



**NORTHWEST TERRITORIES
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

2nd Session

Day 31

12th Assembly

HANSARD

FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 1992

Pages 602-615
Pagination reflects print edition

The Honourable Michael Ballantyne, Speaker

FRIDAY, APRIL 3, 1992

Pages 602 - 615

MEMBERS PRESENT

Hon. Titus Allooloo, Mr. Antoine, Hon. Michael Ballantyne, Mr. Bernhardt, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Mr. Dent, Mr. Gargan, Hon. Stephen Kakfwi, Mr. Koe, Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Marie-Jewell, Ms. Mike, Hon. Don Morin, Mr. Nerysoo, Hon. John Ningark, Hon. John Pollard, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Todd, Hon. Tony Whitford

ITEM 1: PRAYER

--- Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Michael Ballantyne): Good morning. Orders of the day for Friday, April 3, 1992.

Item 2, Ministers' statements. Item 3, Members' statements. Mr. Antoine.

ITEM 3: MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Member's Statement On Need To Improve Signage At NWT/BC Border

MR. ANTOINE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism has expressed his willingness to consider ideas from Members in tourism matters. I have a couple of suggestions today. A couple of weeks ago, I was driving back from Whitehorse from the Arctic Winter Games. I came through British Columbia and had to cross the border between British Columbia and the Northwest Territories. I noticed a big difference between the BC side and our side. On the BC side of the border the roadside was dominated by a large, attractive sign that says, 'The Supernatural Splendour of British Columbia Welcomes You.' On the NWT side, there was a rickety, little sign warning drivers not to hit the bison. A little further on there was another sign that said, "Hunting is Not Allowed within a Kilometre of the Roadway." A little while later it said that seatbelts are the law. It was not until a turn in the bend a couple of kilometres past the border that you see a faded, old sign saying, "The Northwest Territories Welcomes You."

This is not much of a welcome, Mr. Speaker. Honourable Members will know that this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Alaska Highway. There will be increased tourist traffic up and down the route. I believe that the decisions tourists make about how long to stay in a place -- and even how much money

to spend while on vacation -- is at least partially dependent upon their first impressions. We are not creating much of an impression with the way our highway roadside is set up, Mr. Speaker.

It is important to me because it is my constituency that they first enter, and I believe it is one of the friendliest and most welcoming areas in the Northwest Territories. We are hoping to attract more tourists with the beauty and tradition of our land and not leave them with the feeling that they have just driven another stretch of highway on a long trip.

I would like to encourage the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, as well as the Minister of Transportation, to review the appearance of the border crossing and consider building a small welcoming centre -- even a temporary one -- on a trial basis...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Antoine, your time is up.

MR. ANTOINE: I seek unanimous consent to, conclude.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is seeking unanimous consent. Are there any nays? There are no nays. Proceed please, Mr. Antoine.

MR. ANTOINE: Thank you. I would like the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, as well as the Minister of Transportation, to review the appearance of border crossings, and consider building a small welcoming centre -- even a temporary one -- on a trial basis to commemorate the 50th year associated with the Alaska Highway. This would be a welcome endeavour on our part for the Northwest Territories, especially my constituency. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Mr. Lewis.

Member's Statement On Stanton Yellowknife Hospital's Diagnosis Of Patient's Source Of Pain

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have had very intense debate over the last week over health care in the Northwest Territories. I would like to relate to Members a very short anecdote about a very good friend of mine. His name is Merlyn Williams. About a week and a half ago, in British Columbia, he was involved in a very nasty traffic accident. The vehicle he was driving, together with his wife, Joyce, rolled over four times in an area near Revelstoke. They were in hospital, very, very badly injured, for some time. He was given pain killers and all kinds of

medications so that the pain would be lessened, Eventually, he was able to come back to Yellowknife to be at home and to get treatment from our local hospital.

I would like to thank the hospital for identifying the source of his pain, which they were not able to identify in the South. He had broken several bones in his neck, which were identified at Stanton Yellowknife Hospital, and he is now getting the care that he should have been given in the first place. Thank you.

--- Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Mr. Nerysoo.

Member's Statement On Request For Public Review Of Services And Procedures, Stanton Yellowknife Hospital

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to make a couple of comments with regard to the matter of health care. I believe Members here are all too knowledgeable of the debate that has taken place on the question regarding the services and surgical procedures at Stanton Yellowknife Hospital. I want to say, having read yesterday's Globe and Mail, that the issue is not going away. In fact, it is getting worse rather than better. I think there are many, many complaints that I would like the Minister of Health to review. Even more so, I would encourage her to seriously consider the recommendation or the matter that I raised yesterday, in which I requested a public inquiry. I do not think it is simply a matter that can be dealt with as an independent review without the people that have been affected by the service, having an opportunity to have their say and having their expression of concern and recommendations as to the procedures that are occurring. The simple fact is

Page 603

that the services are being provided to every constituency in the Northwest Territories and that each Member has to express a concern with regard to the service -- not to suggest for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that we should not improve the service -- that we have to ensure the safety and security of those people that are to receive the services that we in this Assembly argue as a right for every individual in the Northwest Territories. I wanted to make these particular remarks before we conclude this discussion.

I will be tabling in this House, at the appropriate time, an article from The Globe and Mail with regard to that specific issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Member's Statement On Vote Of Non-Confidence In Minister Of Social Services

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to rise today to indicate that I know we are going to be adjourning today until June. I also want to state, as a Member, that this session has been productive to some degree; however, I do want to state publicly that I am somewhat disappointed with cabinet and some of the Ministers' lack of ability to respond to some of the concerns raised by Members. I want to state to the Minister of Social Services that I was truly disappointed in his inability to reply to our concerns regarding the issues brought forth to the House. I want Members to know that I feel I would be doing a disservice to the public if I leave this House and not address some fundamental concerns of the public.

Therefore, I want Members to be aware that today, I, as a Member, will be requesting consent to deal with a motion of non-confidence in the Minister of Social Services. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Members' statements. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Ningark.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Further Return To Question O487-12(2): Legality Of Hunting Polar Bears From The Air

HON. JOHN NINGARK: I have a return to a question asked by Mr. Arvaluk on April 2, 1992. The Member is correct in stating that polar bears may not be hunted from an aircraft without the authority of a wildlife research permit. The department intends to issue a wildlife research permit for the telazol study. The hides of these bears may still be sold by the hunters' and trappers' association members using the tags from their quota. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Mr. Morin.

Further Return To Question O471-12(2): Contracting With Community Businesses To Provide Computer-Aided Design/Drafting Services

HON. DON MORIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to Question O471-12(2), asked by Mr. Dent

on April 2, 1992. The design work for the reclamation of the tailings pond at Rankin Inlet was considered to be a first-of-a-kind pilot project and was completed in house on a leased computer system.

Return To Question O477-12(2): Assurance That DPW Will Not Expand Computer-Aided Design Section

I have a return to Question O477-12(2), asked by Mr. Dent on April 2, 1992, The department will not expand its computer assisted design and drafting capabilities where these can be contracted with the private sector. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Ms. Cournoyea.

Further Return To Question O465-12(2): Status Of Northern Accord

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I have two returns. The first is a return to Question O465-12(2), asked by Mr. Koe on April 1. When finalized, the Northern Accord will provide for a transfer of powers and responsibilities over the management of oil and gas. Management of economic benefits will be an integral part of these responsibilities. Benefits are not an outstanding issue in relation to the Northern Accord. Following is a summary of how this issue has been resolved:

The Inuvialuit and TFN have received assurances that the accord will not interfere with their ability to negotiate participation agreements or Inuit impact benefits agreements in accordance with the provisions of their respective claims.

The Hon, Tom Siddon, Minister of Indian Affairs, has made the commitment to transfer, through the Northern Accord, the additional legislative authority to provide for aboriginal subsurface benefits agreements with respect to oil and gas settlement lands. This government has, in turn, committed to including provisions establishing Gwich'in subsurface benefits agreements in the oil and gas legislation that it would introduce. to the Legislative Assembly following the signing of the accord.

The Department of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources has been consulting with the Gwich'in Tribal Council in drafting these provisions, which are to be modelled after the proposal raised by the Gwich'in during their claims negotiations. Further discussions are scheduled for April 14. 1992.

For those areas not subject to claims agreements, this government would not support the issuance of any new oil and gas exploration rights without the endorsement of the affected communities on terms and conditions relating to benefits, or on any other relevant issue.

Return To Question O464-12(2): Status Of Metis Health Benefits

A return to Question O464-12(2), asked by Mr. Koe on April 2, 1992. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1991, during the eighth session of the 11th Assembly, I indicated that the government's support for improving health benefits for Metis. I also indicated that there were several steps required before the government could make a decision on expansion of health benefits for Metis residents. These steps included the development of a definition of Metis mutually acceptable to the Metis Nation and the government; a survey to determine who meets the criteria in the definition; specification of the additional benefits; calculation of the costs; and an Executive Council decision on expanded health benefits for Metis.

The previous Executive Council considered the matter further on October 21, 1991, and deferred the item to the cabinet of the 12th Assembly in light of constitutional, legal, financial and other factors.

Mr. Speaker, the provision of Metis health benefits remains under consideration by cabinet. The ability of the government to extend these benefits will be considered as part of the 1992-93 budget review process. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Returns to oral questions. Returns to oral questions. Item 5, oral questions. Mr. Antoine..

Page 604

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question O516-12(2): Licence And Fee For Tourist Accommodations

MR. ANTOINE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism with regard to a concern raised by one of my constituents with regard to hotel operations. Can the Minister tell the House if there is such a thing as a licence for tourist accommodations, and if there is, is there a fee attached to that? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pollard. There were two questions, so you can respond to the first or use your own discretion.

Return To Question O516-12(2): Licence And Fee For Tourist Accommodations

HON. JOHN POLLARD: Mr. Speaker, there is a tourist establishment licence issued by the Department of Economic Development and Tourism. I will take the fee question as notice, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Mrs. Marie Jewell.

Question O517-12(2): Total Amount Paid To Chairpersons Of Boards, Agencies And Committees

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Government Leader. The Government Leader replied yesterday to a written question that I asked in February. Will the Government Leader provide, for the June session, the total amount that has been paid to each chairperson as stated in her circulation of the document she gave to the Members yesterday in the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Ms. Cournoyea.

Return To Question O517-12(2): Total Amount Paid To Chairpersons Of Boards, Agencies And Committees

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I realize that we were researching a great number of boards, and I will attempt to have that considered by June. Thank you for the notice and time to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O517-12(2): Total Amount Paid To Chairpersons Of Boards, Agencies And Committees

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is it possible to also indicate the amount paid to contract staff for the particular boards as stated? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms. Cournoyea.

Further Return To Question O517-12(2): Total Amount Paid To Chairpersons Of Boards, Agencies And Committees

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Oral questions. Item 6, written questions. Mr. Koe.

ITEM 6: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Question W34-12(2): Payments To Chairpersons Of Agencies, Boards And Commissions

MR. KOE: I have a written question to the Government Leader regarding payments to chairpersons of agencies, boards and commissions. What were the total amounts paid out to each chairperson over the past fiscal year? The amount should include honoraria, contract fees, daily per diems for expenses, plus any other payments received for performing their duties. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Written questions. Written questions. Item 7, returns to written questions. Mr. Clerk.

ITEM 7: RETURNS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, a return to Question W22-12(2), asked by Mr. Gargan, and responded to by the Minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board.

W22-12(2): Workers' Compensation Board Affirmative Action Hiring Record

Hon. Dennis Patterson's return to Question W22-12(2), asked by Mr. Gargan on March 9, 1992:

1) Five positions are classified as 'management occupations,' as follows: manager, administrative services; manager, rehabilitative services; manager, financial services; manager, information services; manager, claims services. 2) The manager of claims services and manager of financial services positions are occupied by women. 3) The positions classified as 'non-traditional occupations' are: programmer/analyst; programmer; corporate auditor. 4) The corporate auditor position is staffed by a woman who is Metis. 5) Six staff qualify as "indigenous aboriginal" persons, and eight staff qualify as "indigenous non-aboriginal" persons.

MR. SPEAKER: Item 8, replies to Opening Address. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent to return to oral questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member is seeking unanimous consent to return to oral questions. Are there any

nays? There are no nays. Proceed, Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

REVERT TO ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question O518-12(2): Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Members. I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister if his department had given any funding to the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association. In December, in my reply to the Commissioner's Opening Address, I indicated that the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association has been non-compliant with the Societies Act; that they are a group of people in the community who have not had an election for three years. I have indicated non-support for this particular group. I would like to ask the Minister why he allowed his department, on March 31, 1992, to grant \$31,500 to the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association.

Page 605

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark,

Return To Question O518-12(2): Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association has the right to get funding within the Territories as much as any other hunters' and trappers' association. I think we should be very fair when giving money to each of the hunters' and trappers' associations within the NWT.

MR. SPEAKER: Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O518-12(2): Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, I do not begrudge any hunters' and trappers' association's getting equitable funding. Does the Minister believe that hunters' and trappers' associations that do not abide by the law should receive funding from this government?

MR. SPEAKER: You are asking an opinion of the Minister. Mr. Ningark.

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Member is seeking an opinion. I will take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Antoine.

Question O519-12(2): Funding For Western Public Awareness Campaign On The Plebiscite

MR. ANTOINE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs and Constitutional Development in regard to the plebiscite. Will funding be available for a campaign to inform the public in the West about the plebiscite question on May 4th, similar to funding that was made available to TFN?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kakfwi.

Return To Question O519-12(2): Funding For Western Public Awareness Campaign On The Plebiscite

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Speaker, the point was made last week by one of the Members that this Legislative Assembly is not bound by decisions or commitments made by previous Legislatures. I do not want to quibble about the point, but the fact is the last Legislature, in July of last year, through political agreement, made two motions. One motion committed and directed the Executive to set up a western constitutional commission and fund it appropriately. I think the funding came to about \$1.7 million. This was in response to a request and discussions through a committee of western leaders, which included the Dene Nation, the Metis Association at that time, the Gwich'in Tribal Council, the Sahtu Tribal Council and the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, as well as myself and another Member of the Legislative Assembly.

The agreement among MLAs was reached unofficially that this would be done, and the subsequent motion that was moved in this House dealt with the aspirations of people in the Eastern Arctic. It was moved by eastern MLAs, and was supported by everyone here, that there would be some public awareness campaign set up and appropriate money set aside for that to be carried out in the East, and that this would be co-ordinated through the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut's office and it would involve MLAs, to make sure that there is public involvement; and there is some implication that because it is public money, that there was some involvement by the Legislature. I think that money was set up to not

exceed, totally -- this fiscal year it was about \$134,000. I may not be exact on my figures, but it was not to total more than \$250,000. That was the way that this Legislature and this government proceeded.

I raise that because I think it has to be understood that the way we have operated up until now -- and the Legislature is free to do what it wants -- is that money was sought by the different groups that worked with us on political and constitutional development. The general consensus of the aboriginal leaders and representatives of this Legislature and the previous government was to put the full allocation money, set aside for the West, into the work of the Western Constitutional Commission. In the East there was a lesser amount set aside to do the political awareness.

I say that because that is where the direction went, and if Members seek to request that additional moneys be allocated, they should at least understand the mechanism and the process we have used up until now to do that. So as a Minister, if I get sufficient direction, I would of course have to consider it and see if it would not upset the political understanding that I have with the other aboriginal leaders and organizations about how we allocate the resources in this exercise. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Antoine.

Supplementary To Question O519-12(2): Funding For Western Public Awareness Campaign On The Plebiscite

MR. ANTOINE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Minister for that information, but I think that he mentioned that \$1.3 million was spent in the West to develop the constitution if there is division. This \$1.3 million is not allocated to provide the necessary information in the West or to do a public campaign on this plebiscite. I say this because a lot of people in my constituency have indicated to me that they do not have all the information that is required to make a really good decision on May 4th when they are going to be voting on the boundary issue.

One hundred and forty-three thousand dollars was allocated to TFN to do their campaign on this plebiscite, and I do not think that this question about expending money is finished yet. I think that if there is division, then the East will probably come back and ask for funding to develop their constitution, and we have already spent \$1.3 million. So that is still going to happen.

I think the important thing right now is that the people in the West need that information. We have only one month left for this information to be disseminated to them. So we need funding to provide that information to them in the West so that the people in the West can make a really honest decision. I will ask the Minister again if there will be funding made available to people and groups in the West if they want to do a campaign before May 4th?

MR. SPEAKER: If I could ask honourable Members, if they are posing a question, the preamble should be enough to set the stage and provide the background to the question. But question period is not meant to be the time to give a Members' statement. Mr. Kakfwi.

Further Return To Question O519-12(2): Funding For Western Public Awareness Campaign On The Plebiscite

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Speaker, I have just a short response. I tried to indicate earlier that if Members want to draft a motion and ask the Executive Council to consider or recommend taking a certain course of action, of course we would take it very seriously. That is the prerogative of the Legislature.

Page 606

For myself, as a Minister in this government and involved in the previous government, it was my political understanding that it is not for me by myself to go about seeking money from this Legislature without some understanding with the Done Nation, with the Metis Nation, with the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation and with other Members of this Legislature that make up this committee of western leaders, in regard to what kinds of funds should be made available to do work in this political area. So I feel bound by that, but it would not prohibit Members of this House from doing something, in which case it should also indicate what kind of money we are talking about and who it should go to and who should benefit from this money.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Question O520-12(2): Criteria For Funding Hunters' And Trappers' Associations

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Renewable Resources, what are the criteria used to fund hunters' and trappers' associations in the NWT?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Return To Question O520-12(2): Criteria For Funding Hunters' And Trappers' Associations

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the group has to be an association in order to get funding from the department.

MR. SPEAKER: Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O520-12(2): Criteria For Funding Hunters' And Trappers' Associations

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, is it the policy of the government to fund organizations that are not in compliance with the Societies Act?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Further Return To Question O520-12(2): Criteria For Funding Hunters' And Trappers' Associations

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is not a policy of the government to fund organizations who are not in compliance with the regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O520-12(2): Criteria For Funding Hunters' And Trappers' Associations

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: If it is not the policy of the department to fund organizations that are not in compliance with the Societies Act, why did he fund the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will take that question as notice and review the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Koe.

Question O521-12(2): Provision Of Funds For Plebiscite Awareness Campaign

MR. KOE: I have a question to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, a follow-up to my colleague's questioning re funding for a plebiscite. It is my understanding that in one of the Minister's statements he indicated that if a request for funds is to be made, it should be made by letter. Yesterday the Minister received a letter from western Members asking the Minister to look into providing funds for a western

campaign. Has the Minister done anything in response to this letter?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kakfwi.

Return To Question O521-12(2): Provision Of Funds For Plebiscite Awareness Campaign

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Speaker, whether or not I received a letter, it would not be sufficient to get me to do anything substantial. The only way that anything can happen in this area is right here in the Legislature, some motion to direct the Executive to consider allocating some money for this exercise. I cannot do anything on my own. I am not going to draft anything for the Members. I already gave a suggestion as to how it can be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Koe.

Supplementary To Question O521-12(2): Provision Of Funds For Plebiscite Awareness Campaign

MR. KOE: I am a bit confused now because in the interim appropriations, and reviewing the items in those amounts, there was an item for TFN, \$143,000, to carry out this work approved by this Legislature. In an earlier statement you mentioned that you could not do anything because these motions were passed by a previous Assembly. But this Assembly approved funding for a campaign in the East. Will the western communities be given the same consideration for access to funding?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kakfwi.

Further Return To Question O521-12(2): Provision Of Funds For Plebiscite Awareness Campaign

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Speaker, I have to go back again to last year. This issue was raised last spring and dealt with last July. All Members of the past Legislature were fully aware of the upcoming plebiscite; they were aware that the question of the boundary would be addressed this fall; it was supposed to be addressed in October originally. The timetables were very, very tight when we talked about it last year. It was later moved to November and then December; it was moved to March and now it is the 4th of May. As leaders, in discussions with the aboriginal groups, all of us made our best political judgments at that time and said, "Here in the West, if we are going to get ready, here is what we think we need." There was no request, in the submissions that I remember, by the committee of western leaders or Members of the Legislature who are from the western

part of the territories, who at that time said, "We also want a little pot of money to do a public awareness campaign." The entire amount that was asked for was allocated for this Western Constitutional Commission.

The Members of the Eastern Arctic with TFN said in their best judgment what they needed was an allocation of money just to do a public awareness campaign. That is what was dealt with at the time. There were two motions that were moved one after another. They were as a result of agreements that were made at that time among the MLAs. There was support for both motions by the entire Legislature.

Page 607

I understand what the Members are suggesting, that somehow we should, even at this late stage, look at trying to provide some money to somebody or some bodies or organization to try to mount a campaign of some sort. But I have to remind Members that that is the way it came out, so if there is anything going to be done, as it was done that time in July --there were motions drafted that were discussed with caucus and moved. These motions were a different kind of creature from ordinary motions. There were discussions in the back room, and some negotiations were done before they were done and approved.

So I am not saying no to the idea at all. I am just trying to put it in context. It is not my oversight. It is not the oversight of Members of this Legislature. It was as a result of a consensus agreement among western leaders that the money that was allocated to us would be used in a specific way. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Supplementary, Mr. Koe.

Supplementary To Question O521-12(2): Provision Of Funds For Plebiscite Awareness Campaign

MR. KOE: It is such a late date now to deal with this, but the Minister has been asked questions throughout this Assembly on this issue. The Minister is a little bit more fortunate than some of us ordinary Members in that you have staff that advise you and can assist you on working on these matters, whereas we have none. It would have been nice if we had been given some advice on how to proceed then, rather than at the 11th hour. We have one more month to try and do something. I have had calls and concerns from my constituency and from other people in the West that I know and talk to on a regular basis. So it would have been nice if we had been able to deal with it.

My question is, if we prorogue today, how can this matter be dealt with in the next week or so? Can it be dealt with in the next week or so?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kakfwi.

Further Return To Question O521-12(2): Provision Of Funds For Plebiscite Awareness Campaign

HON. STEPHEN KAKFWI: Mr. Speaker, the best way, for me, is if a motion was moved in the Legislature. That would be the best way, since it would be seen as direction from the Legislature, and I would feel very comfortable with proceeding on work that would expend some public money, since I would know, if the motion passed, that the majority of Members support the action 1, or the cabinet, would take. Other than that, the only other recourse might be myself, as a Minister, to consider asking cabinet to look at finding some way to spend some money without knowing if the majority of Members would approve this in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Koe.

MR. KOE: Thank you, Mr. Minister. We will be proceeding, then, with a motion this afternoon or this morning. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not a question, Mr. Koe. Oral questions. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Question O522-12(2): Advisement Of Release Of Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: I have another question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister whether or not his department has given any funding to the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association, and noted to him that they had not had a meeting for their membership for the past three or four years. The Minister indicated that as of yesterday it was not, to his knowledge, and the previous day, or this week, his department had given funding. I would like to ask the Minister of Renewable Resources if his department officials advised him, prior to giving funding to the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association, that they were going to release this funding of \$31,500?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Return To Question O522-12(2): Advisement Of Release Of Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To my knowledge, I responded to yesterday's question as honestly as I could. The funding slipped my mind. I know I signed that one, and I apologize to the Member. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O522-12(2): Advisement Of Release Of Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how he can state in this House, two days after he signed to release the funding to the Fort Smith HTA on March 31 st, that he had no knowledge of this funding being granted. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Further Return To Question O522-12(2): Advisement Of Release Of Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not a computer. I am a human being, and it just simply slipped my mind. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Supplementary, Mrs. Marie Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O522-12(2): Advisement Of Release Of Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the Minister is not a computer, and thank goodness for that. I recognize he is a human being, and I recognize that he is an honest human being as well as an individual of integrity. But when he signs documents in his office, documents that allow funding for societies that are in non-compliance, does he not remember the type of documents that he signs for funding given by his department'? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark.

Further Return To Question O522-12(2): Advisement Of Release Of Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' And Trappers' Association

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my practice to read all the documents that I sign; however, sometimes, when I sign a whole bunch of documents, I tend to forget about some of them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

Supplementary To Question O522-12(2): Advisement Of Release Of Funding To Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: I would like to ask the Minister if he will ensure to advise his executive assistants or departmental officials that, in future, until the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association is in compliance with the Societies Act, or at least have the decency to hold a general meeting for members, that his department will not fund the Fort Smith Hunters' and Trappers' Association.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ningark. Order, please, Mrs. Marie Jewell. Mr. Ningark.

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, I will review the matter and take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been taken as notice. Oral questions.

I have gone through written questions, so I will return to Item 8, replies to Opening Address.

Item 9, petitions.

Item 10, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 11, reports of committees on the review of bills.

Item 12, tabling of documents. Mr. Nerysoo.

ITEM 12: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table Tabled Document 47-12(2), an article from The Globe and Mail, Thursday, April 2, 1992, titled, "NWT Orders Abortion Inquiry."

MR. SPEAKER: Tabling of documents. Item 13, notices of motions. Mrs. Marie-Jewell.

ITEM 13: NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Notice Of Motion 16-12(2): To Revoke Appointment Of Hon. Tony Whitford As A Member Of The Executive Council

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 6, 1992, I shall move the following motion: Now therefore, I move, seconded by the honourable

Member for Baffin Centre, that this Assembly formally revoke the pleasure of the Assembly from the appointment as an Executive Member of the Hon. Tony Whitford; and further, that this Assembly recommends that a new Member be chosen to sit on the Executive Council during the June session.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motions. Mr. Koe.

Notice Of Motion 17-12(2): Funding For Western Campaign On Plebiscite

MR. KOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I give notice that on Monday, April 6, 1992, I will move the following motion: I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Nahendeh, that this Legislative Assembly recommend to the Minister of Intergovernmental and Aboriginal Affairs and the Executive Council that they consider providing funding, when requested, to individuals or organizations in the West to enable them to provide basic information on the May 4, 1992 plebiscite on the boundary to divide the NWT.

At the appropriate time I will be seeking unanimous consent to proceed with this motion today.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of motions.

Item 14, notices of motions for first reading of bills. Before we get into motions, we will take a short break.

--SHORT RECESS

I call the Assembly back to order. Item 15, motions. Mr. Koe.

ITEM 18: MOTIONS

MR. KOE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. I seek unanimous consent to proceed with my motion regarding funding to individuals and organizations in the West on the May 4th plebiscite issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is seeking unanimous consent to proceed with his motion. Are there any nays? There are no nays. Proceed, Mr. Koe.

Motion 17-12(2): Funding For Western Campaign On Plebiscite

MR. KOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I **MOVE**, seconded by the honourable Member for Nahendeh, that this Legislative Assembly recommend to the Minister of Intergovernmental and Aboriginal

Affairs and the Executive Council that they consider providing funding, when requested, to individuals or organizations in the West to enable them to provide basic information on the May 4, 1992 plebiscite on the boundary to divide the Northwest Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Your motion is in order, Mr. Koe. To the motion, Mr. Koe.

MR. KOE: I made my comments this morning in question period. The honourable Member who seconded the motion made his comments as well. I think the issue is fairly straightforward. This is the advice the Minister requested or direction that he wanted us to proceed in. It is the direction we have taken. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Secunder to the motion, Mr. Antoine.

MR. ANTOINE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker. I made my comments this morning; however, I just want to stress that people in the West have approached me and want to know as much information as they can, so that on May 4th they will be making an informed decision on the historical event of the vote on the boundary. I think funding is required -- even though for a short period of time -- to try to get out the information that people in the West require. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question has been called. Mr. Pudluk

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to support this motion because the plebiscite on May 4th is an historic event. It is an especially important day for our constituents. We have consulted with our constituents and have been asked to do our job in the Legislature. If we misinform our constituents, they are not going to be well informed and will not know what to do on voting day. The people of the Northwest Territories should be well-informed and well aware of the plebiscite on May 4th to divide the Northwest Territories. The people of the Western Arctic and their elected representatives have to be well aware so that they can consult with their constituents regarding the plebiscite. For this reason, I support the Member for Inuvik.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question is being called. Do you want to conclude debate, Mr. Koe? Ms. Mike.

MS. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will support this motion because this motion conveys the message to me that there has always been a difference between the East and the West. On that basis, I am supporting the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question is being called. Would you care to conclude debate? Mr. Koe.

MR. KOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the honourable Members from the East who have expressed their support. I think for an appropriate vote to be taken on the plebiscite and people in the West to be fully informed -- and if they are going to support the plebiscite, they need to be informed; and I think this motion provides direction to the Executive Council to look at ways of providing means of this happening. I urge all Members to support this motion.

Motion 17-12(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: That concludes the debate. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

--- Carried

Motions. Mr. Koe.

MR. KOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I seek unanimous consent to proceed with my motion regarding extended adjournment of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member is seeking unanimous consent to proceed with his motion. Are there any nays? There are no nays. Proceed, Mr. Koe.

Motion 15-12(2): Extended Adjournment Of The House, Carried

MR. KOE: Mahsi, Mr. Speaker.

I **MOVE**, seconded by the honourable Member for Keewatin Central, that when the House adjourns on

April 3, 1992, it shall stand adjourned until June 16, 1992;

AND FURTHER, that at any time prior to June 16, 1992, the Speaker is satisfied, after consultation with the Executive Council and Members of the Assembly, that the public interest requires that the House should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, the Speaker may give notice and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated in such notice and shall transact its business as it has been duly adjourned to that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Your motion is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

--- Carried

Motions.

Item 16, first reading of bills.

Item 17, second reading of bills. Item 18, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength at Two Levels; Tabled Document 10-12(2), Reshaping Northern Government; Tabled Document 12-12(2), Plebiscite Direction; Motion 6-12(2), Discussion on Sobriety Clause in Contribution Agreements, with Mr. Nerysoo in the chair.

ITEM 18: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): The committee will come to order. We were dealing with Tabled Document 12-12(2), Plebiscite Direction. Is it the wish of the House that we conclude Tabled Document 12-12(2)? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

--- Agreed

Tabled Document 12-12(2), Plebiscite Direction

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Before we conclude the tabled document, I would like to make a few comments regarding the statement made by Mr. Arngna'naaq and Mr. Bernhardt. The issue of a boundary line, if

you understand it -- it is not too difficult to understand why we want a boundary line. A lot of people misunderstood; the boundary line means division of Canadians. It is not so. It seems the Keewatin and Central Arctic does not seem to trust the Baffin area. I doubt they will not be treated equal because Baffin is a bigger area. It is not so.

I would like to go far back when the Yukon separated from the Northwest Territories. Since I have been in the North, I have never heard any complaints about that boundary line. Mr. Arngna'naaq indicated yesterday that aboriginal people have never lived by boundaries before. If we look at the Yukon, the boundary line is not affecting the aboriginal people in the North. The boundary line is only for the government proposal; it does not separate native people. The Yukon people still hunt in the NWT and the NWT people still hunt in the Yukon. They do not really worry about the boundary line. The boundary line is just for the government; it does not separate aboriginal people.

On having the Keewatin and Kitikmeot treated equally, they want something written to be assured they will be treated equally. I think today those people should write a letter and make sure it does not happen. All you have to do is get some good representative from that area to deal with issues that may come up between those regions. I would like to say that those people are really concerned because they are close to the boundary line. I do not blame those people who are concerned, but I think they need more explanation.

Mr. Chairman, if I could sit down with those people again, I am willing to explain more about what the boundary line is all about. Even in my communities there was confusion about what the boundary line means. It took me more than a month to explain what the boundary line means. A lot of people thought we were separating from Ottawa, separating from Canada, but it is not so. Even when I would say it was not that way, the same question still arose, that they did not want to be separated from other native people. We are not trying to separate native people in Canada. The boundary line only means that we want to have our own government.

Page 610

Sometime in 1904 and 1906 and 1913 there was a big issue on the Yukon and Alaska boundary lines, and they have their own boundary line now. We have

never heard any complaints on the boundary. Let us go along with it, and we can start working together.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Mr. Bernhardt.

Language Difference In Kitikmeot

MR. BERNHARDT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What my colleague, Mr. Pudluk, from the High Arctic has expressed, my interpretation is different. The people in the Kitikmeot, which is the constituency I represent and includes Coppermine, Bathurst Inlet and Bay Chimo, have a slight difference in the way we do our day-to-day living, including our language, which is already different. We use Roman orthography. We write in ABCs. We value this, but when I returned from Arctic College in Fort Smith and sat down as a hamlet councillor, I was appalled to see Kugluktuk spelled wrong. Instead of the "k"s which we commonly use, we are seeing "q"s. This disturbs our elders. It is altogether a different pronunciation. Even though I do not speak the language, people in my region are very much concerned about why the government or someone has decided to make us try to conform to a different way of writing.

The Copper Inuit people are different, yet we are all Inuit people. These are the things that people or new organizations should not bother to try to disturb. I have complaints that parents are pulling their children out of Inuvialuktun language classes because the way of saying words long ago is changing. This disturbs the parents. It is one issue that is very important to the people that I represent. No one in their right mind should try to change the way we write in our own native language.

Another matter my colleague from the High Arctic expressed was about the boundary. The boundary in the Kitikmeot Region is beside Sahtu, North Slave, Nunakput and Natilikmiot. We have people born in the Sahtu region and the Great Slave Lake many, many years ago. Even my mother-in-law was born over there in Great Slave Lake. That is how nomadic we were. A lot of people were born south of Contwoyto Lake. A lot of people were born in other places a way inland. They still want the right to hunt, trap and fish in the area where they were born. We do not want to see a mine field to say you are entering a new territory. We want to have the inherent right to go wherever we wish and please but to live within our own region.

Cost To Kitikmeot Of Joining Nunavut

Historically, in the Kitikmeot Region as far as Cambridge Bay and Coppermine, Bathurst and Bay Chimo, we have always relied on Yellowknife and Hay River for essential services including barge systems, air transportation, health and social services, et cetera. All these things are so precious to what we want to hang on to. I am wondering if this new government can still guarantee our right to hang on to our own culture, our own written language and to be able to speak our own language in our own way, and our privilege to come to high school or the hospital in Yellowknife. Could we, at some point in time, have our own hospital and high school in the Kitikmeot Region, and not rely on other regions to provide services to us? We might be a small region, but geographically we are pretty huge, and we are very rich in mineral wealth.

But I think it is more than that that the plebiscite should be looking at; it is how unique we will be if we are to join Nunavut. We would like to be part of it, but at what cost? At what cost to the federal government? Can the new government provide these services? And I do not mean lip service; I mean concrete guaranteed services that we would not be hindered by dilution of services.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. Mr. Todd.

MR. TODD: I think a number of people have what I call the "pre-vote jitters." We have to remember that this has been going on for a long period of time, and there have been intense discussions at the community level and ongoing debate over the last 10 or 15 years. The fact of the matter is the Nunavut government will bring central government closer to people, in my opinion. I would suggest to my good friend from the Kitikmeot if he is content with the way the civil service is handled in the Kitikmeot, in Yellowknife over the last 10 years, then he would be more content if it was handled by a Nunavut government that understands the aspirations, understands the feelings of the people, and, I hope, cares about the level of service that his community and his riding requires.

To me, what we are doing with the plebiscite and the ultimate change in government to the Nunavut government is that we are bringing government closer to the people. We are going to ensure that there is a fair distribution of the dollars. There is not going to be -- I hope there is not going to be -- \$700 million controlled by a small group of people, as it is currently

done in the O and M budget, out of Yellowknife. We have a unique opportunity to change the style of government and make it more accountable and more responsible. And I think we equally have a unique opportunity to ensure that a maximum number of Northerners are involved in the system.

As far as I am concerned, the current way in which government is run, really, no matter how well-intentioned some people are and there are a lot of people who are well-intentioned there is no comprehension by the bureaucracy, or little comprehension by the bureaucracy, of the problems and issues that affect the communities outside of the centre. I have fought this argument for 20 years. I will continue to fight it.

I hope that people will vote "Yes" to the boundary, because it will bring about government with more accountability and a better and fairer distribution of the dollars. Let me remind everybody, over 30 per cent of the O and M budget is currently being spent on civil servant salaries and benefits -- \$300 million plus. And let me remind everybody that it is the majority of civil servants who are reaping the benefits of this, Rightly so, they do not sit in Whale Cove, do not sit in Chesterfield Inlet, do not sit in Grise Fiord; they sit here. In my simple world, we can only improve the situation by supporting the plebiscite, provided -- and I have said on a number of occasions -- that in the final analysis there are adequate financial resources to do the job. And that is not to take away from anybody else, as has been suggested. It is clear that when we vote "Yes," as I am confident we will,

Page 611

that everybody recognizes there will be a requirement for financial resources above and beyond the current financing that is in place. Nobody wants to take away anything. What we want is a more equitable distribution of the resources and to bring government closer to the people and, as my friend Al Woodhouse says in the Navigator Inn, "The crew that cares." You need a caring government, a caring bureaucracy and an understanding one. One that understands the issues in the Eastern Arctic, that understands what it is like to live in Bay Chimo and Grise Fiord and Whale Cove. Half the people here do not even know where the hell these places are - excuse me.

So I would hope, despite some of our apprehensions, that people would get out and vote overwhelmingly for the boundary issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Mr. Alloo.oo.

Governmental System New And Foreign

HON. TITUS ALLOOLOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the Member for Keewatin Central stated, this issue is not new to the NWT. This has been talked about for at least 15 years in the NWT, concerning a need to create a Nunavut territory.

I believe that we are unique within Canada, as we are a government represented with a majority of people who were born here, born of aboriginal descent, and also the long-time Northerners who are representing their communities.

Even though we are an aboriginal majority government in the NWT, this system is still, to some of us, foreign; we did not create the procedures and the way we operate. This was brought to us from Ottawa. Not too long ago the Dene from the West did not want to be involved in the Northwest Territories government, until very recently, because they did not recognize the NWT government. Even today I believe that some of the Dene still do not recognize the territorial government.

But we, the people from the East, are new to this government. We only started to be involved 20 years ago. We are fortunate, I think, that we could be here and be legislators to this land, but it is still foreign.

The creation of the Nunavut territory is a dream of the eastern people. As the Member for High Arctic said, it is the aspiration of the Nunavut people. When Nunavut government is created, it is going to be a public government. The seats will be open to the public, no matter who they are, but I believe because of the make-up of the population that we are going to have a government that is more representative of the Inuit who live there. It is going to be a government, as my friend for Keewatin Centre said, that is more sensitive to the eastern needs, because it is going to be in the Nunavut territory.

Yellowknife is very far away from Baffin, very far away from the Keewatin. For me to go home is like going across the country, from Vancouver to Montreal or Ottawa. It takes 16 hours altogether and eight hours' flying time. My people in the North Baffin, although they would like to be involved in the government process, have very little understanding of what happens here, because they do not get a chance to come here, It is very, very costly for my people to come here. The ticket is more than \$2600.

My friend from Kitikmeot mentioned that his people are concerned because they want to continue hunting where they were born in Great Bear Lake and other areas. I believe the agreement, in terms of renewable resource harvesting, is going to be open to both sides. The people from the West will be able to hunt freely in the Nunavut region, and the East will be able to hunt in the divisional area in the West.

As far as non-renewable resources are concerned, there is going to be an agreement between Nunavut and the western government with respect to sharing those resources in particular areas close to the boundary.

I do not believe the people in the Kitikmeot are going to be hampered by going into Yellowknife or Inuvik for their essential services, or even to Hay River.

I do not think transportation is going to change. People in the Northwest Territories, especially in the Fort McPherson and Arctic Red River areas, are able to harvest natural resources from the Yukon. People from Old Crow, Yukon are able to harvest natural resources in the Northwest Territories without any restriction. I think we could continue to do this.

Regarding hospital needs of the Nunavut region, they will still continue to use hospitals in Quebec, Ontario and Yellowknife. I would encourage everyone to make sure that the people of the Northwest Territories understand resource harvesting and using essential services such as hospitals and schools so that we will be able to make an agreement between the two governments. For those people in Kitikmeot, Baffin or the Keewatin, they will be able to use centres outside of the Nunavut area for hospital needs as well as their schooling needs. I do not think this is going to change as far as transportation is concerned.

I encourage everyone to turn out for the plebiscite and vote "Yes" on May 4th; people from the East and people from the West. Keep in mind that this is not going to go away. The Nunavut region will always try to get a government that is more equitable and closer to the people, as my friend from the Kivallivik Region said, so that the government will be more sensitized to the needs of the Nunavut people. Yellowknife is far away from the Baffin and Keewatin areas. Qujannamiik.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nerysoo): Thank you. General comments. Member for Baffin Central.

History Of Northwest Territories Boundaries

MS. MIKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the issue of the boundary, I want to remind all the residents of the Northwest Territories just how large the NWT used to be from 1895. The boundary of the NWT in 1895 included part of Labrador, which is northern Labrador, Quebec, the northern part of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Yukon. Ungava, Mackenzie, Yukon and Franklin were established in 1895 as districts in the NWT. The creation of the district of Franklin acknowledged the inclusion of the Arctic Islands in Canada. The districts of Athabasca and Keewatin were enlarged. Then in 1898 the boundaries were changed in the district of Mackenzie, Keewatin, Ungava, Franklin and Yukon. In 1898 the district of Yukon became a territory separate from the NWT. The Quebec boundaries were extended north. In 1905 Alberta and Saskatchewan were created as provinces, to make a total of nine provinces in the Dominion of Canada. The district of Keewatin was transferred back to the NWT. Due to changes in adjoining areas, the boundaries of the NWT were redefined in 1906. In 1912, Ontario and Manitoba attained their present boundaries. Quebec was extended northward to Hudson Bay and Hudson Strait, thereby absorbing mainland Ungava. Labrador boundary remained unsettled. In 1927 Canada's boundaries were extended northward pursuant to provisions of international law. The Imperial Privy Council provided the settlement of the Quebec, Labrador boundary question. In 1949, at its own request after a plebiscite, Newfoundland entered Confederation as the 10th and most recent province of the Dominion of Canada. This has been the progress that Canada has made.

Page 612

What we want now is to progress further in having this boundary that has been put forward that we are going to vote on, on May 4th. I encourage all residents of the NWT to vote "Yes" or "No." It is up to the residents. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Member for Mackenzie Delta.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to clarify a couple of matters that seem to be misinterpreted about boundaries and the perceived opportunities that aboriginal people have to pursue their traditional and their aboriginal right in the areas that they traditionally used. I want to first make a couple of comments on the matter of the plebiscite.

Firstly, I want to indicate to people here that my own personal position has been to support the creation of Nunavut ever since I became a Member of this House, since 1979, and even before then. But I want to say to you that it has always been with a view that the Dene and the Metis would see their dream of their right to self-government protected as well. I know that other Members and the Government Leader, who has worked hard on behalf of the Inuvialuit, have always wanted their dream of having their right to govern themselves included in any constitution. I do not think that there is anyone here that could argue a case against the Inuit to obtain their right to government, to control their communities and decisions that are made about them.

Uncertainty A Cause For Concern In The West

I do want to say that this is not necessarily certain about the Dene and Metis in the West at this particular time, nor, for that matter, the Inuvialuit. I think that much of the concern that exists is that uncertainty, because the boundary itself creates a much clearer certainty for the Inuit. Their land claim stipulates the basis on which we are going to establish our relationship in the East. This is not necessarily the case for the Dene, Metis and Inuvialuit in the West. I think that because of this uncertainty, people are not sure whether or not it is time for them to vote in support of the boundary. That certainty has to be created even in the views that are expressed by the Inuit leaders that they are going to be diligent and supportive of the aspirations of the Dene/Metis and Inuvialuit. I think this is very fundamental.

As well, I want to say that I think even in the West, when we talk about this idea of a government for the West, the rights of the non-aboriginal people are going to have to be clear, and they are going to have to be protected. I know that while we have established a commission to deal with this particular issue and even today they are holding hearings here, there is still that uncertainty even in the non-aboriginal communities with the relationship with government in the West. I think this in itself causes a great deal of concern.

I want to say that I want to be able to say, as an aboriginal person, that any new western government has my confidence because they are going to be established to protect my interests. Whether or not it is protecting the right of aboriginal self-government, or whether or not it is protecting our role within a public structure, needs to be clear. It may not happen on

May 4th, but it should happen before the actual conclusions are made to divide.

Decision-Making Power Lost Re Laws Affecting Rights In Another Jurisdiction

I want to bring to your attention -- just for clarification because there seems to be some confusion about the issue of the Yukon boundary, the BC boundary or the other boundaries that we have -- that it has not always been that simple. Yes, we have the right to continue harvesting. The problem we have is that we are not part of the decision-making regarding laws which affect those rights. Yes, we can travel back and forth with no serious legal problems, but the issue is, who makes the decisions that, in the end, affect your communities?

Like many other areas in Canada, we are subject to decisions in and out of our jurisdiction, even on matters relating to issues such as water management. I know my colleagues, Mr. Allooloo and Mr. Ningark, who have been close to this issue and are involved with this issue, and the Government Leader, who has been intimately involved in terms of negotiations previously with the Yukon Government, know that it is not that simple. Dealing with another government is not that simple.

I hope that when we address the matter of the particular boundary that divides Nunavut and the West, that it is based on some agreement prior to making final decisions of moving your own way. It has only been because of Treaty 11 that we have really been able to maintain a legal basis in the Yukon, and the Inuvialuit have been able to argue their case because of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement that gave them and protected their interest. It is only those kinds of arrangements that seem to commit governments to protecting your interest. Otherwise it seems that if they had a way out -- they would try to find a way out of applying those traditional rights you have had all along.

So I would ask my colleagues, when you are addressing this matter in future, even as you leave today, that it is with a view that we try to resolve some of these particular issues before the final conclusion that we are going our separate ways. Because I think they are important, and they are certainties to rights that people have. Whether or not it is the Inuit in the western area or the Dene in the Nunavut area, those long-term certainties should be there. They are very, very crucial.

So I just wanted to point those issues out to you so that we do not get mixed information about this idea that we have the right to continue. Because there are restrictions. I can indicate to the Members here, for instance, that in the Yukon the non-status Metis, non-status Indians in our communities, until we signed the Gwich'in final agreement, did not have the right to harvest in the Yukon. It has only been because we put them in the final agreement for the Gwich'in that they now have the right to harvest legally in the Yukon.

So these are some of the things that I wanted to make you aware of, so that if we come to our final decisions after the May 4th plebiscite vote, you will respect and ensure that these are things that do not happen in future.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Member for Natilikmiot.

Native People Survive By Working Together

HON. JOHN NINGARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Like most of my colleagues from the East and the West, I believe in unity. Although I believe in unity, I also believe in the right to self-government and self-determination for aboriginal people. A number of times people ask why the people of the Eastern Arctic want to divide. What do we hope to gain from division? I think we want to be able to determine our future. We want to be able to control and operate, in our own land, the renewable resources, non-renewable resources, wildlife management. We have inhabited the land for many thousands of years, before anyone else. I think we have that right to be able to determine our own future.

I also believe that eastern people support the Dene in their endeavour to have their own land claim

Page 613

settlement. Like my colleague, Mr. Nerysoo, I support the Dene people as he supported Inuit people in their determination to have their own future, especially in running their own land.

Mr. Chairman, it is important and significant to retain our language and our culture. I am proud to be a native person, aboriginal person. I am proud to be an Inuk.

We, the native people, the Inuit people as well as the Dene people, have survived by working together. I am not saying that Dene and Inuit work together, but I know Dene people have survived by working

together. The same goes for the Inuit people. We have survived maybe 30,000 years by working together in Nunavut. Nunavut means, literally translated into English, "our land." We have always worked together in order to survive. We are very much a community people. That is what we would like to see May 4th when we go to vote on the plebiscite to determine the boundary.

I am very confident that, as usual the Eastern Arctic people will stick together and have the yes vote. This is my opinion, but I am not able to foresee the results of the future. Most of the Members of this House are probably in the same situation.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to prolong discussing this. I support the plebiscite to determine the boundary. I support division. Mr. Chairman, I support Nunavut. I wanted to express this as the representative of Natilikmiot and Kitikmeot regions. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. General comments. Member for Thebacha.

Opposition To Boundary In Fort Smith Constituency

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to be very brief on the boundary and the plebiscite issues. I want to indicate, for the record, that as an MLA I have always supported the concept of Nunavut, and that I support Nunavut. However, I do want to advise this Assembly that I do know that the concern of the chief in Fort Smith is to encourage his members to vote against the boundary, and for the native people in Fort Smith to vote against the boundary. They feel that it imposes upon some of their traditional lands where they have hunted and harvested, particularly in support of the residents of Snowdrift and the South Slave area of the lake. I want Members to be aware of the type of opposition that I am up against in our community.

I also want Members to be aware that the chief also believes that non-natives should not be able to vote on the plebiscite. He feels that because of the fact that they do not use the land, and they have never used the land, that they should not be able to vote. Unfortunately, I do not agree with his stand. I believe that is a very radical stand, and I do not believe it is in fairness to residents that are non-natives and have lived in our communities for a number of years and should not be treated in this manner.

--- Applause

Therefore, I do want to advise Members that I will make every effort in our community, even though our community in 1982 voted against division, to encourage them to at least go out and exercise their democratic right as citizens of the Territories to vote on the plebiscite. It is my hope, in fairness, that my constituents will take an open viewpoint and recognize the aspirations of the Inuit to achieve Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

--- Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. General comments. Member for Nahendeh.

Proper Information Needed In West

MR. ANTOINE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few comments I would like to make on the question of the plebiscite. I talked earlier on today and over the last few days about my concerns. My concern is that people in the West need to be properly informed about the whole question that we are going to vote on on May 4th. People in my constituency have approached me. I found out that I was not too informed myself about this plebiscite. I have been trying to learn as much as I can about it.

My other concern is that on Tuesday, March 10th, when there was a public discussion on the boundary to divide the Northwest Territories, there was a presentation by the chief of Snowdrift who wanted to continue to talk with members of Tungavik Federation of Nunavut with regard to the boundary in the Thelon River area, which is in the Chipewyan traditional area and will be on the Nunavut side. There is a concern by the chief of this community, who stated that he would like to continue talking with members of TFN to see if they can come to an understanding in that area. To date, I do not know if this has happened. Hopefully, some discussion will take place between now and May 4th.

Among the Dene people there are different tribes, including the Chipewyan in the Snowdrift area; north of here we have the Tlicho or Dogrib; for myself, I am a Dene from the southwestern portion of the Northwest Territories, which is far away from the boundary question. It does not really affect us, but when the Dene people meet with each other, we have these discussions and try to support each other in what is affecting us. Therefore, I am going to be supporting the Tlicho people and the Chipewyan

people in this regard. This morning, again, I heard on CBC radio that there was a constitutional development hearing going on in Snare Lake, where there was a lot of concern by Tlicho people about the boundary. There, again, they are not totally satisfied that the way the boundary was drawn was to their satisfaction.

I think it is unfinished business, and, even after May 4th, the problem will still exist. I do not know how it will be dealt with, but that is my concern, Mr. Chairman. There are two groups of people whose traditional area the line is going through, and there is a dispute about the line. Even after May 4th, that concern and problem will remain. I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that even if there is a vote yes on May 4th, the problem will be there. It is not going to go away. You have to take that into consideration.

As a representative of people, I have always tried to represent everybody no matter what. I try to take in their concerns and try to deal with them. That is the way I have always operated, as a former chief; and as an MLA, I am continuing to be myself. I think these people have to be taken into consideration, because a majority of the people may vote "Yes," and these people will continue to exist. They are not going to go away. These people have been there for generations and will continue to be there. They will not go away, because they did not come from any other place. My concern is that even if there is a "Yes" vote, that problem will remain the same. They have not really done anything yet, and I am concerned that they may take a strong position.

You could have all the different political groups representing different regions gang up on them. But, they are not going to go away. My concern is that the boundary line is going to go through their area, and they are disputing it, as we heard on CBC this morning. We heard the chief from Snowdrift on Tuesday, March 10th, and he is concerned about the boundary going through his traditional area. I do not

Page 614

think his concern has, to date, been met. He wants to talk with representatives of TFN to see if it can be resolved. I do not know, to date, if that has happened.

I will conclude by saying that as Dene people we try to support each other. If their concerns are not met, then I would like to see their concerns met, and I will be in support of them. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. General comments. Does the committee agree that Tabled Document 12-12(2) is now concluded?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

--- Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. What does the committee wish to do now? Member for Thebacha.

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Mr. Chairman, we would like to make one brief motion with respect to Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength at Two Levels.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Does the committee agree?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Ag reed

Tabled Document 9-12(2), Strength At Two Levels

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Member for Thebacha.

MRS. MARIE-JEWELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue of Tabled Document 9-12(2) was brought up in the ordinary Members' caucus for the past couple of days. This motion should have been introduced yesterday; however, it was overlooked. There have been concerns by the ordinary Members' caucus with respect to the implementation of structural or organizational changes of government departments. I would like to move a motion.

Motion That Recommendations In "Strength At Two Levels" Not Be Implemented Until Implementation Strategy Is Tabled And Discussed In The House, Carried

I move, Mr. Chairman, that this committee strongly recommend that the Government of the Northwest Territories not proceed with the implementation of any of the recommendations contained in the report entitled "Strength at Two Levels," or make any structural or organizational changes to the departments of the government, until the implementation strategy that will be prepared and delivered to the standing committee on finance in June 1992 has been tabled and fully discussed and approved by the Members of this House. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Madam Government Leader.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I do not have a problem with the motion as we -- certainly, with the length of the Legislative Assembly, much of the working group's work that was to be done is a bit delayed, as well -- will be continuing with our work plan and the work that we can complete. We will have the implementation recommendations ready for the standing committee in June. I have no problem with the motion, considering the busy schedules that everyone has. We will be able to get the work done so that we can have the implementation plan in June. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Thank you. To the motion. Are you ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Question has been called. All those in favour? All those opposed? The motion is carried.

--- Carried

What is the committee's wish now? Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, I move that we report progress.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Pudluk): Order, please. The motion on the floor is not debatable. All those in favour? Those opposed? The motion is carried.

--- Carried

I will now rise to report progress to the Speaker.

ITEM 19: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. SPEAKER: Item 19, report of committee of the whole. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, you committee has been considering Tabled Document 12-12(2) and Tabled Document 9-12(2) and wishes to report progress, with Tabled Document 12-12(2) being concluded, with one motion being adopted. Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the chairman of the committee of the whole be concurred with.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there a seconder to the motion? Mr. Nerysoo. The motion is in order. All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

--- Carried

Item 20, third reading of bills.

Before we proceed, I would like, on behalf of the Legislative Assembly, to express our gratitude to Sergeant-at-Arms Warrant Officer Rick Nickerson.

--- Applause

And earlier in the session Master Warrant Officer Russ Watson acted as Sergeant-at-Arms.

--- Applause

I would also like to thank the interpreters, the Legislative Assembly staff, the Executive Council staff, for their very hard work during this session.

--- Applause

Mr. Clerk, Item 21, orders of the day.

ITEM 21: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, orders of the day for Tuesday, June 16, 1992.

1. Prayer
 2. Ministers' Statements
 3. Members' Statements
 4. Returns to Oral Questions
- Page 615
5. Oral Questions
 6. Written Questions
 7. Returns to Written Questions
 8. Replies to Opening Address
 9. Petitions
 10. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
 11. Reports of Committees on the Review of Bills
 12. Tabling of Documents
 13. Notices of Motions
 14. Notices of Motions for First Reading of Bills
 15. Motions: Motion 16-12(2)

16. First Reading of Bills
17. Second Reading of Bills
18. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Tabled Documents 9-12(2) and 10-12(2); Motion 6-12(2)
19. Report of Committee of the Whole
20. Third Reading of Bills
21. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. I would also like to express our gratitude to the Pages. We had Pages from all over the Territories serving with us during this Assembly, and I think all of us owe you a debt of gratitude. You did a great job.

--- Applause

This House stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 16, 1992.

--- ADJOURNMENT