concerns, described by one lawyer as political, and "large scale in terms of time and space".²

Neither the courts nor the British Columbia Environmental Appeal Board can factor the social values of another culture into their decision-making. The values of the dominant culture are so imbedded in the process of EIA (including that administered by the Environmental Assessment Review Process at the federal level), that alternative values cannot even be considered. As noted earlier, the

underlying values — both of the culture and the process — must be changed to making environmental impact assessment meaningful to Native people.

It is perplexing to consider now the Haida might facilitate that process, how they might educate another culture about their own when so many key political, legal, and cultural channels are foreign or closed to them. What they will do in terms of EIA and resource management, should they ever win their day in court or the legislature, is largely a matter of speculation. One thing is clear, however, from public forums and private interviews: the Haida have no interest in playing “the noble savage”.

Modified Environmental Impact Assessment: A Political Community Planning Process

Given the limitations of conventional environmental impact assessment, particularly in satisfying Native concerns, what parallel or similar processes might be used by Indian Nations? How could environmental impact assessment be modified to make it more relevant and appropriate to the concerns of Native people?

The Haida concept of social impact assessment (SIA) is not a sub-set of EIA, but a unique process rooted in their cultural traditions, as described by Michael Robinson, Executive Director of the Arctic Institute of North America, in a 1987 interview:

The Haida process, based on my experience, is community-based, relies heavily for direction on views of the traditional chiefs and allied elders, is holistic, dynamic, flexible, political and confrontational in a balanced way. Above all, it is the Haida way; it was not developed to fit into a southern notion of EIA. It is capable of fitting a myriad of situations, ranging from court appearances, public hearings and workshops to discussion on wharves and fishboats.

In Robinson's view, the Haida process could be viewed as a political process of community development. In response to offshore drilling proposals and logging in South Moresby, Robinson observes that the Haida responded to the formal non-Native process through passive and non-violent civil disobedience, skilful use of the media, and articulate speeches by Miles Richardson. This response could be seen as an example of Haida impact assessment; beyond that, it underlines the urgency of settling land claims before development.

The role of elders in a Haida impact assessment and management process would be to “advise, constrain and direct”. Their sense of wise stewardship would predict the limits to growth, identify areas

to be logged, and “techniques.” Policy would result from slower-paced consensus decision-making. Native EIA/SIA would probably proceed with greater caution, and less willingness to approve certain projects, let alone mitigate their impacts.

It is speculated that the Haida — and Northern Native people in general — would relate better to social impact assessment than environmental impact assessment. The question is whether the non-Native term “impact assessment” best describes current or future Native practice. Mary Ellen Tyler, involved in administering the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development Resource Development Fund (RDI) to the Haida, prefers the terms “strategic planning process” and “community planning process”.

Also relevant to Native people is the bargaining and community development approach to social impact assessment and management advocated by Rachel Corbett in her Master's thesis for the Faculty of Environmental Design of the University of Calgary (1986). Corbett undertook an exhaustive review of SIA literature and criticism, and concluded that it “has tried to be something it cannot be; that is, scientific, objective, predictive and comprehensive...” Corbett argued for an alternative based upon bargaining, consciousness raising, and a community which is “cooperative, humanistic and unabashedly political.” She described it as follows:

According to this approach, the purpose of SIA is not to serve decision-makers but affected communities by empowering them to make their own decisions and manage social and economic impacts themselves...As a bargaining tool, SIA enables communities to negotiate programs for impact mitigation, monitoring and development; employment and economic benefits, and joint ventures...As a consciousness-raising and educational tool, SIA promotes open communication, helps communities learn about themselves. As a community development tool, SIA helps establish goals, build local leadership, motivate residents to participate, make decisions, manage resources, and increase its capacity to formulate, implement and evaluate policy.

As a way of integrating Native values, concerns and process, modified SIA makes sense. It also has important implications. The institutional and legislative frameworks (EARP and NEPA — the National Environmental Policy Act of the U.S.), their concepts of EIA and analytic procedures are not appropriate to bargaining, community-based SIA, which is flexible and not project-specific (Corbett, 1986).

In effect, Corbett advocated the same thing as Rees, who urged modifications to EIA which would allow all participants a role at whatever they do best: "Native organizations, other public groups and the "community" in general would organize to prepare their own SIA, including a social impacts monitoring program" (Rees, 1985:12).

Another paper reviewed a social impact assessment of Hydaburg, Alaska to illustrate the modification of non-NEPA social impact assessments in response to "empowered" Native communities. The Hydaburg SIA incorporated community-based research, cultural assessment and mitigation — a trend likely to continue as self-determination becomes more prevalent among Native communities (Gondolf and Wells, 1986).

Jobes (1986:388) cited problems assessing impacts on Indian Reservations in the USA, using conventional SIA. The first obstacle was theoretical, in that SIA is "generally insensitive" to the qualities of small, isolated, rural communities. There are difficulties with methodology, given the standard emphasis on quantitative analysis. There are jurisdictional problems, which necessitate historical documentation and legal interpretation. Finally, there are social problems and cultural conflicts, such as the Native oral tradition.

Debates concerning "product" or "process" approaches to SIA are relevant to considerations of an appropriate Native process. Product SIA is seen "as a challenge to quantify and predict social phenomena as quickly as possible," while process SIA emphasizes community involvement, planning and negotiation. Process-oriented methodology is favoured by practitioners working with Native communities (Lee, 1984:23).

Krawetz, MacDonald and Nichols (1987:39) suggest, however, it is not necessary to choose between process (sociopolitical aspects) and product (the technical); they are not irreconcilable. In fact, the combination of a "highly consultative process" with a "rigorous, professionally directed product" can offer a more balanced assessment. Nevertheless, situations involving Native people "tend to be more successfully handled by the sociopolitical paradigm with the technical playing a less significant role than usual," as in the case of the Berger Inquiry and the siting of a hazardous waste facility in Alberta.

Weaver and Cunningham (1985) maintain that SIA remains limited for northern Native people. "If carried out properly it takes a step beyond ad hoc regulation and provides ... development alternatives. At best, however, this is only a kind of anti-planning."

George Calliou, an Indian consultant based in Alberta, stated during a 1987 interview the viewpoint of many Native people: "There is no need to have EIA if you're living in tune with the environment."

The problem, of course, is that we are not. The implications of choosing not to be “in tune”, of ignoring natural laws that would keep us in balance, point to a society which is ultimately unsustainable. Without significant structural change, government regulated processes such as EIA and SIA perform no more than a legitimization function; that is, they serve to mitigate against the damage created by the primary goals of capitalism: development and consumption. Michael M'Gonigle describes the paradox in his essay advocating a natural law of the market/legal state:

While government regulation provides some protective environmental and social legislation, government agencies also provide the energy subsidies that enable disruptive development in the first place. In a society out of balance with its context, protective devices for preserving the remnants of ecological balance, such as wilderness areas or multiple use forests, remain perpetually under threat (1986:273).

If current trends continue, development alternatives will no longer be a matter of choice, for Natives or non-Natives. Demands created by capitalist economies to produce and consume more goods increasingly and often irreversibly stress natural environments. “Resources” are being depleted, and environmental degradation is seen as the price of doing business. Trading off costs and benefits, mitigating environmental impacts, compensating communities — these components of impact assessment are all based on monetary value. In the view of many Native people, this is a simplistic and ineffective analysis for dealing with environmental impacts. There is a value beyond dollars, which is also beyond the mandate of EIA and SIA.

Resource Management By Native People

The concept of “resource management”, given the relationship of many Native people to the natural environment, is as foreign to them as the courts in which they have argued their rights to lands and “resources”. The words “resource” and “management” imply a human superiority incompatible with the holistic values expressed by many traditional Native people.

Although notions of “wise use management” and “rational stewardship” were not part of the early Indian lexicon, it is well documented that Native people were wise and rational resource users. As Churchill observed,

far from living hand-to-mouth, “Stone Age” American Indians adhered to an economic structure that not only

met their immediate needs but provided considerable surplus of both material goods and leisure time (1986:14).

The Haida and other land and sea-based proponents of what Michael Robinson calls a “bush economy” were “rational stewards of their resources”. He explained in an interview:

Every creek, halibut bank, herring spawning bay, sea bird colony, tidal narrows, island, reef and rock had defined owners from the beginning. Key elders were the scheduling managers of procurement on a seasonal round defined by the natural cyclic events in fish, animal and bird populations. Each year's harvest was taken in the full knowledge of the importance of sustaining future yields. Today's procurement of logs, argillite, herring spawn, salmon and abalone goes on with the same resource base, modified to the degree that Haida people now rely increasingly on wage labour for income.

Animals had a prominent place in traditional Haida resource management, according to other sources. Bears, killer whales and eagles were the respective chiefs of land, sea and sky. Each regulated the abundance, in exchange for gifts from the Haida (Grzybowski and Brown, 1986:12).

Miles Richardson explained the key to Haida survival before the Offshore Exploration Panel:

One reason the Haida Nation is still here after 10,000 years...is because of the spiritual relationship our people have had with the resources we depended on, that we live amongst; we always knew that if we were to survive on Haida Gwaii that those resources must be managed and taken care of. There must be a balance maintained between our people and those resources (West Coast Offshore Exploration Assessment Panel, 1985, Volume 14:10).

The Haida are involved in government-sponsored training programs in both forestry and fisheries. Peter Buck, a former employee of MacMillan Bloedel who works as a forestry consultant and is an environmental activist, began teaching a 22 week course in forestry and silviculture in January, 1987. Thirty-six Haida were enrolled.

In a 1987 interview, Buck said the course would offer “basic understanding of forestry, based on sound ecology. It's a training program so they can market themselves as forestry workers.” Buck believes the Haida have a greater appreciation and understanding

of nature than non-Natives; what they don't have is a scientific understanding of ecology: "Their ecology is that things can be kept in balance — you only take as much as you need."

In the absence of qualified Haida, it is apparently acceptable to learn from others. As Haida environmental advocate Guujaaw points out, Peter Buck is training Native people to work within the "existing system." Within their own system, Haida management could be quite different.

Michael Robinson expects the Haida will practise a form of occupational pluralism which will permit them to selectively harvest for part of the year, fish for herring and salmon, and act as tour guides. Elders would have a key role in ensuring the Haida continue to be "wise stewards" of their resources. Robinson observed in an interview:

The scientific observations from wise elders are every bit as rational and deserving of serious thought as scientists working as consultants. That's not founded in some naive, romantic idealism, but in the knowledge that people who live in a bush community know a lot about the bush.

Some non-Haida consultants and resource managers express misgivings about Haida management. Dave Davies, consultant for two salmon enhancement projects co-managed by the Haida and The Department of Fisheries and Oceans, questioned whether they have the "expertise". He cited as examples, before the Haidas were taught about management, over-fishing and near-depletions. In a 1987 interview, Davis stated:

A lot think they can manage on traditional gut feelings and historical background. I don't think they can do that in our complicated world. The Haida need scientific background information so they can maximize profits with the least damage."

The Salmon Enhancement Program (SEP) provides employment for Native people at small facilities that enhance local fish stocks. It increases catches for Native commercial fishermen and the Native food fishery. The program is also intended to promote a transfer of technical expertise to increase Native self-sufficiency.

Davies forecast the development of a Native commercial fishery, which will require more Haida (available as non-status Indians return to the reserves) to monitor the number of fish caught and escaped. He believes SEP will foster awareness and conservation, and help the Haida find "a happy medium" between two styles of manage-

ment.

Davies' comments, perhaps more than any others in this paper, underline the dramatic disparity in values and practices between Native and non-Native cultures. Davies himself is representative of the dominant society's world view, with its faith in facts, figures, the "technocratic fix", maximum yields and profits. The Haida interviewed for this paper, however, do not want to compromise the environment for the sake of economics. They have managed for generations on "traditional gut feelings and historical background." Their expertise is the wisdom of life experience accumulated over centuries.

It can be argued that the "happy medium" notion is simplistic and ultimately unworkable. Michael M'Gonigle argued in his essay (1986:308) for a redirection which "is neither antimarket nor anti-growth," but a new framework for defining market and growth in sustainable terms. Our concepts of science, technology and reason must be broadened to include not just the object observed but the subjective observer; to acknowledge that reason is as much rooted in experience as intuition and spirituality.

The Haida manager of the Skidegate program stresses traditional approaches and common sense, but the reality of current expectations is that the Haida will re-create the roles of managers, experts and state-of-the-art assessors. Conflict in approaches to resource management between Natives and non-Natives, like approaches to environmental impact assessment, are essentially rooted in values and ideology. The challenge, articulated by Native people in *Native Self-Reliance Through Resource Management* (1984), is "to find a path to development which respects our proud traditions of spirituality and our world view."

The prognosis is unpromising, given the current context of political denial. The Chief Forester of British Columbia, J.B. Cuthbert, recently stated that the provincial Ministry of Forests will not support resolutions passed by the Skidegate Band Council (*Queen Charlotte Islands Observer*, September 21, 1989:1). The resolutions, passed by the Haida in June, oppose logging of the Grey Bay to Cumshewa Head area (part of MacMillan Bloedel's Timber Forest License 39) and the establishment of Haida Gwaii as a herbicide/pesticide free zone.

A more glaring example of denial relates to the joint management responsibilities promised to the Haida by the federal government in setting up the South Moresby national park reserve. Two years later, promises unkept, "government agencies are systematically deleting all acknowledgement of the Haida's Aboriginal rights from official documents related to South Moresby" and "negotiations to share responsibility for managing the proposed park reserve have been

stalemated by a federal refusal to agree to anything more than a token role for the Haida" (Broadhead, 1989:62).

The Haida have countered with a strategy which will not permit the park to proceed "until a framework for management that respects their interests and responsibilities is reached," according to Broadhead, who has been involved in negotiations between the government and the Haida. In the meantime, the Haida are managing Gwaii Haanas (South Moresby) through the Haida Gwaii Watchmen, posted at five camps and former village sites.

At four of these, visitors must pay a \$25 fee. At Hotspring Island — one of the most popular attractions on the Charlottes — the Haida drained the pools in the spring of 1989 and declared the entire island off-limits. Overuse of the pools and poor hygiene have been cited as the reasons, but the Haida undoubtedly recognized an opportunity to impose their own dramatic limits.

Resource Management: Haida Views

Testifying at the Offshore Exploration Panel in Skidegate in 1985, Frank Collison, Vice-President of the Haida Nation, said the Haida could not appraise risks to resources because they were still developing information for use in resource management analysis:

We cannot tell you in quantitative terms the kinds and volumes of resources that are at risk by offshore exploration. We do have an immense amount of local knowledge...but we have not had the opportunity to compile all this information and develop comprehensive documentation on just how valuable the resource base is (West Coast Offshore Exploration Assessment Panel, 1985, Volume 14:7).

In documents and interviews, the Haida stress the importance of consensus in whatever decisions they make involving land use. Resource policies will be developed which are compatible with natural law, that is, respecting ecological limits, checks and balances.

The Haida did not traditionally log their forests, used mainly to supply materials for canoes, dwellings and clothing; Haida culture was primarily based upon the sea. Nevertheless, the Haida have articulated principles which would govern what they describe as an "environmentally sound" forest management plan. They include: adequate time for forest regeneration, reforestation, habitat protection, appropriate harvesting systems, and sustained economic stability in local communities. These ideas are recorded in the report which followed their annual assembly in 1986.

Many Haida interviewed for this paper deplore clearcutting, although some believe it might be permitted where soil stability would tolerate it and streams would not be adversely impacted. Silviculture, where practiced, would probably not permit the use of pesticides and herbicides. Testimony by the Haida before the British Columbia Environmental Appeal Board in 1987 revealed that chemical applications to eradicate alder can negatively impact upon the gathering of wild mushrooms, berries, and medicinal herbs; it can also pollute waterways and wildlife. Frank Collison offers the following scenario:

We won't stop logging and fishing when we get control, but we will do it in a manner more conducive to the environment. We won't take as much. There's no reason for clearcutting. We're more concerned about total utilization. A lot of good wood is rotting away...If we had to drill oil, we would do it effectively. We wouldn't spill it, because we have an obligation to protect what is ours.

Haida carver Claude Davidson, who has been working with his wife Sarah assessing the environmental implications of the controversial Cinola gold mine proposal (which has been rejected) says logging would not be permitted within one mile of creek and river shores, to prevent erosion. As an alternative to clearcutting, Davidson suggests the Haida might selectively remove prime timber with helicopters.

Guujaaw, an increasingly popular speaker on the preservation and management of Haida lands, is critical of current non-Native logging and fishing practices. In an interview in 1987, he noted there are no limits on fish that can be brought to the Masset cannery — quotas are set by how much is gathered. The Skidegate Haida don't deal with fishing permits; many Native people reject such regulations. One management strategy, practiced on the Yakoun River, restricts the number of days the Haida can fish. According to Guujaaw, the Haida would ban shellfish harvesting to protect dwindling stocks such as abalone.

Guujaaw and other Haida advocate integrated fishery and forestry management. In theory, integration is currently in place, although Guujaaw says the reality is that streams are traded off for forests. Logging, meanwhile, is done by stock charts. Haida management would oversee logging by the local people, by local families who would feel the consequences of their decisions. The rate of logging would be slowed down, as well as the liquidation of old growth forests.

Decisions about where to log would be based upon other inherent values. The presence of sockeye and the steepness of slopes are cited by Guujaaw as reasons not to log. The Haida would make

commercial use of forests, placing more emphasis on secondary production of wood.

Charlie Bellis, a member of the Offshore Exploration Panel, maintains the Haida will rely upon outside experts. He doesn't believe the Haida know where all the best spawning beds and forests are; such notions are "folklore", according to him!

Implications Of Haida Management

In 1981, the Haida submitted their formal land claim to the federal government, and made several important policy statements including "a pronouncement on the necessity of reducing by one-half the rate of forest harvest on the entire Islands" (Pinkerton, 1983:83). Haida initiatives, Pinkerton observed, "open the door to a more meaningful consideration of 'local control' aspirations of all Islanders" (Ibid.).

The Haida interviewed for this paper about the implications of Native management stressed the concept of sharing. The Haida Nation, managing its own lands, would not reject non-Native residents; they would be permitted to continue working and living on the islands. Non-Natives would experience a different set of values, and a more cooperative approach to resource management.

There are clearly a range of viewpoints of Native resource management, both within and outside the Haida community. Cynics dismiss Native values and ethics as political rhetoric, calculated to win the Aboriginal cause. There are many reasons for optimism, the most significant of which is that the Haida have a vested interest — beyond the economic — in protecting their lands and resources. As Frank Collison pointed out in an interview: "The islands are our home — everything. We don't have any other place to go. Short term profit doesn't make sense."

Conclusion

There is a misfit between the ethics, processes and practices of many Native people and those of the industrialized, dominant society. The implications for conventional environmental impact assessment and resource management are significant. Native people are constrained by such procedures, in part because they are foreign to their cosmology, but also because — in the case of the Haida and some Native groups in northern Canada — they are conducted in the absence of settled land claims. Until such issues are resolved, it is presumptuous to impose impact assessment upon Native people, or expect them to relate to it in a meaningful way.

The findings of this paper conclude — land claims notwithstanding — that conventional environmental impact assessment (both as

defined by the federal Environmental Assessment Review Process and provincial environmental assessment boards) is of limited relevance to Native people because its agenda contravenes the spirit of their values and concerns. EIA has dismally failed to integrate these values and concerns, especially in the realms of Native culture and spirituality. It is suggested that a broader mandate and more sensitive panels, including Native representation, might address these shortcomings.

The language of formal EIA — “experts”, “objectivity”, “technique”, “number-crunching”, “quantitative analysis”, “data”, “cost/benefit analysis”, — betrays the bias and exposes the limitations of Western environmental science. It is the language of the technocratic fixers; of rigorous, rational inquiry; of a world view which holds the economic as the highest value. As such, it is foreign to Natives whose language and expertise are based upon knowledge of custom, experience accumulated by wise elders over centuries, and a spiritual sense of unity with nature.

Native people have much to teach the culture which created environmental impact assessment about how it could be transformed into a more meaningful process for everything affected by impact evaluation — not the least of which is the environment. Native concepts relating to cooperation, sharing and conservation make sense within the context of a larger social ecology, in which all life forms are respected and protected from harm. Native experience can help the dominant culture expand its horizons to embrace this larger perspective, a composite of many related parts which must work together in a balanced, sustainable way. Native sensibilities can impart a greater awareness of the fragility, resilience and complexity inherent in the web of life, a greater appreciation of consequences, and ultimately, a path of spiritual renewal.

Native versions of environmental impact assessment and resource management remain theories rather than practice. Although such notions are taken seriously by the Haida Nation, priority is placed upon gaining sovereignty over the islands they call Haida Gwaii. Only then can the Haida implement their own forms of assessment and management. Given the traditional ethics and land ethic of Native people, as well as the political nature of their negotiations, some consultants suggest that a bargaining, community-based form of social impact assessment, incorporating consensus and sharing, might be more appropriate. This modified form of social impact assessment would be significantly different from forms of SIA and EIA currently practiced.

Clearly, environmental impact assessment must operate from a broader base than scientific rigor and economic expediency, regardless of whatever Native people bring to light on the process, and in

spite of their own special requirements. Facts and knowledge are inadequate unless accompanied by the wisdom of experience, and balanced by the intelligence of the heart. EIA cries out for a more holistic, biocentric (life centered) approach. Its most crucial concern must not be mitigation of impacts, but outright avoidance of them.

Through the process of working within the dominant culture's system, Native people serve only to legitimize and perpetuate it. Playing by the rules of the larger society's structures and processes — such as EIA — the status quo is affirmed: the marginalization and commodification of Native people and the environment continues with minimal disruption. This is one reason the Haida have often responded with their own distinctive forms of non-violent resistance, such as the issuing of passports to their own people. The Haida and many other Native groups feel they must continue to refuse collusion with those in power; their own ideas and values must continue to be asserted with the dignity and patience which has characterized their struggles to date.

Native people are struggling as never before to regain rights over their lands, and to determine their own destinies. Within that struggle is a challenge to the larger society, a seed for the deeper, structural, ideological change which must take place if we are really committed to protecting environmental and human health. Environmental impact assessment cannot do the job without it. Without significant social change, in which Native people establish the criteria and terms of reference, even modified environmental impact assessment can offer no more than the kind of justice that makes it appear to have been served.

NOTES

1. The financial support of the Canadian Environmental Research Council (CEARC), which assisted in the preparation of this paper, is gratefully acknowledged. I also thank the staff at the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office in Vancouver for their patient and generous assistance.

I am indebted to several people for their encouragement and counsel, especially my advisor, Frank Tester, formerly Professor of Environmental Studies, York University, and now with the School of Social Work at the University of British Columbia; and Michael Robinson, Executive Director of the Arctic Institute of North America.

I wish to express special gratitude to the Council of the Haida

Nation, and the Haida people of Skidegate and Old Masset, Haida Gwaii, for the significant role they played in helping me understand and appreciate their points of view. Their grace and generosity of spirit taught me first-hand about the values which inspire their unique forms of process and practice. Those lessons are at the heart of this paper, and are offered in the hope that they will be honored and re-created.

2. Stated in an unpublished background paper by John Broadhead.

REFERENCES

- Armour, A.
1977 Understanding Environmental Assessment. *Plan Canada* 17 (1): 8-17.
- Broadhead, John
1989 in M. Hummel (Editor): *Endangered Spaces*. Key Porter Books Ltd.
- CEARC
1985 *Social Impact Assessment: A Research Prospectus*.
- Churchill, Ward
1986 American Indian Lands: The Native Ethic Amid Resource Development. *Environment* 28 (6): 13-34.
- Corbett, Rachel
1986 A Bargaining and Community Development Approach to SIA and Management. Faculty of Environmental Design, University of Calgary (Masters Thesis).
- Duffy, P.J.B. (Editor)
1986 *Initial Assessment Guide*. Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office.
- Gondolf, E.W. and S.R. Wells
1986 Empowered Native Community, Modified SIA: The Case of Hydaburg, Alaska. *Environmental Assessment Review* 6 (4): 373-381.
- Grzybowski, A. and D. Brown
1986 Feasting on Haida Gwaii. Faculty of Environmental Studies, University of Waterloo: *Alternatives* 13 (4): 11-16.
- Jobes, Patrick C.
1986 Assessing Impact on Reservations: A Failure of Social Impact Research. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 6 (4): 385-395.
- Krawetz, Natalia M., William R. MacDonald, and Peter Nichols
1987 *A Framework for Effective Monitoring*. Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council.

Lee, Brenda

- 1984 "Product" versus "Process": Developing Perspectives on SIA. *Environments* 16 (1):21-29.

M'Gonigle, Michael

- 1986 The Tribune and the Tribe: Toward a Natural Law of the Market/Legal State. *Ecology Law Quarterly* 13 (1):233-310.

Munro, D., T. Bryant, and A. Matte-Baker

- 1986 *Learning From Experience: A State-of-the-Art Review and Evaluation of Environmental Impact Audits*. Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council.

Native Self-Reliance Through Resource Development

- 1984 Vancouver: Proceedings of the International Conference.

Pinkerton, Evelyn

- 1983 Forest Management and Haida Land Claims. *B.C. Studies* 57:69-85.

Public Review: Neither Judicial, nor Political, but an essential Forum for the Future of the Environment

- 1988 Study Group on Environmental Assessment Hearing Procedures.

Queen Charlotte Islands Observer. Sept. 21, 1989.

Rees, William

- 1980 EARP at the Crossroads: Environmental Assessment in Canada. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 1 (4): 355-376.

Rees, William and Peter Boothroyd

- 1984 Impact Assessment from Pseudo-Science to Planning Process: An Educational Response. *Impact Assessment Bulletin* 3 (2).

- 1985 Government Management Capability: A Brief to the Beaufort Sea Environmental Assessment Panel. *UBC Planning Papers: Studies in Northern Development* (8).

Tester, Frank

- 1987 Fiscal Crisis, Environmental Protection and the State: A New Zealand Case Study. *Alternatives* 14 (2).

Weaver, C. and A. Cunningham

1985 Social Theory, Impact Assessment and Northern Native Communities. *Berkeley Planning Journal* 2 (1,2).

West Coast Offshore Exploration Environmental Assessment Panel

1984/85 Public hearings, Queen Charlotte City, Sept. 30, 1985, Vol. 1: 46-56. Community hearings, Skidegate, Sept. 21, 1985, Vol. 14; Public hearings, Vancouver, Oct. 29, 1985; Vol. 14, 170-175. Community, Masset, Nov. 14, 1984, Vol. 12.