

THE CRIME CHALLENGE FOR INUIT JUSTICE IN LABRADOR

PRESENTED TO LABRADOR LEGAL SERVICES

BY

DON CLAIRMONT

ATLANTIC INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

JULY, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE TASK 3

THE APPROACH FOLLOWED 5

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT 7

CRIME STATISTICS AND PATTERNS OF BEHAVIOUR 15

THE COMMUNITY FOCUS GROUPS 44

THE INTERVIEWS 51

APPENDICES 66

BIBLIOGRAPHY 67

THE TASK

Not much data have been gathered nor analyses produced concerning crime patterns among the Inuit in Labrador. While there has been widespread appreciation that crime has wreaked much havoc at the individual, familial and community levels, the focus among many Inuit leaders has been, perhaps quite appropriately, on the larger issues of land claims and increased Inuit control over the policy development and administrative responsibility in all areas of Inuit life. A small number of role players and agencies, most notably Labrador Legal Services, have provided an Inuit presence vis-a-vis the criminal justice system (CJS) but the combination of meagre resources and extensive crime and social problems have necessitated a concentration on the here and now and the provision of services. There has been a gap at the level of data gathering, analysis and planning. This shortfall must be addressed as significant political, socio-economic and administrative change looms large now that an agreement in principle on land claims and jurisdiction/administration has been negotiated by the Labrador Inuit Association with the governments of Canada and Newfoundland and Labrador (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2002; Labrador Inuit Association, 2002).

Very conscious of the above challenge, Labrador Legal Services (LLS) has recently gathered, and put into machine-readable format, long-term data from the RCMP's "mayor's report" on crime for many communities, and multi-year court data from the provincial criminal courts' files. In addition, the LLS has organized several community forums to discuss criminal justice issues and the possibly greater role of local communities in dealing with crime both proactively and reactively. The task of this paper - and of the project on which it is based - has been to

analyse these diverse data, locate and account for crime patterns, put the findings in context, and draw out possible policy implications for future directions in Inuit justice. The ultimate objectives concern understanding crime patterns with a view to preventing crime, and contributing through research to capacity building at the community level.

THE APPROACH FOLLOWED

The major emphasis in this research has been on analysing the two large data sets noted above. The RCMP reports cover the period from 1981 to 1999 but the data are most reliable for the 1990s so that period has been concentrated upon. These RCMP-generated data provide a longitudinal picture at the community level of crime patterns by offence, gender and age (i.e., youth/adults). The communities for which the RCMP reports are available include, Hopedale, Makkovik, Nain, Postville, Rigolet, Happy Valley, North West River, Cartwright, Mary's Harbour, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu. The data from the provincial criminal court includes roughly 17,000 entries or files. These files provide individual level data by community (as above), age, gender, offence, plea and sentence; each person (offender) has a unique identification number. This court file supplements well the aggregate data produced by the RCMP report despite the fact that it contains many errors and missing cases.

Analyses of these secondary data files have been put in context by a variety of other qualitative and quantitative methods. Statistics Canada reports on the sample communities have been accessed. They have yielded much useful information on socio-demographic, educational, and economic community characteristics. In addition, reports from the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) provided relevant information on the geographical zones in which the sample communities are located. LLS reports on community forums / workshops held in Labrador in 2001 were closely examined for information on what local leaders and agency personnel deemed crucial issues and possible future strategies for Inuit criminal justice. The researcher also made two field trips to the Happy Valley / Goose Bay area, gathering secondary data and having one-

on-one interviews with LLS staff, CJS personnel, local agency staff and Inuit and Métis political leaders.

The focus in this report has been upon the Inuit in Labrador and the communities in which they reside. Comparisons, of a modest and limited nature, have been drawn among these communities and with the Labrador Métis and Innu communities, and with certain other Canadian communities, not to highlight differences and make invidious comparisons but rather to isolate possible distinctiveness on the part of the Inuit sample and in that way contribute, hopefully, to significant and focused social policy development.

THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

The informational base for the social and economic context was obtained via Statistics Canada and ACOA reports. Official counts of the aboriginal population in Canada and the provinces have been complicated by changing definitions used by Statistics Canada. Over the past twenty years the criteria for identification have changed in at least three profound ways, namely recognizing ethnic lines from both parents, allowing for multiple ethnic identities, and determining primary identity. The 1996 census was different from predecessors in that it asked of a person if she or he was an aboriginal belonging to one of three groups, namely Amerindian, Inuit or Métis. Unlike previous censuses there was no multiple identity option save in the sense that a person might check off two of the three categories; accordingly, the census population counts for aboriginal persons for 1996 are not strictly comparable to those of 1991 and 1986. In 1996 the figures for Amerindian, Métis and Inuit were for Canada, 554,280, 210,190 and 41,080 respectively while, for Newfoundland and Labrador, they were 5430, 4685 and 4265. The percent aboriginal of the total population was 2.8% for Canada (where the total population was given as 28,528,125), and 2.6% for Newfoundland and Labrador (where the total population was given as 547,160). In Labrador the largest concentrations of the approximately 4000 Inuit are found in the Happy Valley area, and in the distinctive Inuit communities of Nain and Hopedale. The latter two, along with Makkovik, Postville and Rigolet, constitute the primary Inuit settlement area in Labrador. The approximately 2000 Innu reside chiefly in Sheshatshiu and Davis Inlet.

The Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA) in Newfoundland and Labrador has divided the province into twenty

economic zones from an economic development perspective. The Labrador communities of interest here are located in one or other of three of these twenty ACOA zones. Zone 1, Inukshuk, includes Hopedale, Nain, Rigolet, Postville, Makkovik and Davis Inlet. Zone 3, Central Labrador, is constituted basically of Happy Valley/Goose Bay, North West River and Sheshatshiu, and Zone 4, Aurora, is the south-eastern coastal area (Cartwright, Mary's Harbour etc). Apart from the Innu community of Davis Inlet, Inukshuk is basically constituted of Inuit communities. Central Labrador, centered around the ethnically mixed town of Happy Valley/Goose Bay, includes the large Innu community of Sheshatshiu and the Inuit/Métis community of North West River. Zone 4, is composed of Métis and European-peopled communities. As indicated in Table One, Inukshuk is the only one of the three zones that has experienced consistent demographic growth over the past twenty years and, indeed, it is one of the very few zones in the whole of Newfoundland and Labrador to have done so. The population increase in Inukshuk has been the result of natural growth not immigration. In the large majority of the twenty Newfoundland and Labrador zones the percentage of the population aged nineteen years and under is less than 50% of the twenty year plus population, but in Inukshuk, the former age category is fully 80% of the latter, a figure which both attests to past natural increase and indicates that the zone one population will increase in the future as well.

In terms of educational achievement, Inukshuk clearly trails the other Newfoundland and Labrador zones. Of the twenty zones, it has the highest percentage of adults 18-64 years of age who have less than high school completion - some 46% compared with but 14% in Central Labrador. It also has the lowest percentage of high school graduates in 1996 who subsequently pursued some form of post-secondary education - only 23% did so, well below the other

three zones and much lower than other Newfoundland and Labrador zones; in Central Labrador, for example, 57% of the graduates of 1996 went on to more advanced education and training. Not surprisingly, zone one has by far the highest proportion of people aged 15 to 24 (i.e., 60%) not attending school among all the provincial zones.

The economic well-being of the Inuit communities also leaves much to be desired as indicated in Table One. While the labour force participation for adults between 18 and 64 years of age is high (i.e., 87% in 1999) and there is significant labour mobility (i.e., 30% of Inukshuk residents were working outside their home community), there is a high level of unemployment (i.e., about 30%), and much of the available work is seasonal as reflected in the fact that less than half the labour force worked more than 36 weeks in 1999. These figures reflect much more economic depression than in most other provincial zones and clearly are much different from Central Labrador as well, where as Table One shows, unemployment was only one fifth as much and the proportion working more than 36 weeks a year was double that of zone one. Occupational profiles indicate that roughly half those employed in Inukshuk are in the government/health/education sector and few persons (about 15%) in either manufacturing or the primary industries. The ACOA reports indicate that there are basically five small fish plants and that there has been little economic development outside the tertiary sector. The per capita disposable income in zone one - approximately \$8300 in 1998 - was the lowest of all twenty provincial ACOA zones and the proportion of transfer payments in total income was among the highest.

As will be noted below, a case can certainly be made that lack of economic opportunities, and consequent problematic male

role identity, may well be causally related to the exceptionally high levels of violent crime among young Inuit male adults. In that regard it is interesting to note the reference to "pressure index" in Table One. This measure, generated in the ACOA analysis, reflects the extent to which there will be pressure exerted on labour markets as new entrants attempt to find employment. Among the twenty zones the index value projected to the year 2006 ranges from 1.66 (lowest) to the 4.40 (highest) for Inukshuk. The average for all Newfoundland and Labrador is 2.13 and, for Canada, 1.27. Clearly, there will continue to be immense pressure on young adult males to secure a meaningful role in their Inuit communities. Of course the future development(s) associated with Voisey Bay might well have a positive impact on job opportunities (especially perhaps for Inuit young adult males) and economic development in the heart of Inuit Labrador. Certainly it will be crucial for Inuit and Newfoundland-Labrador provincial leaders to ensure that it does if they want to get at underlying macro factors effecting violent crime and suicide.

Table Two presents data on the specific communities that will be the focus of this brief report. Clearly, the two Inuit communities of Hopedale and Nain yield similar profiles in terms of having growing populations; their population are marked with a "+" to indicate continued growth over the 1990s and they have, among the five Inuit communities, the smallest percentage of residents fifteen years and older. The two are also similar in terms of educational attainment (i.e., the proportion of residents twenty-five years of age and older who have obtained a high school certificate), unemployment rate (28.6 and 22.4 respectively), average total income of residents reporting to Revenue Canada (roughly fourteen and sixteen thousand dollars respectively), proportion of one parent families (about 16%), and proportion of

residences where there are two or more occupants per room (21% and 29% respectively). The other three Inuit communities, namely Rigolet, Postville and Makkovik, are quite similar to each other. They have small stable populations, low expected natural increase (i.e., in all three the proportion of the population fifteen and older is over 70%), employment concentrated in the tertiary sector, high unemployment, similar total incomes (about fifteen thousand dollars in 1996), and similar proportions of one parent families and occupancy/crowdedness levels. These three communities differ from Hopedale and Nain primarily in their socio-demographics and growth trajectories.

The two Innu communities of Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu are not only strikingly similar according to the characteristics listed in Table Two but also are markedly different from all the other Labrador communities. These two communities are fast growing with young populations (i.e., less than 60% of their residents are fifteen years of age or older) and a recent history of sharp population increase (i.e., indicated by the "+" alongside their population count). They both have low levels of educational attainment among adults and, not shown in the table, low levels of school attendance and school performance. In both communities there is little employment outside the tertiary sector (i.e., government, health and education), low average total income (i.e., about twelve thousand dollars annually) and high levels of crowdedness in their homes.

The other communities listed in Table Two are more similar to one another than they are to either the Inuit pair of Hopedale and Nain or the Innu pair of Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu. Using Happy Valley as a reference point, the other communities (Mary's Harbour, North West River, and Cartwright) differ primarily in

having substantially higher unemployment rates, lower average total incomes and more diversified, if struggling economies, (i.e., less concentration in the tertiary sector).

TABLE ONE
ZONE SNAPSHOTS
ACOA,* 2000

	Zone 1 Inukshuk	Zone 3 Central Labrador	Zone 4 Aurora
Population:			
1986	2757	8490	2996
1996	3134 (14%+)	10240 (20%+)	2876 (4%-)
1998	3420 (9%+)	9960 (3%-)	2820 (2%-)
Employment:			
LFP	87%	88%	87%
Unemployment	30.8	6.2	30.8
Labour Mobility	30%	18%	30%
Work > 36 Weeks	46%	85%	46%
Occupation:			
Primary	12%	2%	12%
Manufacturing	3%	2%	28%
Retail	7%	15%	10%
Govt/Health/Education	50%	48%	25%
Income:			
1998 Per Capita Disposable Income	\$8,300	\$14,800	\$10,400
1998 Transfers As Proportion of Income	26%	14%	40%
Pressure Index	4.40 (2006)	3.12 (2006)	3.55 (2006)
Education:			
Adults (18-64) < HSC	46%	14%	46%
1996 HS Grads With Post-Secondary Education	23%	57%	60%

* From the Newfoundland and Labrador Zone Profiles, of the Policy and Coordination Division ACOA, 2001.

TABLE TWO
ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY PROFILE
LABRADOR, STATISTICS CANADA 1996*

Community	Pop	% >/= 15	% >/= 25+ HS Certif	% in Tertiary Services	1996 Unemp Rate	Average Total Income of Reportees (000s)	% One Parent Family	% Occupcy > 1 Person per Room
Hopedale	591+	60%	50%	90%	28.6	\$13.8	16%	21
Makkovik	367	71	48	70	32.1	\$15.5	18	10
Nain	1176+	64	46	77	22.4	\$16.5	17	29
Postville	223	74	63	80	28.6	-	15	15
Rigolet	259	71	44	71	45.0	\$15.7	14	13
Happy Valley	8655	75	67	93	15.8	\$24.4	13	-
North West River	567+	81	68	84	34.0	\$19.8	21	0.0
Cartwright	628	78	48	61	51.0	\$17.6	20	5
Mary's Harbour	474	74	55	40	62.8	\$18.3	12	-
Davis Inlet	512+	57	30	100	10.0	\$12.8	14	60
Sheshatshiu	933+	56	27	91	41.7	\$11.4	14	49

* These data have been obtained from the statistical profiles, 1996, for Newfoundland and Labrador Zones 1, 3 and 4, produced by Statistics Canada. All Percentages have been rounded to the appropriate whole number.

CRIME STATISTICS AND PATTERNS OF BEHAVIOUR

BASIC DATA ON OFFENSES AND OFFENDERS

The graphs appended to this report establish quite clearly that in all communities the recorded offenses are largely committed by adult males, especially the grouping between eighteen and forty years of age. In distant second place, in terms of frequency, are the male youth. Examining the cases that have gone to court between 1988 and 1999 (derived from the Labrador court file provided by Labrador Legal Services), it was found that adult males accounted for roughly 90% of all the Postville, Cartwright and Mary's Harbour cases, 80% of the North West River cases, 75% of the Hopedale and Makkovik cases and about 70% of the Happy Valley, Nain and Rigolet cases. The court dockets for the Innu communities were more inclusive of all groupings as 60% of the Sheshatshiu cases and only 45% of the Davis Inlet cases involved adult males; indeed, in Davis Inlet youth cases were 75% of the adult total. Over the period 1988 to 1999 the number of adult male cases going to court has shown an upward trend for Nain, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu. In all the other communities the trend for adult male cases has been either declining (e.g., Happy Valley) or steady. The graph for male youth cases going to court exhibits similar patterns played out at lower levels of crime. There has been an upward trend in Nain, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu and decline or stability elsewhere. The low levels of female cases which have gone to court produce more erratic graphic patterns but overall, over the 1988-1999 period, adult female cases have become more frequent in Nain, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu and remained quite low elsewhere. Female youth cases going to court have remained low throughout this period in all communities with some "bumps" occurring sporadically in Nain and Davis Inlet in particular. It is quite

clear, then, that in terms of cases going to court, the chief offenders are adult males (especially young male adults) and that over the past twelve years there has been an increase in court cases for youth and adults, males and females in Nain, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu.

The court file also provides data on the specific offenses that have been processed in criminal court over the years 1988 to 1999, by community, gender and young/adult status. In Happy Valley the number of such offenses peaked in 1990-1991 and the top three offenses for adults, both male and female, were assaults, impaired driving and breaches (of undertakings, probation and parole). Among Happy Valley youth the dominant offenses were breaches and break and enters. These patterns were stable throughout the 1990s. In the Inuit communities of Nain and Hopedale, adult offenses processed in court were chiefly assaults and breaches for both males and females. Common assaults increased significantly during the 1990s but there was also a steady stream of sexual and aggravated assaults on the part of the adult males. Among the youth the dominant offenses going to court were property crimes (especially break and enter) and breaches. These offence patterns were very consistent throughout the 1988 to 1999 period in Nain and Hopedale. In the case of Makkovik, Postville, Rigolet, North West River and Cartwright the number of court processed offenses was quite small and therefore any trend assessment would be of limited value. The basic pattern remained of adult offenses being chiefly impaired driving, assaults and breaches while youth offenses were overwhelmingly break and enter and breaches.

In the two Innu communities of Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu, the patterns found in offenses processed in court were quite similar to those noted above with respect to Nain and Hopedale.

Among adults, assaults, especially common assault, have been most common and increasing, followed by administration of justice offenses such as breaches. In Davis Inlet, break and enter has also been a major adult offence while in Sheshatshiu mischief and impaired driving have been more common than break and enter. This has been true for both males and females, though males of course have had a much higher rate of offending. Break and enter and breaches have been the dominant male and female youth offenses, accounting for roughly 80% of all youth offenses processed in court between 1988 and 1999.

TABLE THREE

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

HOPEDALE, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		-		-	
Assault	33		31		27		60		64	
Assault 2/3	4		10		8		12		3	
Sexual Assault	19		10		6		18		14	
Other Person Offences	1		2		-		2		1	
Total Person	57	855	53	795	41	615	92	1380	82	1230

Break & Enter	21		20		26		25		33	
Theft Under	9		6		10		17		17	
Theft Over	1		1		1		6		7	
Fraud	2		1		2		1		5	
Total Property	33	495	28	420	39	585	49	735	62	930

Damage	22		11		15		49		31	
Disturbing	4		5		11		23		25	
Breaches	8		30		30		44		36	
Other	20		23		13		56		24	
Total Other	54	810	69	1035	69	1035	172	2580	116	1740

Federal Statutes	16		3		3		-		10	
Traffic	-		1		8		20		11	
Other Provincial	-		13		21		32		37	
LCA	1		3		7		2		1	

GRAND TOTAL	161	2415	170	2550	188	2820	367	5505	319	4785
--------------------	------------	-------------	------------	-------------	------------	-------------	------------	-------------	------------	-------------

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE FOUR

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

NAIN, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		1		1		-	
Assault	68		76		105		202		217	
Assault 2/3	16		11		41		32		39	
Sexual Assault	28		38		23		19		19	
Other Person Offences	2		18		7		5		11	
Total Person	114	1026	144	1296	177	1593	259	2331	286	2574
Break & Enter	79		54		51		70		79	
Theft Under	20		18		33		60		49	
Theft Over	4		5		12		13		37	
Fraud	9		-		16		2		6	
Total Property	112	1008	77	693	112	1008	145	1305	171	1539
Damage	25		27		54		53		56	
Disturbing	28		8		17		38		34	
Breaches	145		102		144		206		181	
Other	42		28		50		80		98	
Total Other	240	2160	165	1385	265	2385	377	3393	369	3321
Federal Statutes	14		8		26		11		12	
Traffic	-		-		3		27		49	
Other Provincial	35		68		45		132		133	
LCA	11		7		11		17		5	
GRAND TOTAL	526	4734	469	4221	639	5751	968	8712	1025	9225

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE FIVE**ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS****HAPPY VALLEY, RCMP REPORTS***

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		-		1	
Assault	89		122		114		154		144	
Assault 2/3	23		14		10		28		21	
Sexual Assault	34		29		29		18		14	
Other Person Offences	17		16		13		11		7	
Total Person	163	187	181	208	166	190	211	242	186	214
Break & Enter	55		84		72		90		131	
Theft Under	198		231		152		213		250	
Theft Over	25		28		33		55		49	
Fraud	22		39		29		44		56	
Total Property	300	345	382	439	286	329	402	462	486	559
Damage	106		133		101		142		142	
Disturbing	43		24		44		178		179	
Breaches	83		135		114		128		128	
Other	108		120		102		175		175	
Total Other	340	391	412	473	361	415	623	716	624	717
Federal Statutes	17		20		38		48		48	
Traffic	485		404		553		388		917	
Other Provincial	170		97		92		236		236	
LCA	66		27		32		76		76	
GRAND TOTAL	1541	1772	1523	1751	1528	1757	1984	2281	2573	2958

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE SIX

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

RIGOLET, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		-		-	
Assault	5		8		4		-		2	
Assault 2/3	-		1		-		-		-	
Sexual Assault	1		6		1		2		1	
Other Person Offences	-		-		1		-		-	
Total Person	6	300	15	750	6	300	2	100	3	150
Break & Enter	14		18		1		7		2	
Theft Under	2		9		1		5		5	
Theft Over	-		2		-		-		-	
Fraud	-		-		-		2		2	
Total Property	16	800	29	1450	2	100	14	700	9	450
Damage	8		8		3		1		4	
Disturbing	2		-		5		1		-	
Breaches	-		8		1		-		-	
Other	3		11		3		2		4	
Total Other	13	650	27	1350	12	600	4	200	8	400
Federal Statutes	-		1		1		1		1	
Traffic	-		1		6		3		8	
Other Provincial	3		8		1		4		6	
LCA	-		1		-		3		-	
GRAND TOTAL	38	1900	82	4100	28	1400	31	1550	35	1750

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE SEVEN

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

MARY'S HARBOUR, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		-		-	
Assault	-		2		4		5		7	
Assault 2/3	-		-		-		2		1	
Sexual Assault	-		-		2		1		3	
Other Person Offences	-		-		3		-		1	
Total Person	-	-	2	40	9	180	8	160	12	240
Break & Enter	1		1		4		8		8	
Theft Under	2		4		1		7		4	
Theft Over	-		-		1		4		1	
Fraud	-		-		-		2		1	
Total Property	3	60	5	100	6	120	21	420	14	280
Damage	1		1		-		6		9	
Disturbing	1		2		-		3		5	
Breaches	-		-		-		2		12	
Other	2		1		-		14		19	
Total Other	4	80	4	80	-	-	25	500	45	900
Federal Statutes	-		6		-		1		15	
Traffic	3		6		10		32		78	
Other Provincial	6		3		5		26		15	
LCA	6		3		-		18		24	
GRAND TOTAL	22	440	29	580	30	600	131	2620	203	4060

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE EIGHT

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

MAKKOVIC, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		-		-	
Assault	5		12		4		4		7	
Assault 2/3	3		-		1		1		2	
Sexual Assault	1		2		1		2		4	
Other Person Offences	-		2		1		1		-	
Total Person	9	225	16	400	7	175	8	200	13	325
Break & Enter	12		8		19		2		12	
Theft Under	10		1		6		-		11	
Theft Over	-		4		1		-		1	
Fraud	1		-		-		2		-	
Total Property	23	575	13	325	26	650	4	100	24	600
Damage	7		4		8		2		11	
Disturbing	1		-		-		1		5	
Breaches	-		2		5		4		4	
Other	2		8		12		11		5	
Total Other	10	250	14	350	25	625	18	450	25	625
Federal Statutes	3		3		1		-		3	
Traffic	-		-		21		1		30	
Other Provincial	5		5		13		8		20	
LCA	-		4		-		2		3	
GRAND TOTAL	50	1250	55	1375	93	2325	41	1025	118	2950

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE NINE

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

CARTWRIGHT, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		<u>Not Available</u>			
Assault	13		5		-					
Assault 2/3	2		-		-					
Sexual Assault	3		3		4					
Other Person Offences	6		-		-					
Total Person	24	360	8	120	4	60				
Break & Enter	2		3		3		<u>Not Available</u>			
Theft Under	8		7		12					
Theft Over	1		2		1					
Fraud	-		-		-					
Total Property	11	165	12	180	16	240				
Damage	9		2		3		<u>Not Available</u>			
Disturbing	5		1		2					
Breaches	2		9		11					
Other	9		2		-					
Total Other	25	375	14	210	16	240				
Federal Statutes	2		6		4		<u>Not Available</u>			
Traffic	4		24		11					
Other Provincial	7		6		5					
LCA	3		3		-					
GRAND TOTAL	76	1140	73	1095	56	840				

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE TEN

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

NORTH WEST RIVER, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	Not Available				-		-		-	
Assault	Not Available				3		9		8	
Assault 2/3	Not Available				-		2		1	
Sexual Assault	Not Available				2		2		-	
Other Person Offences	Not Available				-		-		-	
Total Person					5	75	13	195	9	135
Break & Enter	Not Available				6		11		10	
Theft Under	Not Available				17		15		19	
Theft Over	Not Available				8		9		5	
Fraud	Not Available				1		1		3	
Total Property					32	480	36	540	37	555
Damage	Not Available				12		10		11	
Disturbing Breaches	Not Available				3		8		20	
Other	Not Available				5		8		2	
Total Other					30	450	39	585	44	660
Federal Statutes	Not Available				4		2		3	
Traffic	Not Available				12		16		28	
Other Provincial	Not Available				9		13		15	
LCA	Not Available				1		6		10	
GRAND TOTAL					93	1395	125	1875	146	2190

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE ELEVEN

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

DAVIS INLET, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		-		-	
Assault	27		14		69		109		102	
Assault 2/3	2		7		19		16		18	
Sexual Assault	6		8		17		5		6	
Other Person Offences	2		3		6		7		3	
Total Person	37	740	32	640	111	2220	137	2740	129	2580
Break & Enter	37		25		79		74		100	
Theft Under	4		4		19		31		25	
Theft Over	7		9		17		41		36	
Fraud	-		-		1		-		-	
Total Property	48	960	38	760	116	2320	146	2920	161	3220
Damage	15		8		46		65		55	
Disturbing	4		-		16		41		46	
Breaches	2		10		35		54		24	
Other	19		10		25		148		79	
Total Other	40	800	28	560	122	2440	308	6160	204	4080
Federal Statutes	-		-		3		3		3	
Traffic	-		-		13		47		11	
Other Provincial	28		-		39		141		66	
LCA	1		-		1		7		5	
GRAND TOTAL	154	3080	101	2020	405	8100	789	15780	579	11580

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

TABLE TWELVE

ACTUAL OFFENSES AND RATES PER 10,000, SELECTED YEARS

SHESHATSHIU, RCMP REPORTS*

	1992		1994		1996		1998		1999	
	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate	Actual #	Rate
Homicide Related	-		-		-		1		-	
Assault	52		78		97		142		195	
Assault 2/3	4		9		8		16		15	
Sexual Assault	21		45		17		16		18	
Other Person Offences	-		1		-		5		8	
Total Person	77	847	133	1463	122	1342	180	1980	236	2596
Break & Enter	12		20		20		50		30	
Theft Under	21		22		23		28		33	
Theft Over	2		4		12		29		19	
Fraud	5		2		4		4		5	
Total Property	40	440	48	528	59	649	111	1221	87	957
Damage	44		21		46		59		77	
Disturbing	12		12		10		22		87	
Breaches	44		50		42		54		45	
Other	19		18		26		41		59	
Total Other	119	1309	101	1111	124	1364	176	1936	268	2948
Federal Statutes	14		1		2		2		10	
Traffic	6		11		23		50		80	
Other Provincial	6		24		33		70		143	
LCA	9		5		8		4		23	
GRAND TOTAL	271	2981	323	3553	371	4081	593	6523	847	9317

* RCMP "Detailed Mayors Reports" are available on all communities described here for the period 1982 to 1999.

OFFENCE PATTERNS AND RATES PER 10,000 BY COMMUNITY

Tables Three to Twelve present data on "actual offenses" provided in the RCMP's detailed Mayors' Reports for each of ten communities for the selected years 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998 and 1999. The data were available for the period 1982 through to 1999 but for convenience only selected years are considered here. In each table the actual number of specific offenses is given for that particular community. To facilitate comparisons, given the differences in population size, rates per 10,000 also have been computed for total person (i.e., violent) offenses, total property offenses, total "other offenses" (e.g., mischief, damage, disturbances and breaches) and the grand total of offenses for each of the years depicted.

It can be seen that Nain and Hopedale (Tables Three and Four) exhibit the same overall pattern of offenses. In each community the rates have increased over time for all categories of offenses, namely person, property and "other". For example, in Hopedale the rate of person offenses was about 800 per 10,000 in 1992 and 1994 and about 1300 in 1998 and 1999. The rates of property crimes and "other offenses" almost doubled over these same years. In Nain the rates of person (i.e., violent) offenses have doubled between 1992/1994 and 1998/1999, while the rates for property crime and "other offenses" have also increased sharply, though more in the order of 50%. Nain clearly has a higher level of "actual offenses" than Hopedale but structurally the communities are similar. It can be seen, too, that in both communities the rank order of rates by category is "other offenses", then person offenses and, lastly, property crime.

The rates of the different categories of offenses over time in Happy Valley (Table Five) are more similar to trends occurring in Canada as a whole, not surprising since it is a much larger community and is closer to the Canadian average in socio-demographic and other characteristics. The rates have increased only modestly and the rates per year of person offenses have been consistently well below the rates for property offenses and "other offenses" (e.g. in 1998/1999, 242 and 214 per 10,000 compared to 462 and 559 for property offenses and to 716 and 717 for "other criminal code"). The other Inuit and Métis communities - Makkovik, Rigolet, North West River, Cartwright and Mary's Harbour (Tables Six through Ten) - do not exhibit any particular time-trend in these RCMP-recorded offenses and, in all cases, the number of offenses is few, yielding modest but variable rates.

The Innu communities of Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu (Tables Eleven and Twelve) are similar to Nain and Hopedale in that the rates for all categories of offenses have steadily increased over the 1990s and the rates are very high. Sheshatshiu's rates are quite similar to Nain and the rank order of "other offenses", person offenses and lastly property offenses is also the same. Davis Inlet is singular in that it has exceptionally high rates of property crime as well as high rates of person offenses and "other offenses".

COMPARATIVE OFFENCE PATTERNS

Table Thirteen compares five Labrador communities - Nain, Hopedale, Sheshatshiu, Davis Inlet and Happy Valley - with Ontario First Nations, rural areas and small towns, with respect to rates of offenses in 1996. That year was taken since comparative data were available for 1996 and such comparisons assist in

appreciating the special crime features in Labrador's Inuit communities. The year, 1996, was a representative year for the 1990s' crime patterns in Labrador. Table Thirteen indicates that the rates of crime (i.e., "actual offenses") in Happy Valley were slightly less but similar to the averages for First Nations in both Quebec and Ontario. Person offenses, property crimes and "other offenses", by rates per 10,000, were of similar magnitude and followed the same rank order (i.e., "other" offenses, property offenses, and lastly person or violent offenses). Compared however to the Ontario and Quebec rural and small urban areas, Happy Valley had much higher rates of person and "other" offenses and a modestly lower rate of property crime. Nain, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu, however, all had rates well beyond all the other units for every category of offence. In particular, their rates of person (violent) crime and "other offenses" (i.e., social order and administration of justice offenses) were, at the minimum, double the Ontario and Quebec First Nations which, in turn, were more than double their provincial rural and small urban counterparts.

The high rates of all categories of crime in the four largest Inuit and Innu communities in Labrador are comparable only to rates in the Northwest Territories (see Evans et al, 1998) and in Nunavut (see Clairmont, 1999). There, over the past five years, the rate of total crime was three times the Canadian average, five times the rate for assault and seven times the rate for sexual assault. In the Northwest Territories, but not in Nunavut, both violent and non-violent crime peaked by the mid-1990s and has declined in recent years (though violent crime has declined less steeply than non-violent crime). As noted above, crime for all gender/age categories and all offence categories has not declined over the past five for Nain, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and

Sheshatshiu, although there has been some year to year fluctuation in actual crime offenses.

TABLE THIRTEEN

1996 RATES OF CRIME:

Five Communities and Selected First Nations and Provincial Units *

First Nations And Provincial Units	Rates Per 10,000			
	Actual Violent Crime	Actual Property Crime	Actual "Other C.C."	Actual Total C.C.
Nain	1593	1008	2385	5781
Hopedale	615	585	1035	2820
Davis Inlet	2220	2320	2440	8110
Sheshatshiu	1342	649	1364	4081
Happy Valley	190	329	415	1757
Ontario First Nations	257	436	572	1277
Ontario Rural	81	386	237	717
Ontario Small Urban	93	443	306	850
Quebec First Nations	224	323	429	981
Quebec Rural	40	274	176	492
Quebec Small Urban	41	379	135	566

* The crime rates per 10,000 were constructed from data provided in RCMP reports for the Labrador communities while corresponding rates for Ontario and Quebec communities were obtained from a report produced by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (Kowalski, 1998)

RECIDIVISM: AGE, GENDER AND ETHNICITY

Through provincial court data supplied by Labrador legal Services it has been possible to focus on the issue of recidivism among offenders. The court files contain only data for the select Labrador communities already discussed in broad strokes above. The data pertain to charges laid in provincial court for the period 1988 to 1999. There are roughly 17,000 charges though a small number of these charges are for offenses which occurred in earlier years. The chief implication of the 1988-1999 restriction is that analyses of recidivism are limited to offenses during this time period since there is no information whatsoever on criminal charges or criminal record prior to 1988.

Tables Fourteen and Fifteen indicate the broad patterns for charges and incidents (all charges laid against the same individual having the same date of offence are taken as constituting one incident). Clearly there is much recidivism. The 3205 distinct persons accounted for some 16,445 charges and 11,716 incidents processed through provincial criminal courts between 1988 and 1999. Roughly 66% of the charges were accounted for by only 22% of the accused persons; that is, about 600 persons presumably each committed at least seven offenses during the period 1988 to 1998 and slightly over 100 of these persons each faced a minimum of twenty-six charges in that period. The patterns for incidents are similar. About half (i.e., 46%) the 3205 accused persons had only one incident of court-processed crime between 1988 and 1999 but approximately 27% of the 3205 persons accounted for roughly 70% of all incidents handled in court and 156 persons accounted for some 2340 incidents (i.e., 156 times the mean of the "13 plus incidents" category)

In Table Fifteen, charges and incidents are analysed in terms of gender, age at first offence and "ethnicity". Since there was no simple direct indicator for ethnicity in the court files generated by LLS, the assumption is made here that all persons cited in the files as based in the five Inuit communities of Nain, Hopedale, Makkovik, Postville and Rigolet are Inuit, while those based in the Innu communities of Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu are taken as Innu. Happy Valley's population includes Innu, Inuit, Métis and Caucasians so it represents here simply a reference point for comparison purposes. The table shows that males accounted for most of the recidivism with respect to both charges and incidents, and that, even on a proportional basis, female repeat offenders were fewer than their male counterparts. Almost 1000 males were recidivists compared to but 167 females. Still, compared to other jurisdictions in Canada, the recidivism rate for females was surprisingly high, about 25%. About 40% of the 2550 male accused persons faced charges on three or more incidents between 1988 and 1999. Fully fifty percent of all Inuit and Innu accused persons faced charges on a minimum of three different incidents between 1988 and 1999. Innu and Inuit accuseds were significantly more likely than the heterogenous Happy Valley sample to have had three or more incidents (i.e., 50% to 25%) but the differences between Innu and Inuit were quite slight (and given the quality of the data it would be unwise to draw any inferences from these Inuit-Innu comparisons).

The data on age at first offence are seriously limited for recidivism analysis because they pertained only to charges and incidents occurring in the 1988 to 1999 period. In that data set, as shown in Table Fifteen, the bulk of the charges and incidents were accounted for by persons whose age at first offence was between eighteen and thirty-five.

In order to dig deeper into age, gender and ethnic patterns in these court data, additional cross-tabulations were obtained. Table Sixteen provides data on age and ethnicity interaction effects. It can be seen that the age/ethnicity mix produced statistically significant differences and highlighted special Inuit patterns. Among those committing an offence (in this data set) when they were seventeen or younger, Innu offenders were more common than Inuit by quite a large margin (i.e., 165 to 108) and despite the larger Inuit population in the communities selected. Innu and Inuit in this age category were similar in the proportion having "three or more" charges or "four or more" incidents of offending. However, among those whose age at first offence in the years 1988 to 1998 was eighteen or older, Inuit were much more frequent (i.e., 670 to 434), and, in the eighteen to thirty-five category in particular, were more likely (i.e., 48% to 38%) to have had four or more incidents of offending over that period. These data then underline the high level of recidivism for both Inuit and Innu persons and also are consistent with the thesis that among Inuit males, criminal offenses become almost endemic with their assumption of early adulthood (i.e., eighteen to thirty-five years of age).

To check further on these empirical patterns, all males listed who were born in 1977 or later were excluded from the analysis leaving a subsample of court charges and incidents where everyone included was a male at least twelve years of age in 1976 and, theoretically at least, could have committed an offence in each of the court file years, 1988 to 1998. This analysis confirmed the above patterns. Inuit were less common than Innu among the males committing their first offence (in this data set) at age seventeen or less but were more common among the males

committing the first offence at eighteen years of age or older (i.e., 493 to 276); consistently, too, the eighteen to thirty-five Inuit male grouping had the highest proportion of those involved in eleven or more criminal incidents.

Overall, then, the court data reveal high levels of recidivism and multiple repeat offending. Less than 25% of the sample accounted for roughly 70% of the charges and incidents. The recidivists, like offenders as a general category, were especially likely to be males. More detailed cross-tabulation analyses indicated that, at the youth level, Inuit persons faced court much less than their Innu counterparts but, at the adult level, and especially the young male adult level, Inuit persons were more frequently accused persons in court. This pattern will be discussed further below.

TABLE FOURTEEN

**RECIDIVISM PATTERNS, CHARGES AND INCIDENTS
LABRADOR COURT DATA, 1988 TO 1998**

CHARGES			
Number of Charges	Number of Distinct Persons	%	Cumulative %
1 charge	1125	35	35
2-3 charges	934	29	64
4-6 charges	444	14	78
7-25 charges	484	19	97
26 plus charges	118	3	100

INCIDENTS			
Number of Incidents	Number of Distinct Persons	%	Cumulative %
1 incident	1467	46	46
2-3 incidents	863	27	73
4-12 incidents	719	22	95
13 plus incidents	156	5	100

TABLE FIFTEEN

**RECIDIVISM: CHARGES AND INCIDENTS
BY GENDER, AGE AND "ETHNICITY"
LABRADOR COURT FILE, 1988 TO 1998 ***

CHARGES																
#	Gender				Age at First Offence						"Ethnicity"					
	Female		Male		<= 17 yrs		18-35 yrs		> 35 yrs		Inuit		Innu		Happy Valley	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1-3	488	75	1571	62	338	63	1150	62	551	71	401	51	319	53	1179	73
4-15	146	22	737	29	151	28	541	29	188	24	268	34	212	35	370	23
16 +	21	3	242	9	51	9	175	9	35	5	111	14	69	12	72	4
Total	655	100 %	2550	100 %	540	100 %	1866	100 %	774	100 %	780	99 %	600	100 %	1621	99 %

INCIDENTS																
#	Gender				Age at First Offence						"Ethnicity"					
	Female		Male		<= 17yrs		18-35yrs		> 35yrs		Inuit		Innu		Happy Valley	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1-2	468	72	1571	62	335	62	1141	61	541	70	391	50	305	51	1188	73
3-10	164	25	779	30	164	30	574	31	203	26	291	37	230	38	382	24
11 +	23	3	200	8	41	8	151	8	30	4	98	13	65	11	51	3
Total	655	100 %	2550	100 %	540	100 %	1866	100 %	774	100 %	780	100 %	600	100 %	1621	100 %

Gender, Age and "Ethnicity" effects all yielded statistically significant X₂.

TABLE SIXTEEN

**CHARGES AND INCIDENTS BY AGE AT FIRST OFFENCE
BY ETHNICITY
LABRADOR COURT FILE**

	INUIT						INNU					
	17 yrs & under		18 - 35 yrs		36 yrs plus		17 yrs & under		18 - 35 yrs		36 yrs plus	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Charges*												
1 - 2	49	45	161	37	116	50	71	43	131	40	47	43
3 plus	59	55	277	63	116	50	94	57	193	60	63	57
Total	108	100 %	438	100 %	232	100 %	165	100 %	324	100 %	110	100 %
Incidents**												
1 - 3	71	66	228	52	159	68	102	62	200	62	78	71
4 plus	37	34	210	48	73	32	63	38	124	38	32	29
Total	108	100 %	438	100 %	232	100 %	165	100 %	324	100 %	110	100 %

* The age and ethnic effect has a X_2 value with a significance level of <.003

** The age and ethnic effect has a X_2 value with a significance level of <.006

PLEAS AT ARRAIGNMENT AND INCARCERATION

The court file also included data on the pleas that accused persons made at arraignment. These data were analysed, at the community level, only for Nain, Hopedale, Happy Valley, North West River, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu. There were too few cases in the other communities. The pleas considered were "not guilty" and "guilty" since "other pleas" were minimal. Similarly, the analyses focused on adult males since this category of accused persons contained enough cases to make analysis meaningful. Table Seventeen describes the pleas of adult males in the five communities over the period 1988 to 1999. The longitudinal depiction sheds light on possibly changing patterns in access to legal services and in courtroom familiarity among Inuit persons. As above, it is assumed that accused persons from Nain and Hopedale are Inuit while those from the Innu communities are Innu, and the Happy Valley grouping is heterogenous and taken as a point of reference. North West River is taken to be a community largely of Métis persons (although there are significant numbers of Inuit people there as well).

Looking at the adult male pleas then, in Happy Valley, between 1988 and 1995 there were far more guilty pleas compared to non-guilty pleas; in the 1996-1999 period there continued to be more guilty than non-guilty but the difference was much more modest. This pattern is consistent with a premise of more access to legal services (Legal Aid lawyers, court workers etc) and more familiarity with the CJS (i.e., less intimidation). In North West River, for most of the period 1988 to 1999, guilty pleas were more common as they were among Inuit accuseds in Hopedale and Nain. In Hopedale, there was no change over the 1988 to 1999 period as guilty pleas were generally twice as common as non-guilty pleas.

In Nain's case, the Hopedale pattern is reproduced with guilty pleas always being much more common. Not only were the Inuit plea patterns different than those in the more ethnically heterogenous communities but they also differed significantly from the Innu patterns. In Davis Inlet, the pattern was, as in Happy Valley, more guilty than non-guilty pleas at arraignment throughout the years but the difference was substantial in the 1988-1994 era and quite modest in the 1995-1999 era. Sheshatshiu accused persons exhibited a similar pattern, namely more guilty than non-guilty pleas in 1988-1991, but little difference since then (in fact more not guilty pleas though 1999 was a significant exception).

The patterns of pleas at arraignment suggest that Inuit accused persons may well be more passive and more intimidated by the courtroom process. Legal Aid lawyers and court workers have been available for some time and appear to have impacted on the courtroom demeanour of other accused persons in predictable ways but less so on the Inuit. Perhaps, as will be noted below, the impact has been less because Inuit accused persons are more "loners" and often without community support subsequent to their offending. This issue will be discussed further below in the context of the interview data gathered for this report. Of course there could well be many other factors at work such as the type of offence. Certainly, as noted above, the difference among ethnic groups in pleas cannot be accounted for by experience in court since the Inuit adult males have a very high rate of recidivism.

Turning to incarceration patterns, it is clear that Inuit adult males make up a disproportionately high number of Labrador inmates under federal warrants and also of prisoners housed at the provincial Labrador Correctional Centre (LCC) in Happy Valley. Data available from the LCC indicate that for most of the 1990s,

Inuit prisoners have accounted for two-thirds of the usual forty plus inmates and that the rate of recidivism for LCC inmates as a whole in recent years has been roughly 70%. Among the fifty current federal inmates from Labrador, according to federal corrections officials, almost all are Inuit, with only a couple being Innu or "Whites". The high level of incarceration among Inuit adult males is undoubtedly related to offence patterns (i.e., their high level of serious violence and sexual assault) and criminal record. For example, Nain and Hopedale persons charged in provincial court, between 1982 and 1994, with sexual assault numbered 179, while in the two Innu communities of Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu the total number was less than half at 82. RCMP data (i.e., the Mayors' Reports discussed above) indicate that serious violence, represented readily though not exhaustively by assaults levels 2 and 3, was also more common in the two Inuit communities than in their Innu counterparts by a margin of 176 to 114. Still, the high level of Inuit incarceration cannot fully be accounted for by offence and record. Supplementary explanations will be advanced below.

TABLE SEVENTEEN

PLEAS OF ADULT MALE ACCUSED, 1988 TO 1999

SELECT LABRADOR COMMUNITIES *

Yr	Happy Valley		Davis Inlet		Sheshatshiu		Nain		Hopedale		North West River		Total	
	NG	G	NG	G	NG	G	NG	G	NG	G	NG	G	NG	G
88	9		1		0		0		0		0		10	
		0		0		1		3		2		0		6
89	41		7		33		43		26		0		150	
		192		8		52		162		53		0		467
90	92		14		25		27		43		0		201	
		307		40		57		118		75		0		597
91	170		20		53		47		21		22		333	
		417		41		62		94		43		22		679
92	135		17		55		58		9		7		281	
		175		42		33		169		38		14		471
93	166		17		49		28		43		11		314	
		214		20		27		97		34		5		397
94	101		6		64		56		12		4		243	
		200		27		42		164		60		18		511
95	146		22		73		111		38		10		400	
		231		36		59		145		83		29		583
96	138		56		63		130		39		1		427	
		169		57		57		260		84		2		629
97	118		32		50		61		31		5		297	
		117		43		32		126		39		15		372
98	83		45		52		96		22		7		305	
		110		55		68		243		71		9		556
99	79		37		34		70		27		6		253	
		93		43		71		193		41		8		449
NG Total	1278		274		551		727		311		73		3214	
G Total		2225		412		561		1775		623		122		5718

* NG = Not Guilty Plea, G = Guilty Plea
 These data were obtained from provincial court records, Newfoundland and Labrador.

THE COMMUNITY FOCUS GROUPS

Over the past year, LLS sponsored several meetings on Justice issues in communities where Inuit people are most numerous in Labrador. Three reports were available from two-day sessions held by LLS in 2001, namely a seminar on offender reintegration programs held at Happy Valley (September 18 and 19, 2001), a workshop on traditional law held in Hopedale (May 15 and 16, 2001) and a community justice workshop held in Nain (February 27 and 28, 2001). These reports and related materials provide useful insights into how Inuit opinion leaders assess crime and crime prevention in their communities.

At the two day Community Justice Workshop held in Nain there were 27 participants, representing a fairly wide spectrum of CJS personnel (police, corrections, victim services), political representatives from the Labrador Inuit Association and the Labrador Métis Association, agencies (e.g., the Labrador Inuit Health Commission) and community activists (church, safe homes, Mennonites) and, of course, LLS staff. Most participants were residing in either Happy Valley or Nain but there were one or two persons from each of five other communities. There was a presentation on, and much discussion of, three types of programming, namely circle sentencing, community justice forums and anti-violence. It was evident that the major underlying theme was bringing the community back into the equation with respect to crime prevention and healing/reintegration. The report concluded that there was consensus that at least with respect to less serious crime, "communities taking responsibility and ownership is an excellent idea" and that there should be some pursuit of alternative justice models at the local community level.

A number of useful appendices have been incorporated with this Nain report, dealing with topics such as circle sentencing in general and among the Innu, community justice forms (especially the Happy Valley/Goose Bay community justice forum), LLS programs, and a short biographical piece on judge Igloliorte, the first Inuit judge appointed to the provincial court. It was noted that the judge has been making referrals on sentencing to Innu sentencing circles at Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu but so far nothing equivalent has happened among the Inuit communities. Among the LLS programs there was reference to an interesting Peaceable Homes Programming which was developed and implemented by the LLS and which targets men who batter, especially LCC inmates.

Along with the Nain report, there were the questionnaires filled out by conference participants who were either interviewed or filled out the questionnaires themselves. The respondents were equally divided between those who considered Justice issues to be of high priority and those considering such issues to be of medium or low priority. Still, all respondents reported that crime was a problem in their community, a handful blaming the criminal justice system (e.g., poor police visibility/presence and "soft" sentences) and a slightly larger percentage blaming poor family socialization (e.g., lack of discipline at home). The major crime problems identified were personal violence (homicide, assault, and sexual assault) and family violence (e.g., elder abuse, child abuse, spousal assault), but property crime was highlighted as well by a large number of the workshop participants. Substance abuse was also frequently cited. Indeed, the most common solution, by far, offered by the respondents to these crime problems was to ban or limit alcohol. It appears from the answers that while respondents recognized the macro social causes of crime (e.g., lack of economic opportunity, outside cultural domination), they

considered that micro policies (e.g. alcohol control) could nevertheless have an independent, positive, preventative effect. There was a clear consensus, though not unanimity, that the criminal justice system was ineffective and not meeting community needs. Here the respondents supported their views primarily by pointing to the high levels of recidivism. A significant minority did suggest that the formal criminal justice system's response had improved in recent years and that increased services had become available for both offenders and victims.

There was consensus that the community should become more involved in the reintegration and rehabilitation of offenders and, in general, in dealing with Justice issues at the local level. There was less agreement on how that might be done and some scepticism about current community capacity to be mobilized in these ways. When asked for suggestions and strategies the participants fell back on broad themes, such as the need for the community to get involved and help out and the priority of increased community awareness. The respondents were quite equally divided on whether, as aboriginal persons, they felt overwhelmed by non-aboriginal Justice personnel. Those answering yes cited language barriers and inadequate input ("we have no say"). Those answering no emphasized that such CJS personnel were open and friendly to them and that in the criminal justice system everyone is equal. Overall, then, the respondents identified serious person crime in particular as commonplace and not being adequately addressed by the criminal justice system even though the latter may have improved much in sensitivity and services in recent years. They emphasized the need for much greater community input and control but were uncertain about how this might be realized and how effective it could be.

The two day seminar held in Happy Valley on Offender Reintegration Programs focused on programming for offenders while they are in correctional institutions and after their release. The major long-run objective was to decrease recidivism (a) by building community capacity (e.g., knowledge, networking) to facilitate offender reintegration at the community level, and (b) through a critical assessment of on-going and potential programs and services within the correctional institutions and post-release. The participants included several staff members of LLS and the Labrador Correctional Centre, provincial and federal correctional personnel, officials with Victim Services, representatives of women's organizations, other community activists, and three LCC inmates. A handful of the participants came from as far away as Nain and St. John's. Important, key issues discussed included possible exit circles using the community justice forum approach, sex offender programs, anti-violence and healing programs currently available through LLS, anti-addiction programs, and other programs occasionally available at LCC. Two points highlighted were that healing circles might be beneficial but should be implemented slowly and with due caution, and that Correctional Services Canada, was exploring the feasibility of establishing healing lodges for Labrador to assist in preparing inmates for release. The LCC inmates participating in the seminar especially commented on the lack of community support required to facilitate inmate reintegration in the community. The meeting was apparently upbeat and a summary paragraph stressed that these kinds of programming were much needed, and "these programs could work in Labrador" but will require funding training and volunteers. After care in the form of community-based programs and services was seen to be a major challenge.

The Traditional Law Workshop held at Hopedale (beginning on the afternoon of the 15th and carried into the next morning) focused on the potential for more Inuit involvement in Justice issues, in particular a greater role for the community in the reintegration of offenders. Along with a few LLS personnel there were seven elders and community members. It was noted that prior to European colonization conflicts and disputes were handled within the community. Relocation, beginning in the 1950s, of Hebron and Nutak people further south to Nain, Makkovik, Hopedale etc was quite deemed disruptive and, in conjunction with European cultural domination, to have left many Inuit confused, dependent and vulnerable to alcohol abuse. The community capacity to deal with the explosion of social problems was limited and ineffective; rampant crime was one result. The Justice system put in place neither incorporated Inuit views nor was it appreciably understood by Inuit people. This workshop was oriented to discussing how community capacity to deal with social problems could be enhanced. It was made clear that the CJS at present has not been very effective. There is a huge rate of incarceration among Labrador Inuit and there is much recidivism. A study of the LCC was cited which indicated a recidivism rate of 75% in 1993 and reported that 39 of the 53 inmates there at that time were from either Nain or Hopedale.

While some attention was directed to the lack of programming and liaison counsellors for Inuit inmates, most discussion focused on the possible role of the local community, elders and others in the reintegration process. It was reported that Inuit prison inmates from Labrador indicated that they received little support upon re-entering the community and were instead subject to name calling and stigmatization. It was observed that thus far elders have played little role in the reintegration process and that

community services for dealing with crime, whether proactively or subsequent to the offending, were very limited. The hope was expressed that this situation could be significantly changed and that the community could be mobilized and resourced such that it could supplement, and in some ways be an alternative to, the current CJS. It was noted that with the forthcoming land claims agreement, Inuit people would be in a position "to reclaim some of the old ways through community government systems".

Participants were informed that most of the aboriginal inmates in the LCC currently were from one or other of Nain, Hopedale, Davis Inlet and Sheshatshiu. In an appendix there was an excerpt from Taggavut's How the North Was Lost, which described the relocation from Nutak in 1956 and Nain a few years later.

Overall, then, these workshops and seminars can be seen as quite timely in light of the in-principle general agreement on land claims and other issues of Inuit control and governance. There was an underlying thread in these sessions that the near future would bring new opportunities and responsibilities and that the Inuit people and communities could and would be expected to contribute fundamentally to issues of justice and especially crime prevention. There was also a pervasive view that the present CJS has not been effective in incorporating Inuit and community perspectives nor in dealing effectively with crime and recidivism. While there was a clear and widespread recognition of the key Labrador Inuit crime problems (i.e., person violence and sexual assault), there was much diversity of views concerning the causes and the solutions. The immediate causal factor of substance (basically alcohol) abuse was readily acknowledged but larger macro factors such as employment, changing gender role expectations and family styles, much less so. It was widely

acknowledged that in addition to the need to strengthen extant programs of rehabilitation inside and beyond the correctional centres, there was a major problem of reintegration of the offenders. And the latter was generally deemed to require much more community dialogue and involvement. There was an openness to forms of alternative justice such as sentencing and healing circles and so forth, but at the same time, a strong sense that it would be advisable to proceed slowly along these lines. Certainly, the challenges were perceived as was the need for resources and enhanced community capacity in order to meet those challenges.

THE INTERVIEWS

In the course of two, five day, field visits to Happy Valley, the researcher interviewed a number of informed persons in order to flesh out and supplement the information on crime patterns (i.e., extent, causes, CJS and community responses) available through the RCMP and Court files and the community forums held by LLS. LLS staff (especially the director, restorative justice coordinator, court worker, and anger management staffer) were interviewed on both occasions. Local CJS personnel (a judge, two crown prosecutors, a Legal Aid lawyer, two RCMP officers, a federal and a provincial Corrections official) were interviewed one-on-one, sometimes for several hours and sometimes twice. In addition, interviews were carried out with several persons involved in Inuit and Métis political organizations and with a social health professional working with Inuit inmates and counselling others in the Inuit communities (i.e., Labrador Inuit Health Commission or LIHC).

CJS INTERVIEWEES

All CJS role players identified crime among the Labrador Inuit as having two chief characteristics, namely an uncommonly high level of crime and featuring very serious, violent offenses. While acknowledging significant Inuit property crime among the cases processed through the courts, it was the person-violence that was always highlighted. The CJS officials indicated that such crime severely taxed their resources. Police referred to the heavy drain on investigative resources caused by such crime, while at the court level it was noted that the time spent processing criminal cases in the Inuit communities of Nain and Hopedale was much greater than in other parts of Labrador which had larger populations (e.g., the circuit court was said to spend more time

in Nain than in Wabush despite the latter having at least five times the population). Legal Aid was deemed to be overburdened in large measure because of the rate and type of Inuit offenses. Provincial correctional facilities at Happy Valley - the LCC - was said to be almost always filled beyond formal capacity of thirty-eight beds, disproportionately with Inuit young men, and even then it was not uncommon to have to house some inmates in the local RCMP cells for several days at a time. From the point of view of federal corrections, the Labrador inmates at federal institutions in the region were overwhelmingly Inuit men, often having a "schedule one" classification (i.e., repeat, serious violent offenders). Most CJS officials commented, too, on the egregious violence engaged in by many Inuit offenders, referring to it as "macabre", "grotesque", more violent than others' assaults, and often involving the use of weapons. Typically, it was contended, for example, that Innu assaults, in contrast, were more of the drunken fighting variety, without weapons, often domestic, and causing less serious physical harm. The themes articulated by the CJS people were very congruent with the findings from crime data and community forums reported above.

The CJS role players also identified the serious Inuit offenders in these person-violence offenses as young male adults (i.e., 18 to 35 years of age) with a substance abuse problem, at least in the sense that they engaged in what is called, in Nunavut, "power drinking" (i.e., drinking a lot and drinking it fast, but not being intoxicated on a day-to-day basis; see Clairmont, 1999), and usually committed their offenses while intoxicated. The Inuit young male adult offenders were described, by virtually all CJS role players, as usually "loners", "lacking in social skills", passive and reasonably cooperative when sober, but clearly harbouring some inner rage and deep frustration, pent-

up emotion, which too frequently gets released under the guise, if not the stimulus, of intoxication. Several officials also mentioned the high number of suicides among the young adult Inuit males. One suggested that the RCMP-reported decline in crime in Nain in 2000/2001 was probably due to the several suicides that had occurred there among offenders in that age grouping. A check of Labrador Inuit federal inmates in 1998 revealed that five of the thirty-five men had committed suicide by the winter of 2002. Most officials accepted the argument that the Labrador Inuit situation could be likened to that in Nunavut where the young adult male offenders have a very high rate of suicide too, and thus their violence could be interpreted as a generalized response pattern, directed against themselves as well as against others. Interestingly, in both Nunavut and Labrador, there appears to be weak supportive social networks, beyond the close family grouping, among the young adult Inuit males.

There was more divergence in the causes advanced by CJS officials for the Inuit crime patterns. Some emphasized historical macro-factors, suggesting that the serious Inuit offenders were especially likely to be "rejectees", offsprings of the Hebron and other northern Labrador Inuit who were moved to Nain, Hopedale and Makkovik in the 1950s and 1960s (see Taggavut, 1999) and who experienced difficulty in terms of social status and economic opportunity in their new environments. The causal model advanced here was one of multi-generational, multi-problem families but, it should be noted, others contended that the violence was so pervasive among young Inuit adult males that it could not be accounted for by pointing to a small grouping of "rejectees". Several officials emphasized the alcohol abuse problem, suggesting that it was the primary cause (and appropriate focus of social policy), and not merely a manifestation of some deeper, underlying

malaise which had to be directly confronted first in any rehabilitation strategy. Whatever their viewpoint, the CJS officials appeared to appreciate the argument that many of the young male adult offenders lacked both education and employment, having what might be called low, if not zero, status in their communities. The implications of that low status, it was suggested, bear directly and negatively on self-esteem and community respect, and might extend to disappointing gender and sexual relations, compounding the frustration and rage noted above (as well as possibly shedding light on the large number of serious sexual assaults reported above in the section on crime patterns).

The CJS informants expressed frustration and scepticism concerning the effectiveness of either the criminal justice system or the Inuit communities in responding to the crime patterns whether in a preventative or rehabilitative fashion. They noted the high levels of recidivism and suggested that the CJS response was ineffective. At the police level there was little in the way of alternative or restorative justice programming. An alternative measures program for first offence, minor crimes by youth was operative in the Happy Valley area (organized by the Department of Justice's Youth Services) and perhaps in Nain (a decade earlier there had been such a project in Nain but it was unclear whether it was still operative) but there was no program for adults. A Happy Valley demonstration project, organized in collaboration with the RCMP, and following its community justice forum format, had recently handled over 20 adult cases and was "on hold" pending a decision by the Newfoundland Department of Justice to transpose it into a regular program. Its suggested protocol borrowed much from the Nova Scotia restorative justice initiative (Nova Scotia, 1998) but was limited to less serious offenses and offenders.

Some CJS officials pointed to the inadequacy of sentencing, suggesting that too often the sentences were too short to be effective for the rehabilitative programs at correctional institutions or that the sentences assumed a community capacity to assist in the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders that simply was not there. Others contended that programs for inmates, available at either the LCC or federal institutions, were minimal and of limited value. Clearly the inmate programs provided by staff at the LCC were minimal, limited, at least in 2001/2002, to some craft and work projects because of scarcity of resources and staff turnover. Inuit inmates there were reportedly quite active in the craft and work projects but few were interested in furthering their education and obtaining their high school equivalency. The LCC did draw upon programming in anger management and general life skills counselling provided by the LLS and LIHC respectively, whose staff conducted these activities at the correctional institution. These programs were apparently popular with inmates and considered successful by the providers, but the CJS officials (especially non-LCC officials), while acknowledging their value, indicated that the challenge of dealing with serious offenders and serious underlying problems required much more in-depth and skilled intervention. Both provincial and federal corrections officials reported some modest use of local community people either for short-term assistance in smoothing an inmate's return to the community (an LCC program) or in assisting in the monitoring and supervision of parolees on a contract basis (a CSC program). Overall, it would seem fair to conclude that the CJS officials saw the justice response as primarily, and perhaps inevitably as, a reactive response and unfortunately, given the nature of the Inuit crime patterns, a very limited way to deal with an intractable problem.

The CJS officials generally considered that the Inuit communities - especially of course Nain and Hopedale where the crime problems were most severe - did not exhibit much enthusiasm or capacity to be more involved in rehabilitation and reintegration. They were sceptical about the transformative possibilities for the communities' role and capacity in this regard, at least in the near future. Several persons noted that young male adult Inuit offenders were often alone in the courtroom, that the community rarely mobilized on their behalf, that the Inuit communities did not appear to support alternative justice strategies, and that there appeared to be an unwillingness to see inmates return to their communities (though, according to LCC officials, Inuit inmates living outside Happy Valley typically did return to their home community). In terms of community-level responses, the CJS officials suggested that there was a major contrast between Inuit and Innu styles in virtually all of the above respects. The Innu offenders reportedly received more support from families, elders, and other community members whether in the courtroom, in advancing possible alternatives to incarceration (such as sentencing circles which have only occurred among the Innu), in the correctional centres themselves (e.g., healing circles in the LCC have basically involved Innu inmates) or in the encouragement of "traditional" rehabilitation (e.g., the wilderness camp for offenders).

The alleged different ethno-cultural styles were deemed to be a factor in the CJS response to crime. One crown prosecutor indicated that the disproportionately large number of Inuit males incarcerated was a function not only of strictly legally relevant variables such as the offender's record, the violence of the crime and so forth, but also of ethnic styles. He noted that there were fewer alternative possibilities for Inuit offenders, compared with

their Innu counterparts, since the community was less involved and offered few services and little support for the convicted. Such factors, he added, have become appropriate for prosecutors and judges to consider given governmental policy and recent Canada Supreme Court rulings concerning sentencing aboriginal offenders (rulings apparently cited more frequently by the defence lawyers in Innu cases). A Legal Aid lawyer supported these observations arguing that, at least on dealing with the CJS, "the Innu community does seem to be more together and involved". A corrections official reiterated the point, arguing that among the Innu there has been more community involvement (more demands made of the CJS and more pushing for restorative justice) with the result that affirmative action sentencing has not happened in a vacuum; cases were cited where apparently the Innu leaders struck committees to figure out a path of change and rehabilitation for a serious offender.

The CJS officials certainly did not appear to be hostile to greater community involvement in all aspects of the CJS. In fact they seemed to welcome it, and were cognizant of developments in CJS policy (e.g., the new federal Youth Justice Strategy) and the pending political changes in Labrador that would enhance the role of Inuit leaders and communities in all justice matters. They were, however, sceptical about it in short term and worried about any fast-tracking of Inuit autonomy in the administration of justice services. One official suggested that the Inuit were in bad shape from the point of view of civic culture and seemed adrift. He attributed this state of affairs to the three successive dominating colonial systems (German Moravian, British, and Canadian/American) which have blurred Inuit history, eliminated the traditional language and left a legacy of confused identity. Another CJS role player suggested that in considering

the Inuit communities for both crime patterns and possibly greater community participation in justice matters, one should differentiate between Nain and Hopedale on the one hand, and the "more European-based" Rigolet, Makkovik and Postville communities on the other.

OTHER INTERVIEWEES

In many respects the views of the other informants were consistent with those of the CJS persons. All identified the Inuit crime problem in roughly the same way, namely very high levels of crime, much serious violent crime, young male adults as the chief offenders, much recidivism, limited rehabilitative/reintegration programming available either in the correctional institutions or at the community level, and a problematic community orientation regarding involvement and partnership in justice matters. There was a widespread sense that the CJS was ineffective but also a sense that a major transformation to an Inuit-administered and community-based model would be slow and very challenging.

These respondents reinforced the picture of the serious Inuit offenders as being, quite frequently, "loners", lacking social skills, having low status and receiving little community support. LLS officials indicated that their in-house records revealed considerable recidivism amongst offenders and, also, the pattern of violent behaviour being passed along inter-generationally through problem families (consistent, too, with the "rejectee" hypothesis discussed above). An LLS-based, court worker confirmed that the young male adult Inuit offenders appeared to lack supportive networks, had few supporters present when in court, and had "shaky" and problematic partner/spousal relationships and employment. In her experience as a court worker, she found

significant cultural differences between Inuit and Innu styles and clearly greater Innu community involvement in the whole formal justice process. A counsellor/therapist working in the Inuit communities, and with LCC Inuit inmates, reported that the Inuit young men often lacked social skills (e.g., dancing), were largely "socially uninvolved", shy, and had poor self-esteem (she tried to assist in overcoming these shortfalls through a life skills program rather than anger management). Like an LLS official, she drew attention to recent suicides in Nain that involved mostly young adult males. She, too, observed that on the surface at least, the Inuit communities seemed lacking in community spirit and reported herself to be more sceptical than optimistic that a change in the social atmosphere among Inuit communities would soon occur. An LIA political leader, very knowledgeable about issues of social health, readily acknowledged that "the Innu community was more interventionist" and while he was of the view that the Inuit communities are changing in that regard, he considered, too, that "they are unlikely to change too much in the near future".

In advancing causes for the young men's situation and the community's orientation, these informants largely echoed the views of the CJS officials. As noted above, LLS officials reported on the multi-generational problem family pattern. An LIHC counsellor thought that this factor, in conjunction with the "rejectee" hypothesis, might well have merit; she added that the young adult males typically were unwilling to talk about their past, the generations of their parents and grandparents. An Inuit political leader allowed that the "rejectee hypothesis" (i.e., that the serious offenders are significantly identified with those Inuit people who were relocated from the far northern part of Labrador in the 50s and 60s, and who suffered socio-economically in their new environments) seemed valid but he quickly added that serious

crime among young Inuit male adults had become more widespread over the last decade. There was much support for the position that many of the serious offenders' actions stemmed from their having virtually zero status in the community given their lack of education, employment and social skills. One political leader observed that often there was no meaningful role for the male in providing for themselves or others, adding " I am talking about not just a loss of traditional roles but loss of any meaningful role". He also observed that peer support might be weak, given what he termed "a macho style that said males just had to suck it up" (i.e., do not talk about or share their frustrations with others). These non-CJS informants also frequently explained the community response or lack of response as due to historical factors such as Inuit cultural style, the camp tradition of settlement, and the long period of serial cultural domination by others. One person noted that the "settlers" were more common and their impact more profound in the Inuit communities than in the Innu ones.

The agencies' personnel and the political informants had more complex views concerning the future of justice among the Inuit in Labrador. While none thought profound change to be likely in the short run, there was a sense that now that the land claims negotiations had reached the stage of "agreement in principle", there would be more consideration of social health (including crime, suicide and so forth) by leaders and communities. It was indicated that with the new agreement would come the possibility of greater Inuit responsibility and Inuit leaders will seek the resources (i.e., funding) associated with taking over these responsibilities. One political leader noted that social health and justice issues had made the agenda at the recent LIA annual meeting and that "the quiet talk is happening so once the

structures are in place ... over the next four or five years ... who knows". Some agency officials echoed this viewpoint, suggesting that increasingly there are openings for more community mobilization and involvement in justice matters.

OVERVIEW

This report has provided analyses of police and court files on offenses and offenders in Inuit and other communities in Labrador. The files were available in longitudinal format through Labrador Legal Services. In placing the analyses in appropriate context, other secondary data were drawn upon (i.e., Statistics Canada, ACOA) and a limited amount of field work was undertaken which largely consisted of interviewing a sample of personnel from the CJS, local agencies, and political associations.

The central points with respect to crime patterns (offence and offender patterns) were:

(a) The Inuit communities have very high crime rates in comparison to provinces, First Nations, and Canada overall. The rates are comparable to Nunavut and to a lesser extent, the Northwest Territories.

(b) The high crime rates pertain to all three major crime categories, namely person violence, property crime and "other criminal code" (principally mischief, damage, and breaches).

(c) The level of serious violent crime has increased over the past seven years and not declined as in most jurisdictions including the NWT. Population factors and socio-economic conditions indicate that high crime levels could be maintained over the next decade unless there is some effective intervention strategy.

(d) The high level of recidivism and the large number of "administration of justice" offenses indicate that the CJS is not effectively intimidating nor rehabilitative.

(e) The Inuit crime is especially concentrated in, and the above patterns especially found in, the two communities of Nain and Hopedale.

(f) While crime rates have increased for females and males, young and older Inuit persons over the last decade, it is clearly the young adult males (aged eighteen to thirty-five) who are the major offenders, both numerically and in terms of serious violent crime. This grouping also has a very high rate of recidivism.

The trends, as noted, are not favorable for a reduction in the high levels of crime nor for rehabilitating and reintegrating the many serious offenders. Among CJS and other informants, there was much awareness of the basic crime patterns and a widespread acknowledgment that the CJS institutions and the communities have not been effective in preventing serious crime and dealing with the offenders. There is much consensus, too, concerning the characteristics of the offenders, and the causal factors behind both their behaviour (e.g., the "zero status" and "rejectee" hypotheses) and the ineffective institutional and community-level response to it (e.g., traditional Inuit cultural styles, long-term cultural domination). The problems in this regard are often depicted as intractable. At the same time, there was an appreciation among the sample's informants that profound changes are on the horizon with respect to CJS philosophy and practice (e.g., more restorative justice, a new Youth justice strategy, special sentencing policies), and with respect to Inuit control and administrative responsibilities concerning social health and justice (e.g., the agreement in principle concerning land claims negotiations).

Clearly, it is important and timely to engage in strategic planning to deal with crime in Inuit Labrador. It will be important to confront, more effectively, youth crime, and to bring to bear on it the strategies that have been developed elsewhere in terms of restorative justice, intense supervision and so forth. At present there is an alternative measures program but it is reportedly limited in its protocol (i.e., types of offenders and offences dealt with) and does not appear to be extensively employed in the Inuit communities. Some strategies to reduce youth crime may well be non-CJS based, such as making the school environment more attractive to students (especially males) in order to encourage their educational achievement and reduce drop-out rates. While strategies to reduce crime among youth could, undoubtedly, also lead to less crime among young adults, the situation the latter face and the causes of their deviance are quite different. Indeed, the Nunavut experience illustrates well that low crime rates among youths need not lead to low crime rates among young adults grappling with issues of employment, gender, sexual and familial roles and expectations. And, since these young adults are the chief offenders whose behaviour and problems must be dealt with, there has to be some strategic planning specifically directed at this level or grouping.

Clearly the major problems of the young adult males require a multi-prong corrective strategy. At one level there is the alcohol abuse issue which has to be confronted. Currently, there reportedly is little effective substance abuse programming, though there are at least chapters of alcoholics anonymous at Happy Valley and Nain. The "zero status" problem would require greater employment opportunities, more on-going education and training, and perhaps involving offenders, or those at risk to be serious

offenders, in positive community roles. The pent-up frustration which periodically erupts in rage must be targeted. This latter issue raises concerns about community openness, support groups, early intervention, and protocols that could channel persons to rehabilitation and reintegration more than to simply punishment and incarceration. How to achieve that result without jeopardizing those who are the usual victims of the rage would be no easy task. Certainly women's' groups would have to be central players in the development of any protocols oriented to rehabilitation and reintegration. There are apparently women centres in Happy Valley and Nain and these organizations would have to be partners in the development of alternative strategies. A major weakness of restorative justice programming in aboriginal and mainstream society has been the failure to fully involve women organization from the earliest planning stage onwards; this shortfall has considerably weakened these restorative justice initiatives and it is clear that without the support and active collaboration of such bodies, little will be accomplished in dealing with serious violent assaults and sexual assaults. Having said that, there is a case to be made for focusing social policy on the troublesome youth adult males. They cause too much harm to themselves and others and are too young to be consigned to a wasted life.

This research found that informants were quite aware of the limitations of the current CJS and community response to offenses and offenders. They were open to alternatives, new strategies and new opportunities but cautious and sceptical of change possibilities. Such a perspective is reasonable and justified by the seriousness of the crime problems, the divergent views about causes and realistic social policies, and the resource requirements (e.g., personnel, infrastructure) for more decentralized, community-based, "getting -at-the roots"

approaches. It will be necessary to have much community conversation about strategic planning, in and across the relatively small and distant Inuit communities.

Behind any strategic plan there will have to be resources, investments in a more peaceable and productive future for Labrador Inuit people. These investments may be partially directed at elaborating extant CJS programs such as the LCC's community reintegration contracts or the CSC's community contracts for supervision of parolees. Investments will have to be directed too at building community capacity with respect to support networks, and community conversations and prioritizing of alternative possibilities (i.e., enhancing what might be called the civic culture). Equally important would be resources or investments for strategic planning itself. Currently, justice-related Inuit agencies appear to be fully engaged at responding to the high levels of serious crime and lack resources to conduct research and policy development at the required level.

There is little doubt that major challenges lie ahead if the high level of crime and destructive serious person violence is to be conquered. But with resources, planning and community involvement, some small communities elsewhere have achieved recognition for meeting such challenges (e.g., Hollow Water). The Inuit people are famous among world cultures for coping skills and traditions of resourcefulness, a strength that will have to be nurtured and drawn upon to meet the formidable crime challenge.

APPENDICES

REFERENCES CITED:

Clairmont, Don, Review of Justice System Issues Relevant to Nunavut. Ottawa, Department of Justice, 1999

Department of Justice, Nova Scotia, Restorative Justice: A Program For Nova Scotia. Halifax, Government of Nova Scotia, 1998

Dickason, Olive Patricia, Canada's First Nations. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc., 1992

Evans, John, Robert Hann and Joan Nuffield, Crime and Corrections in the Northwest Territories, Government of the Northwest Territories, 1998

Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, Labrador Inuit Land Claims: Agreement in Principle, 2002

Labrador Inuit Association, Labrador Inuit Constitution. Nain Labrador, 2000

Labrador Inuit Association, The Way Ahead: Nunatsiavut: Deciding Our Future. Nain, Labrador 2002

Taggavut, Kanuk, "How The North Was Lost", Kinatuinamut Ilingajuk, Fall, 1999