



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

4th Session

11th Assembly

HANSARD  
Official Report  
Day 28

Wednesday, April 5, 1989

Pages 1333 - 1370

Speaker: The Hon. Red Pedersen, M.L.A.

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## Speaker

The Hon. Red Pedersen, M.L.A.  
 General Delivery  
 Coppermine, N.W.T.  
 XOE OEO  
 (403) 873-7629 (Office)  
 (403) 873-5788 (Home) (Yellowknife)  
 (403) 982-5788 (Coppermine)  
 (Kitikmeot West)

Allooloo, The Hon. Titus, M.L.A.  
 5024 - 57th Street  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
 X1A 1Y6  
 (403) 873-7113 (Office)  
 (403) 873-4813 (Home)  
 (Amittuq)  
 Minister of Culture & Communications  
 and Renewable Resources

Angottitauruq, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.  
 General Delivery  
 Gjoa Haven, N.W.T.  
 XOE 1J0  
 (403) 360-6600 (Office)  
 (403) 360-6704 (Home)  
 (Natilikmiot)  
 Deputy Chairman  
 Committee of the Whole

Arlooktoo, Mr. Joe, M.L.A.  
 General Delivery  
 Lake Harbour, N.W.T.  
 XOA ONO  
 (819) 939-2363 (Home)  
 (Baffin South)

Ballantyne, The Hon. Michael, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1091  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
 X1A 2N8  
 (403) 873-7658 (Office)  
 (403) 920-2963 (Home)  
 (Yellowknife North)  
 Minister of Finance and Justice

Butters, The Hon. Tom, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1069  
 Inuvik, N.W.T.  
 XOE OT0  
 (403) 979-2373 (Office)  
 (403) 979-2373 (Home)  
 (Inuvik)  
 Minister of Government Services and  
 NWT Housing Corporation

Cournoyea, The Hon. Nellie, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1184  
 Inuvik, N.W.T.  
 XOE OT0  
 (403) 873-7128 (Office)  
 (403) 977-2405 (Tuktoyaktuk)  
 (403) 979-2737 (Inuvik)  
 (Nunakput)  
 Minister of Health and Public  
 Works & Highways

Crow, Mr. Charlie, M.L.A.  
 General Delivery  
 Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.  
 XOA OWO  
 (819) 266-8940 (Home)  
 (Hudson Bay)

Ernerk, Mr. Peter, M.L.A.  
 Box 182  
 Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.  
 XOC OGO  
 (819) 645-2800  
 (819) 645-2500  
 (Aivilik)

Gargan, Mr. Samuel, M.L.A.  
 General Delivery  
 Fort Providence, N.W.T.  
 XOE OLO  
 (403) 873-7999 (Office)  
 (403) 699-3171 (Home)  
 (Deh Cho)  
 Deputy Speaker and Chairman,  
 Committee of the Whole

Kakfwi, The Hon. Stephen, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1320  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
 X1A 2L9  
 (403) 873-7139 (Office)  
 (403) 873-8215 (Home)  
 (Sahtu)  
 Deputy Government Leader  
 Minister of Education, Government  
 Services and Housing

Kilabuk, Mr. Ipeelee, M.L.A.  
 General Delivery  
 Pangnirtung, N.W.T.  
 XOA ORO  
 (819) 437-8827 (Home)  
 (Baffin Central)

Lewis, Mr. Brian, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1320  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
 X1A 2L9  
 (403) 873-7999 (Office)  
 (403) 873-5549 (Home)  
 (Yellowknife Centre)

Marie-Jewell, The Hon. Jeannie, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1051  
 Fort Smith, N.W.T.  
 XOE OPO  
 (403) 873-7959 (Office)  
 (403) 872-2940 (Home)  
 (Slave River)  
 Minister of Social Services and  
 Personnel

McLaughlin, Mr. Bruce, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1320  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
 X1A 2L9  
 (403) 873-7999 (Office)  
 (403) 873-6220 (Home)  
 (403) 874-2884 (Hay River)

Morin, Mr. Don, M.L.A.  
 General Delivery  
 Fort Resolution, N.W.T.  
 XOE OMO  
 (403) 394-3471  
 (Tu Nede)

Nerysoo, Mr. Richard, M.L.A.  
 Fort McPherson, N.W.T.  
 XOE OJO  
 (403) 979-2668 (Home) (Inuvik)  
 (Mackenzie Delta)

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 310  
 Iqaluit, N.W.T.  
 XOA OHO  
 (403) 873-7112 (Office)  
 (819) 979-5993 (Office)  
 (403) 873-2802 (Home)  
 (Iqaluit)  
 Government Leader,  
 Chairman of Executive Council,  
 Minister of Executive

Pollard, Mr. John D., M.L.A.  
 Box 1095  
 Hay River, N.W.T.  
 XOE ORO  
 (403) 874-2345 (Office)  
 (403) 874-2600 (Home)  
 (Hay River)

Pudluk, Mr. Ludy, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 240  
 Resolute Bay, N.W.T.  
 XOA OVO  
 (819) 252-3719 (Home)  
 (High Arctic)

Sibbeston, Mr. Nick, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 560  
 Fort Simpson, N.W.T.  
 XOE ONO  
 (403) 873-6215 (Home)  
 (Nahendeh)

Whitford, Mr. Tony, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 2772  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
 X1A 2R1  
 (403) 920-8010 (Office)  
 (403) 873-5328 (Home)  
 (Yellowknife South)

Wray, The Hon. Gordon, M.L.A.  
 Baker Lake, N.W.T.  
 XOC OAO  
 (403) 873-7962 (Office)  
 (819) 793-2700 (Home)  
 (Kivallivik)  
 Minister of Municipal & Community  
 Affairs and Economic Development  
 & Tourism

Zoe, Mr. Henry, M.L.A.  
 P.O. Box 1320  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
 X1A 2L9  
 (403) 873-7999 (Office)  
 (403) 873-4136 (Home)  
 (Rae - Lac la Martre)  
 Deputy Chairman,  
 Committee of the Whole

## Officers

Clerk  
 Mr. David Hamilton  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Clerk Assistant  
 Mrs. Rhoda Perkison  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Law Clerk  
 Mr. Don Cooper, Q.C.  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Editor of Hansard  
 Ms Marie J. Coe  
 Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Sergeant-at-Arms  
 Mr. Harry Finnis, B.E.M., C.D.  
 Fort Smith, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1989

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>Prayer</b>	1333
<b>Ministers' Statements</b>	
- 34-89(1) Senior Appointments	1333
<b>Members' Statements</b>	
- Mr. Angottitauruq on All-terrain Vehicles Act	1334
- Hon. Michael Ballantyne on Success of Caribou Carnival, 1989	1334
- Mr. Kilabuk on Thanks to MLAs for Support During Time of Sorrow	1334
- Mr. Pudluk on Welcome Back To Mr. Kilabuk	1335
- Mr. Zoe on Two Year Completion Program for HAP Units	1335
- Mr. Arlooktoo on First Air Increase in Freight Charges	1335
- Mr. Ernerk on Government Programs in Repulse Bay	1335
- Mr. Gargan on Canadian Judicial System and Native People	1336
- Mr. Lewis on Private Member's Bill to Produce Northern Beer	1336
<b>Return to Oral Questions</b>	1337
<b>Oral Questions</b>	1338
<b>Returns to Written Questions</b>	1345
<b>Tabling of Documents</b>	1345
<b>Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills</b>	
- Bill 15-89(1) Liquor Act	1346
<b>Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:</b>	
- Appearance of FEARO Witnesses	1346

TABLE OF CONTENTS, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1989 (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>Report of Committee of the Whole of:</b>	
- Appearance of FEARO Witnesses	1369
<b>Orders of the Day</b>	1369

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1989

MEMBERS PRESENT

Hon. Titus Allooloo, Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Hon. Michael Ballantyne, Hon. Tom Butters, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Mr. Crow, Mr. Ernerk, Mr. Gargan, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Lewis, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Morin, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Hon. Red Pedersen, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Whitford, Hon. Gordon Wray, Mr. Zoe

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

**SPEAKER (Hon. Red Pedersen):** The House will come to order. Orders of the day for Wednesday, April 5th, 1989. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Ministers' Statement 34-89(1): Senior Appointments

**HON. DENNIS PATTERSON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Legislature recently approved the budget of the new Department of Transportation that will be responsible to my colleague, the Hon. Gordon Wray. Today I would like to announce the appointment of Mr. Hal Gerein as deputy minister of that department, and of Mr. Gordon Barber as his assistant deputy minister. The appointments are effective immediately. As Members know, programs delivered by the new Department of Transportation will have a major impact on all residents and communities in the NWT. Improvement of all types of transportation facilities is essential, if the Territories is to advance economically and socially. The appointment of these two persons will give us the expertise to implement the department's mandate and to develop and negotiate a long-range transportation strategy for the development of infrastructure in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Gerein has been with the government for 14 years. At the time of his appointment he was assistant deputy minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, a position he has held since the fall of 1985. He joined the department in 1970, holding various positions including head of town planning and special projects from 1977 to 1980. At that time he left government to accept a position with UMA Engineering in Edmonton. He returned five years later as assistant deputy minister of MACA. Mr. Gerein has an M.A. degree in urban and regional planning.

Mr. Barber was an assistant deputy minister in the Department of Public Works and Highways since 1983. He has 14 and a half years experience with the department as a regional superintendent in Inuvik, as head of the highways operation in Yellowknife and Hay River and then as assistant deputy minister. Mr. Barber has a B. Sc. degree in engineering. I am sure Members will join me in congratulating both of these public servants on their new assignments. Qujannamiik.

---Applause

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Government Leader. The Chair would like to recognize at this time in the gallery the mayor of Lake Harbour, Mayor Pudloo Mingeriak. Welcome, sir.

---Applause

Also in the gallery, Anthyme Kadjuk, a representative of the health board from Chesterfield Inlet. Welcome.

---Applause

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

ITEM 3: MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Member's Statement On All-terrain Vehicles Act

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today on a Member's statement with regard to the new All-terrain Vehicles Act. The act in the communities is accepted with reluctance, I am sure, but since it is the act the people are eager to proceed with it. The biggest problem they have in the remote communities is the insurance part. The government staff in the communities have people to look after the issuing of licences. But those people who do not speak any English who have to dial to Churchill or other insurance companies are having great difficulty. It would be appreciated if someone at the community level was appointed to look after these people, to assist them, or if government staff could look after applying for insurance. It is a great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, and the government should recognize that. Other than that I believe the All-terrain Vehicles Act will proceed without any other real resistance, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Angottitauruq. Mr. Ballantyne.

Member's Statement On Success Of Caribou Carnival, 1989

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to congratulate the organizers of a very successful Caribou Carnival. I think Vi Beck and Bill Braden, the organizers, and all the people involved this year in the carnival deserve a lot of credit. The comment that I have got from innumerable people is the fact that Caribou Carnival had activities for children. The children's tent was very, very successful. I know as one who spent a couple of days down there with my children it was really nice to have activities for the children. I hope that that theme of concentrating on children's activities continues in the future. I think the organizers deserve a tremendous amount of credit for a tremendous Caribou Carnival. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Members' statements. Mr. Kilabuk.

Member's Statement On Thanks To MLAs For Support During Time Of Sorrow

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the rest of the Members. I am standing up today to give you personal information. I left on February 19, 1989, because of a tragedy. My son committed suicide. I know that your hearts are with me and that you felt something for me and it was very helpful to me that I had support from the government and the airlines that brought me home. For this my thanks is coming right from my heart to the Members of the Legislative Assembly.

I was not really sure whether I should be coming back or not for the rest of the session but now I am able to come back again after what happened to my family. My wife and myself thank the Members very much for supporting us during our time of hardship and sorrow and I will not forget the assistance and the support that I have received from the Members. I would like to thank you very much right from the bottom of my heart. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk. Mr. Pudluk.

Member's Statement On Welcome Back To Mr. Kilabuk

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a short comment. I would like to say that I am happy that Baffin Central's MLA has been able to come back to the session. We all are feeling sorry that this type of thing had to happen to him. But we tried to help him as much as we could. I am happy that he is able to meet with us again today.

To the Kitikmeot East Member, in regard to the All-terrain Vehicles Act, that there are going to be some problems in regard to the issuing of insurance. That Member is correct in saying that we are going to have problems with getting insurance for the vehicles. The other problem that I have today is...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk, the Rules on Members' statements clearly state you must confine yourself to one subject. You are on two subjects; perhaps we could hear from you tomorrow. Mr. Zoe.

Member's Statement On Two Year Completion Program For HAP Units

MR. ZOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in response to my concerns over the two year completion program for the HAP housing units. Mr. Speaker, the Minister has stated earlier in this session that the decision to go to a two year completion schedule was made in order to provide a more realistic construction schedule for HAP unit owners. I totally agree with the honourable Member but I do not think that it will benefit a lot of people in the Territories.

Mr. Speaker, however, in some of the communities in the Territories I think this new program is going to act to slow down those individuals who can and want to finish their homes in the one year period. As the House is aware, Mr. Speaker, the Territories is in great need of housing. Mr. Speaker, a lot of HAP clients that were already selected for the 1989-90 construction were selected in the fall. At that time when they were selected they were anticipating that this program would be over a one year period and not a two year period, and notwithstanding what I have just said, Mr. Speaker, the Minister that is introducing this two year program is only introducing it to some communities and not all the communities across the Territories. So I have a lot of concern regarding this two year completion program of the HAP units. I will be pursuing the Minister today under question period to clarify some of the concerns that I have. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Zoe. Members' statements. Mr. Arlooktoo.

Member's Statement On First Air Increase In Freight Charges

MR. ARLOOKTOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (Translation) I rise today in regard to Cape Dorset. I got a faxed letter from Cape Dorset from Charlie Manning. The letter states that he is very unhappy because First Air freight charges have been increased up to five per cent. The food is very expensive at the present time in the communities and now there is another five per cent increase for freight charges by First Air. First Air had not given the communities an advance warning about the increase and they are very unhappy because of the sudden increase that First Air has put upon the community of Cape Dorset. First Air does not give an advance warning to any communities when they are going to increase their rates. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Arlooktoo. Members' statements. Mr. Ernerk.

Member's Statement On Government Programs In Repulse Bay

MR. ERNERK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today because last week I went to Repulse Bay and I talked with the residents in regard to the TB epidemic that is going on. Today I am very happy, not with the government programs but about one thing in regard to the government programs. There is a committee struck in Rankin Inlet to deal with the people of Repulse Bay, to help them out and also I think the government will be starting their STEP program again. I am very grateful to hear too, that there is going to be an economic development officer placed in our region. I am happy to tell the government that they have done quite a bit for the

Keewatin Region even though people of Repulse Bay have a TB epidemic at this time, they are trying to do their best to socialize and stuff like that and it would be very good too if they could be given all kinds of improvements for their livelihood in Repulse Bay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ernerk. Mr. Gargan.

Member's Statement On Canadian Judicial System And Native People

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in protest over the Canadian justice system especially the seat belts. The Northern Justice Conference was held during March in Thompson, Manitoba. One of the participants was a circuit court judge who is of aboriginal descent and serves the Inuit communities in Labrador. His conclusion is that the system is simply not working for native people. He believes that Canada must stop imposing laws on native people and instead do more to respect traditional native values.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this man. The report by the Canadian Bar Association on locking up of native people contains some shocking evidence of the way native people are mistreated by the system. For example, in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, native people represent six to seven per cent of the population but constitute 46 to 60 per cent of the prison admissions. I think it is time this government woke up to this situation and stopped messing around with sound native cultural practices such as that of custom adoption. The federal government must change the existing criminal system.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Canadian justice system must be changed so that the criminal laws reflect the cultural practices and traditional ways of Canada's aboriginal people. The legal system has been termed "well-intentioned colonialism" but it is time that this practice ends. The legal system must serve the people. People must not be forced to serve the system. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Members' statements. Mr. Lewis.

Member's Statement On Private Member's Bill To Produce Northern Beer

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I would like to remind Members that it is the beginning of the baseball season and all across this continent people will be sitting in a much warmer climate than we have, watching this game and drinking their glass of beer, in many cases. It is that image, Mr. Speaker, that made me think that after discussions that have gone on for more than 20 years, we should at least have some legislation in place that would allow us to create our own northern beer, and for that reason during the next few days I shall try to introduce a Private Member's Bill because I notice that the government itself has obtained advice on this matter in a report called "Import Substitution Opportunities". It has pointed out that the beverages that are brought into the Northwest Territories constitute 55 per cent of the total weight of all products brought into the NWT. It seems to me we have tried to create milk out of our local water, and have not done very well. There have been discussions about creating pop out of northern water, and that has not gone very far either.

I would like to introduce this concept, which is long overdue in my opinion, not only for local people, but for tourists who come into this part of the world and are surprised to find that we do not make use of our northern water which until now has obtained the reputation of being pure, clean. If we do not do this right away, it seems to me that we will be missing a great opportunity. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Members' statements. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Ms Cournoyea, did you have a return?



ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Return To Question O361-89(1): Radiation Injuries Mentioned In WCB Report

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I have a return to a question asked by Mr. Whitford on March 10, 1989, regarding the Workers' Compensation Board 1987 Annual Report on radiation effects and injuries. Mr. Speaker, the four radiation cases mentioned in the WCB Annual Report are, in fact, claims for welding flashes. The board uses the national work injuries statistics program for coding the type of injury sustained by a worker, and welding flashes fall within the radiation category.

Return To Question O457-89(1): TB Outbreak In Repulse Bay

Mr. Speaker, I have another reply to a question asked by Mr. Zoe on March 16, 1989, concerning routine quarantine for tuberculosis patients. Mr. Speaker, quarantine is not a routine procedure for tuberculosis control. No one has been, or will be, quarantined during the present outbreak in Repulse Bay. Treatment for active tuberculosis begins in hospital, either in one of the regions or in the South. In hospital, patients are given tests before starting on medication, are established on a drug routine and monitored for any possible drug reaction. In addition, they are helped to understand their disease and the importance of taking their medication regularly and completely. Residents of Repulse Bay who require hospitalization for tuberculosis are being sent to Winnipeg, where there is a tuberculosis consultant. Patients identified as requiring preventive therapy may receive treatment in their home community.

Further Return To Question O439-89(1): Spread Of Tuberculosis In Classrooms

Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to an oral question asked by Mr. Ernerk on March 16, 1989, regarding the spreading of tuberculosis in the classroom. Mr. Speaker, tuberculosis is spread by persons who are infected with the disease and are not receiving treatment. When untreated persons breathe or cough tuberculosis germs on others, the TB germs can spread to other persons, particularly if they are within an enclosed area with poor ventilation. When an individual is taking medication as directed by the attending physician, he or she is not contagious, poses no risk to others, and is encouraged to carry on with normal daily activity. Consequently, there are children in the Northwest Territories schools who are currently being treated for tuberculosis. Health professionals in Repulse Bay have been actively screening for residents who may require active or preventive treatment. At this time in Repulse Bay there are more than 70 people taking medicine to prevent TB. Follow-up routines are continuing through chest X-ray, tuberculin skin testing and sputa collection. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Minister. Returns to oral questions. Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O377-89(1): Renewal Of Outfitters' Licences, Snowdrift; And To Question O378-89(1): Policy Re Issuing Outfitters' Licences

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to a question asked by Mr. Morin on March 13, 1989, with regard to requirements for renewal of outfitters' licences.

The outfitters' regulation states that all licences expire on the 31st of March every year and must be renewed prior to that date. Community consultations are not a requirement of the regulation at the time of renewal. However, the department has for some time required all applications for new licences to be accompanied by the results of community consultations. During the initial application process, the outfitter's area of operation and planned activities are determined and made known to the community. Should an outfitter wish to expand his operation or change the focus of his business, it would be necessary for him to apply to the department to change the terms of his licence. In this instance, community consultation would again be required. Economic Development and Tourism is committed to ensuring that communities are actively involved in the licensing process and that all applications are brought to their attention.

Outfitters, after receiving their licences, often make substantial investments in their equipment and building a client base. As with other businesses, such investments can be rationalized if there is confidence in the security of their investment and the ability to continue to operate within a stable set of rules.

In 1979 there were 27 outfitting businesses licensed by Economic Development and Tourism; 82 per cent of which were operated by residents of the NWT. By 1988 the number of outfitting businesses had grown to 97, of which 95 per cent were resident owned. This can be further broken down to show that of the 97 outfitting businesses licensed during 1988, 60 of them, or 62 per cent, were native owned and operated, demonstrating their increasing involvement in the tourism industry across the Northwest Territories. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wray. Returns to oral questions. Item 5, oral questions. Mr. McLaughlin.

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question O466-89(1): Beaufort Oil To Be Piped

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources. Members are all aware of the catastrophe that has happened with the supertanker owned by Exxon in Alaskan waters. This has proven beyond a doubt that no matter what kind of technology you have, you should only be shipping this type of material by sea when you absolutely have to. I would like to ask the Minister responsible if she is going to pursue with the federal government officials and Ministers responsible to make sure that any oil taken out of the Beaufort area will be piped through Canada rather than transported by supertanker around our shores.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Cournoyea.

Return To Question O466-89(1): Beaufort Oil To Be Piped

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all share the concern that has been expressed by the honourable Member in this very unfortunate incident that happened in Alaska and to many people who use the environment for their well-being and for their livelihood. Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the Member that it has been this government's stated position for some time now, and it has not changed, that the preferred way of delivery and taking out non-renewable resources is by pipeline and we at this time still maintain the position that we do not support the use of tankers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. McLaughlin, supplementary.

Supplementary To Question O466-89(1): Beaufort Oil To Be Piped

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Related to this situation, Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago I had the opportunity to visit the Amauligak project, where there was an oil tanker being filled, in order to test the consistency of the flow in the Beaufort Sea in the existing well holes there. I am also aware that there has been heavy crude transport by Panarctic to one of the communities to use in a diesel power plant somewhere nearby and I was wondering if the Minister could advise the House later as to what type of precautions are in place in case there is an accident because obviously Exxon was not capable of doing anything in their area. Would those kinds of experiments taking place in the Territories put us at risk? Is there anything in place to protect our environment if something like that happens?

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Cournoyea.

Further Return To Question O466-89(1): Beaufort Oil To Be Piped

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make a Minister's statement in regard to that tomorrow so I will be prepared to include any consideration of further questions that the Member may have asked today.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Mr. Whitford.

Question O467-89(1): Drug Testing At Arctic Winter Games

MR. WHITFORD: I have a question directed to the Minister responsible for sport and recreation. With all the controversy taking place now over the use of drugs and, in particular, anabolic steroids -- it is even affecting our dog races and horse races in Alberta -- are there any provisions being made for drug testing in the upcoming Arctic Winter Games?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O467-89(1): Drug Testing At Arctic Winter Games

HON. GORDON WRAY: There is some discussion taking place with regard to testing for the dogs. As you know, our junior dog team racing is going to be part of the games in 1990 and so we are making some provision, or we are looking at some provision, the Arctic Winter Games Corporation is looking at some provision for the dogs. With regard to the people, we do not consider anabolic steroids to be a problem for us at this point in time. The level of competition is just not high enough to warrant the use of steroids. So as far as I am aware -- and the Members should be aware that the Arctic Winter Games Corporation should be responsible for these games -- but as far as I am aware there is no provision being made for testing of athletes. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Mr. Arlooktoo.

Question O468-89(1): Increased Housing For Lake Harbour

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Housing Corporation. Our last session here before the break I asked for more houses for Lake Harbour. For this reason I would like to find out what the progress has been concerning our requests for increases in housing in Lake Harbour. Are you looking into this situation or are you working on it? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Return To Question O468-89(1): Increased Housing For Lake Harbour

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, certainly we are looking into it. We are aware of the situation in Lake Harbour as I visited the community a couple of months ago. I do believe the Member at that time was informed of the allocation process, as were the public who met with me and my staff. There are no additional units, beyond those that were indicated at that time, but we are looking at some of the other concerns raised by the Member with regard to housing allocations in other places and the needs survey.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Arlooktoo, supplementary.

Supplementary To Question O468-89(1): Increased Housing For Lake Harbour

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Looking at the scale here, and I received this March 23, Lake Harbour is not in the allocations for the houses in this plan. For this reason I was asking you if you had done anything about our requests for an increase in housing in Lake Harbour. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Further Return To Question O468-89(1): Increased Housing For Lake Harbour

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I will indicate to the Member tomorrow exactly what the allocation is. I believe it will confirm what he has heard before. There have been no new additional houses identified.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions, Mr. Ernerk.

Question O469-89(1): Publicizing All-Terrain Vehicles Legislation

MR. ERNERK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Government Services concerning the three-wheelers and four-wheelers. I know the act came into force in 1989. Before I ask the Minister, I am going to give a statement. I am aware that people in Nunavut are not aware of this new act, especially concerning insurance. I would like to ask the Minister, what kind of information or brochures would you be sending out to the people in the North so that they could understand the new bill concerning the insurance and other policies that you have made a bit better?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, while I could respond to the question, I think it would be improper for me in view of the fact that the responsibility for the department has been transferred as of April 1st to my colleague, the new Minister of Transportation, and I think he can provide that information that the Member requests.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister of Transportation.

Return To Question O469-89(1): Publicizing All-Terrain Vehicles Legislation

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Government Leader just announced, the new deputy minister and ADM of the department were just announced today. I have not had a chance to sit down with them yet, but I do intend to ensure that every community gets a copy of the legislation and time to get the necessary insurance in place. There are some very fundamental problems. For example, I know that most of the Hudson's Bay stores do not even have their stock of helmets in yet, or the co-ops, so people cannot even acquire helmets at this point in time. I am very aware of the problems and we are going to try and move as fast as we can to correct them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Ernerk.

Supplementary To Question O469-89(1): Publicizing All-Terrain Vehicles Legislation

MR. ERNERK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In order to get your registration and licence plate from the Government of the Northwest Territories, you require ownership of a machine, a three and four-wheeled machine. The thing that I noticed, Mr. Speaker, the other day when I went to get my registration as well as my licence plate, is that you are required to fill out an application form, a motor vehicle registration form. My only problem is that it is written only in English. Why was it not translated into Inuktitut, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Further Return To Question O469-89(1): Publicizing All-Terrain Vehicles Legislation

HON. GORDON WRAY: Quite frankly, I really do not know, Mr. Speaker. I guess that is one of the first things that I am going to have to look at. Hopefully, for the time being though, until we solve that problem, we have GLOs or FSOs, or whatever they are called, in every community who can assist the applicants at this point in time to fill the forms out. I can assure the Member that I will take a look at that particular problem very quickly. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Supplementary, Mr. Ernerk.

Supplementary To Question O469-89(1): Publicizing All-Terrain Vehicles Legislation

MR. ERNERK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My last question. Since the All-terrain Vehicles Act came into force in 1988, what kind of assistance does the government have for the communities? For instance, how could they assist the communities with information? If people want to get insurance, where would they go, who would they go to? Can they give us some kind of information so that people would know where to go to get their insurance?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Further Return To Question O469-89(1): Publicizing All-Terrain Vehicles Legislation

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. At this point in time, I would suggest that the GSOs or the field service officers are the best people to contact. Most communities are pretty aware of insurance. In the Keewatin Region, really Hyska is the only insurance agent we have. There is some done through Winnipeg, and a couple of companies in Yellowknife, but I think Hyska Insurance out of Churchill is the big one, and I know Hyska also has quite a presence in Baffin. It is like every other service that people buy. You go where you can get the best price, or who is going to give you the best deal. We will try and get that corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Zoe.

Question O470-89(1): Deletion Of HAP One Year Program

MR. ZOE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Housing. Is the Minister considering deleting the one year construction program for the HAP this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Return To Question O470-89(1): Deletion Of HAP One Year Program

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, no, the manner in which I have dealt with those people who have been prepared to go ahead is through an exception by the corporation for these individuals who have their lots prepared and are ready to meet a one year commitment. In fact, as recently as yesterday I stood on a lot of an individual in Norman Wells whom I had excepted a month ago, where the material had been delivered. I am excepting individuals who can meet the one year commitment. I have been discussing the issues with MLAs who have concerns.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Zoe.

Supplementary To Question O470-89(1): Deletion Of HAP One Year Program

MR. ZOE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister is aware, a number of these clients that were selected for 1989-90 were selected on the basis of anticipating that they would be on this one year completion program, and then all of a sudden, during the budget speech, the Minister has changed the rules and implements this two year program. A concern that I have, Mr. Speaker, is that those people that were selected in the fall were anticipating that they would be completing their houses within the year, but now since the rules have changed they have to wait for a two year period. Could I ask the Minister, if these individuals could qualify or could do it within a year, who would they see? Would it have to go all the way to the Minister's level, or to the district level? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Further Return To Question O470-89(1): Deletion Of HAP One Year Program

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I have been dealing with it since there are only about 36 units out of a total of 173 HAP units involved. It has not been that much of a burden. I think, as the honourable Member mentioned in his opening statement, he had no problem with the development of a two year building program. His problem was with the fact that there was such short notice on its implementation. I recognize that. As I say, there are very small numbers of homes affected this year, and the communities in which those two year implementation plans were given were those where we have had problems of non-completions in the past. One of the priorities that I would have in the next few months is to examine each of those non-completions. In fact, yesterday I was in a community and we looked at a case of an individual who has not completed his house for three years. We must try and determine why these houses are not being completed. We are addressing that issue at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Zoe.

Supplementary To Question O470-89(1): Deletion Of HAP One Year Program

MR. ZOE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If I understood the Minister right, he is indicating that the authority would be coming directly from him. Does that mean that he would also have to stand on each lot as he did in Norman Wells? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Further Return To Question O470-89(1): Deletion Of HAP One Year Program

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. Lewis.

Question O471-89(1): Establishment Of An Economic Development Body

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. Over the weekend he announced in Rankin Inlet a proposal for an economic development body to be set up by this government. I would like to ask the Minister if he would share that information with this House?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O471-89(1): Establishment Of An Economic Development Body

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not announce a proposal for a territorial development corporation. What I announced -- or I did not announce anything -- what we had put forward at the weekend was to discuss the Keewatin Chamber of Commerce's grey paper and it was a forum over the weekend to discuss different ideas for solving territorial economic problems. One of the things I put forward for consideration was the thought that perhaps a crown corporation may be necessary to drive economic development in the small native communities where private sector funding is not available and highly unlikely to be available in the near future. But at this point in time while consideration is certainly being given to it, cabinet has not seen it and cabinet has certainly not approved it. The department has not finished its thinking on it. It is very much at the thinking stage right now and we are still fleshing out different kinds of models, looking at different areas such as the FERA development corporation model in Finland, and such as several dozen crown corporation models across the country. So it is still very much at the thinking stage and there is no concrete plan at this point in time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Mr. Pudluk.

Question O472-89(1): Hamlet Boundary Lines

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two different questions to raise. My question is to the Minister of MACA regarding the hamlets, and their boundaries. In each community, is there a difference in their boundary lines in the hamlets? There may be some smaller boundaries for each community. If that is the case, who makes all the boundaries in the communities? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O472-89(1): Hamlet Boundary Lines

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there are certainly differences in communities. Every community is very different from any other. The way the boundaries are arrived at is usually a process of joint negotiation and consultation between the department and the community and it is based on how much land the community needs for growth, where the gravel pits are and where their water source is, where their sewage outlet is, what the population growth is for the community over the next 20 years. So it is very much a negotiated consultative process between the community and the department and really the boundaries are set in terms of determining what the community's needs will be for a considerable amount of time. There have been some fairly unique arrangements arrived at.

I can think of one back in the 1970s when the community of Repulse Bay wanted extremely large boundaries, far in excess of what their needs were and the arrangement at that time was a two-boundary system where there was an immediate boundary set aside for the community's expansion, its town planning, its normal stuff. Then a secondary boundary was agreed to which was not a legal boundary but it was agreed that this was an area of concern to the residents of Repulse Bay and therefore any activity in that area would not take place until there were discussions with the community. So there are fairly unique arrangements with every community but that is generally how the process works. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Pudluk.

Question O473-89(1): Powers Of Communities To Enact By-Laws

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary question for the Minister of MACA. The hamlet has the power within their own community -- in regard to April 1st, when the act came into effect on all-terrain vehicles -- within the communities will they be able to make their own by-laws to use all-terrain vehicles in the communities, not only on the roads? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O473-89(1): Powers Of Communities To Enact By-Laws

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No, the communities will no longer have that authority. The communities did have the authority and have held it for a considerable amount of time. The problem, and what drove the territorial government to come up with the legislation, was that over half the communities refused to introduce by-law regulations with regard to three-wheelers. What had happened, of course, is that the number of accidents and deaths were growing at a tremendous rate in the communities. The problem was that, because it is such a hot political issue at the local level, in some cases communities refused to bring in laws and in other cases the laws were so weak as to be almost ineffective. So the territorial government in this case had to step in and bring in a territorial law, simply because of the communities' refusal to pass their own laws. But they did have that power and had that power for at least the last 10 years that I am aware of. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Pudluk.

Supplementary To Question O473-89(1): Powers Of Communities To Enact By-Laws

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That may be the case in my constituency for the people who had had 10 years or more with by-laws. As you are probably aware, the ordinary Members do not have the power or authority but today my community has just become a hamlet. For that matter I do not want to look at 10 years for us to get our own by-laws in the communities. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question O473-89(1): Powers Of Communities To Enact By-Laws

HON. GORDON WRAY: I just want to clarify. What I was referring to before was the specific by-law with regard to all-terrain vehicles. The communities still have a vast amount of by-law making power. What we did do was take away their authority to regulate all-terrain vehicles, or some aspects of it, and place it in the Motor Vehicles Act. But the communities still have very wide-ranging powers when it comes to public health and business licensing, town planning, zoning, all kinds of law-making authority. So, no, the hamlets will still have the authority to make by-laws in many, many areas, but just in this one particular area...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk, point of order.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I asked only about one area, the all-terrain vehicles, not the other things. I know all that fact but I was just asking about the all-terrain vehicles. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. I think the question has been answered. Oral questions. Mr. Ernerk.

Question O474-89(1): Economic Development Officer, Repulse Bay

MR. ERNERK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. I understand the department plans to place an area economic development officer in Repulse Bay. This is very good and I am very pleased about it. When?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O474-89(1): Economic Development Officer, Repulse Bay

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. If everything goes well and we find the right person we hope to have somebody in there no later than the end of May.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. That would appear -- I called it twice Mr. Ernerk. Oral questions. Last chance.

Question O475-89(1): Disposal Of Government Buildings

MR. ERNERK: I just added this question, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Government Services. What is the procedure for disposal of government buildings?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I believe a number of departments might be involved. Therefore I will take the question as notice and provide the Member with a formal answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The question is taken as notice. Oral questions. Mr. Lewis.



Question O476-89(1): Possibility Of Government Auto Insurance Plan

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Government Services. In light of the great difficulty that people have in small communities to obtain auto insurance, has the Minister considered the possibility of the government setting up its own auto insurance program?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Return To Question O476-89(1): Possibility Of Government Auto Insurance Plan

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No, Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions.

Item 6, written questions. Item 7, returns to written questions. Mr. Clerk.

ITEM 7: RETURNS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Return to Question W14-89(1), asked by Mr. Angottitauruq to the Minister of Education, on a school playground for Spence Bay.

Return To Question W14-89(1): School Playground For Spence Bay

The Hon. Stephen Kakfwi's return to Question W14-89(1), asked by Mr. Angottitauruq on February 23, 1989, regarding school playground for Spence Bay. At the time the Spence Bay school was built, a small levelled play area was prepared. As the school playground is used by both the school and community, the community education council purchased the playground equipment, and the hamlet set it up. Since then the community education council has purchased a second set of equipment for the playground, but before the hamlet can set it up the playground site has to be expanded and prepared.

The expansion of the Spence Bay playground was discussed at the March 3, 1989, meeting of the executive committee of the Kitikmeot Divisional Board of Education. The divisional board agreed to consult with the department, the Spence Bay community education council and the hamlet. Neither the divisional board nor the Spence Bay community education council has contacted the department on this issue. However, it has been identified and will be resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Returns to written questions.

Item 8, replies to Opening Address.

Item 9, petitions.

Item 10, reports of standing and special committees. Item 11, tabling of documents. Mr. Angottitauruq.

ITEM 11: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table Tabled Document 83-89(1), a letter that was written to me by the hamlet of Gjoa Haven in regard to outgoing patients to Yellowknife. I have got a list of names, up to six people that were eligible to be paid by the Department of Health to the hospital and to the boarding home. I would like to share this document for proof, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Angottitauruq. Tabling of documents.

Item 12, notices of motion. Item 13, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Mr. Lewis.

ITEM 13: NOTICES OF MOTION FOR FIRST READING OF BILLS

Notice Of Motion For First Reading Of Bill 15-89(1): Liquor Act

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Friday, April 7, 1989, I shall move that Bill 15-89(1), An Act to Amend the Liquor Act, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Notices of motion for first reading of bills.

Item 14, motions.

Item 15, first reading of bills.

Item 16, second reading of bills. Item 17, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Appearance of FEARO witnesses, Tabled Document 58-89(1), Tabled Document 59-89(1), and Bill 3-89(1), with Mr. Gargan in the chair.

ITEM 17: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER APPEARANCE OF FEARO WITNESSES

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): We are dealing with the appearance of the FEARO witnesses, which is the federal environmental assessment review panel. Madam Minister, would you like to read your opening remarks?

Minister's Opening Remarks

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, in response to the motion in the Legislative Assembly, I have arranged for the co-chairmen of the Kiggavik FEARO review panel to appear before the committee of the whole this afternoon as witnesses to inform the Members and answer questions on the process for FEARO hearings on the proposed Kiggavik uranium mine near Baker Lake.

In December 1988, the federal Minister of the Environment announced the appointment of the Kiggavik FEARO panel, including the two co-chairmen we have as our guests today and four other panel members. He also provided the panel with detailed terms of reference which have been distributed to Members. The panel is to review and assess the short and long-term environmental and socio-economic effects within the NWT of the Kiggavik uranium mining project, including effects associated with the mining operations, milling operations, transportation of mine products, tailings and waste water management; site infrastructure, including camp, roads, powerhouse and air strip; and regional infrastructure including access roads and port facilities. Within the basic mandate of examining the environmental and socio-economic effects of the project, the panel's review shall include consideration of issues relating to community health, workers' safety and regulatory procedures. The review shall also include an examination of mine closure and abandonment activities, with particular emphasis on the long-term effects of the mine tailings.

The panel shall consider and report on the environmental and socio-economic acceptability of the project. If the panel concludes that the project is acceptable, it may recommend terms and conditions under which the project could proceed, including arrangements for monitoring the project implementation and abandonment and subsequent environmental and socio-economic effects. If the panel concludes that the project is unacceptable it shall provide its rationale for this recommendation.

The panel shall focus primarily on local and regional issues but shall not deal with the subject of land claims policy. However, issues relating to land use by native people are within the scope of the review. The energy policies of Canada and the GNWT and the role of uranium mining with these policies should not be included in this review, nor should issues relating to the end uses of uranium. In fulfilling its mandate, the panel shall provide full opportunities for public review

and input. The Government of the NWT together with DIAND have committed \$200,000 in intervener funding to ensure full public involvement throughout the review process.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to introduce the co-chairmen of the Kiggavik FEARO panel, Mr. Robert MacQuarrie and Mr. David Marshall. Mr. MacQuarrie has lived in the NWT since 1966 and has worked as a teacher and school principal in Baker Lake and Yellowknife. He is currently teaching in Yellowknife. Mr. MacQuarrie is well known to most of us having served two terms as a Member of the NWT Legislative Assembly between 1979 and 1987.

Mr. Marshall is the director of the Pacific western and northern region of the federal environment assessment review office, FEARO, in Vancouver. Since joining FEARO in 1980, Mr. Marshall has been involved in a number of panel reviews. He has served as both panel chairman and member and has worked in support of FEARO reviews through the provision of administrative and technical support to panels. This experience includes involvement with a number of northern panel reviews, including the Beaufort review.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that Mr. MacQuarrie and Mr. Marshall will provide you with a good understanding of the FEARO process as it applies to the Kiggavik review. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that they can answer questions you or your constituents may have, related to the review process. I believe it is important to understand that as panel co-chairmen they are public citizens, acting in response to the terms of reference approved by the federal Minister of the Environment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At this time I would suggest that Mr. MacQuarrie and Mr. Marshall be invited to come into the ropes to answer any questions or explain any further issues regarding the FEARO process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Does the committee agree that we invite the witnesses in? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): First of all I welcome Mr. MacQuarrie and Mr. Marshall into the House. I would also like to remind Members that the witnesses are here to focus on the process of the environmental review panel. If we could focus on that when asking questions. Would any of the co-chairmen wish to make opening remarks? Mr. Marshall.

Presentation By Mr. David Marshall

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity for Mr. MacQuarrie and me to appear before the Assembly today. We certainly have embarked on a very challenging and comprehensive process, and it is always nice to have an opportunity to be able to relate that particular process to as many people as possible.

The Kiggavik uranium mine assessment panel was appointed, as you mentioned, in December 1988, by the federal Minister of the Environment under the federal environmental assessment and review process, commonly known by most people as EARP, or the FEARO process, and basically what it constitutes is what we are involved in with the Kiggavik public review. This particular process has been followed in a number of different occurrences over the past 10 years in the Northwest Territories. Some of these particular project activities many of you may be familiar with. Ones like that already mentioned, the Beaufort Sea; the Arctic pilot project; the Norman Wells pipeline; Lancaster Sound offshore drilling and Davis Strait offshore drilling. In all of these reviews there has been a very comprehensive activity to involve as many people as possible in the development of the process and in the recommendations that have always been made by the previous panels.

This particular process was established in the mid 1970s as a result of a federal cabinet directive and strengthened by an order-in-council in 1984. On Monday of this week we were pleased to

learn in the federal Speech from the Throne that the Governor General announced significant plans for legislating this process. As many of you may be familiar, the process involves at this particular stage a group of mainly private citizens who are asked to work together in reviewing the effects of a project proposal, and the effects of such things on our land and water resources, and on people; and to make recommendations to government on the environmental and socio-economic acceptability of these proposals.

I think it is important to stress the term "recommendations" because we are not a decision making body. We are charged with making recommendations. The decisions will be made by others. However, that is not to downplay the importance of these recommendations. Since we have been involved in these types of activities over the years, I would say in 99 per cent of the cases the basic thrust of the recommendations has been accepted by government.

The Kiggavik review panel is a very typical one in the sense that it involves a specific proposal and it involves a specific review, with specific terms of reference. Many of you, I understand, have received copies of the terms of reference and there are a few of the points that I would like to highlight during this presentation. First of all, as has been mentioned, we have been appointed by the federal Minister of the Environment and we will be making recommendations both to the Government of Canada and to the Government of the Northwest Territories. The terms of reference that we are operating under were developed through a very comprehensive consultation exercise with the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Government of the Northwest Territories.

#### Mandate Of Panel

The mandate of the panel is basically to review the short and long-term environmental socio-economic effects within the NWT of the Kiggavik uranium mining project, including such effects as the mining operations, milling operations, transportation of mine products, tailings and waste water management; site infrastructure, including camp, roads, power house and airstrips; and regional infrastructure; including access roads and port facilities. The review will also include those issues relating to community health, worker safety and regulatory procedures. In addition, an examination of mine closure and abandonment activities, with particular emphasis on the long-term effects of mine tailings, is also included.

After the panel completes its public hearings and prepares its report to the two governments, it can make three different types of recommendations. It can conclude that the project is acceptable, and with it it can recommend terms and conditions under which the project could proceed, including arrangements for monitoring the project implementation and abandonment and subsequent environmental and socio-economic effects. In addition, the panel can conclude that the project is unacceptable but it must provide a full rationale for such a recommendation.

In addition, a primary focus that the panel will concentrate on are local and regional issues, but it will not deal with land claims. The panel will also not deal with energy policies and will not deal with the end uses of uranium mining. To help us conduct our particular review we will be engaging technical specialists who will help us examine some of the more complex and comprehensive issues as well as a very able secretariat that will help us do our work. We also have a number of different activities that we are currently engaged in and Mr. MacQuarrie is going to relate some of those to you now.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Marshall. Mr. MacQuarrie.

#### Presentation By Mr. Bob MacQuarrie

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will briefly comment on the make-up of the panel. First of all we hope that it is a panel that the people of the Northwest Territories and the Legislative Assembly could have confidence in. Generally, members were selected to be on the panel on the basis of particular expertise in some field related to the review, their general knowledge about environmental and social issues related to northern development, and impartiality with regard to the proposed specific project, the uranium mine.

The panel includes, as has already been mentioned, David Marshall, who is here with me today as a co-chairman, and five out of the six panel members have quite extensive northern experience and that includes Mr. Marshall. Although he is a resident of Vancouver, he has been involved in many environmental panels associated with the North. He was the executive secretary to the Beaufort Sea panel as well as the chairman of the Lancaster Sound panel and vice-chairman of the Arctic pilot project panel. So he does have extensive northern experience and a great deal of experience in the review process.

We also have David Milani, who is a natural resource consultant and who lived in the Keewatin for a period of time and is now living in Manitoba but was a northern resident for quite a number of years. There is also Rod Douglas, who is a mining engineer and presently living in Vancouver, and I believe retired, doing consulting work but he was for a number of years the manager at Con Mine in Yellowknife, so he has direct northern experience as well. Also, Tom Kudloo, who is a resident of Baker Lake who worked for many years with water resources and is now part of the atmospheric environmental service and living right in Baker Lake.

The only panel member who does not have northern residency experience is Dr. Ernest Mastromatteo, who is an occupational health expert and while he does not have northern experience he has immense experience in the area of occupational health and will clearly be a very valuable member on the panel.

I want to talk at some length about the process that we are going to follow, the procedures that we will follow, in the hope that it will become clear to Members and to the public generally that we intend to do a thorough job of assessing the project and that we intend to give every opportunity for the members of the public, individually or in groups, to express concerns about the project and to make it possible for them to do so in reasonably easy ways.

#### Highlights Of Operational Procedures

First, I will comment about our operational procedures. We have already sat together and agreed on some operational procedures that are now published and these are procedures that we intend to follow and it is important that the public know about them. I will just highlight a couple of the items in those procedures that I think are important for everyone to know. One of the first things is that the panel and individual panel members will avoid private oral or written communications about substantive issues associated with the review with anyone outside the panel staff. What that simply means is that none of us privately, either individually or in groups, will discuss the substantive issues in a private manner. Nobody will have the private ear of the panel. We must give that undertaking when we agree to join the panel in the first place. So we must be able to assure everyone who has a concern about this project that we will hear concerns only in open, public forums where everyone has a fair opportunity to present those concerns. So we feel this is a very important part of our procedures. Also, the panel will not accept any information that may be submitted by someone on the condition that it remain confidential or restricted regarding its release to the public. Any information that comes to the panel we, in turn, will want to make public so that it is accessible to everybody. No secrets about information that is being provided to us.

Also, when we hold public hearings we have some procedures that we will follow. The hearings will be all held in Northwest Territories centres and they will focus primarily on Keewatin communities including Baker Lake. The hearings will be conducted in a non-judicial but structured manner to allow for a full and fair examination of all information received by the panel and to solicit public comment on matters relevant to the panel's mandate. So what that means is that it is not going to be a kind of hearing process in which lawyers cross-examine people and frighten them. We do not intend to do it that way at all. It is very informal and people who have concerns to express need not ever fear that they are going to be subjected to a harsh cross-examination by some lawyer. That simply will not happen. The panel will from time to time itself want to ask questions of members but that will be done in an informal way.

The hearings will be divided into two categories. We are going to have some community sessions and some general sessions. The community sessions are intended to be informal and non-technical to permit members of communities an opportunity to present their views to the panel. These need not be views based on highly technical information, simply the concerns that people have upon hearing about this project. There will also be general sessions and they will be more structured and will include consideration of technical matters. The dates and locations for both the general and community sessions will be announced by the panel at least 30 days in advance of the start of these sessions and detailed procedures governing the conduct of the hearings will be released by the panel at least 30 days in advance of the hearings. So people will know how we intend to proceed and it will be in a rather informal, non-judicial manner.

#### Outline Of Process To Be Followed

Now as to the process we intend to follow over the next several months, I will outline that for Members here but also being aware that the media are here and can publicize for the benefit of the people in the Northwest Territories just the process that we intend to follow over the next several months. First of all, we are going to hold issues-scoping workshops. To put that into simpler English, we are going to hold some meetings where we gather the concerns of people. They have heard about a mining project possibly being developed west of Baker Lake -- what concerns do they have about this? So we will be holding workshops in the Keewatin in the first week of May and here in Yellowknife for the second week of May, to give people a chance to tell us what their concerns are about that project.

We, ourselves, have already discussed the matter and raised some of our own concerns. We have published a draft-scoping document and it is and will be available to all who want to participate in the scoping workshops, so people can see what concerns we, ourselves, as a panel are already raising. And then we, as a panel, will be interested in what concerns the public generally have, in addition to those that we have raised in this document. It is through the issues-scoping workshops that we will be able to determine what studies have to be undertaken and what information has to be collected in order to address the issues that have been raised.

So very specifically there will be workshops held in Baker Lake, May 1st and 2nd. They will be held in Rankin Inlet, May 3rd and 4th and in Yellowknife on May 9th. These workshops will be chaired by John Bayly who will serve as a facilitator. It will be his job to help to focus the concerns that people are expressing and to take formal account of them so that those can be relayed to our panel. Panel members will all be there and will be listening with a great deal of interest to the concerns that are raised by people at these community meetings. The company will also be there so that it can hear the concerns of the public as well and also, perhaps, answer any questions that people might have right at that time. But the whole focus of those initial hearings is largely to gather information about the concerns of people upon hearing of this project.

The product that comes from that will be an issues-scoping document. We have a draft one now and there will be a final issues-scoping document that we hope to have concluded by the end of May. Then we will issue what are called environmental impact statement guidelines and government information requests, and these will be based on the issues that are identified through the scoping process, reflecting the key concerns of all interested parties. We will direct very specific questions and information requirements at the proponent Urangesellschaft and at appropriate government agencies as well. So we will be wanting to know from the company and from governments, exactly what their role will be in this entire project. We hope to have that document available in June of 1989. The time lines are not firm but it is just to give you an idea of how we will be proceeding.

#### Responsibility For Environmental And Socio-Economic Studies

The format of our guidelines given to the company and to the government is designed to provide a broad framework for assessing the impact of the proposed mine development on the interrelated components of the physical, ecological, human and economic environments. Then having received the document from us, it is the responsibility of the company largely but also

various government departments, to carry out environmental and socio-economic studies. These are to be carried out by a company named Beak Consultants on behalf of Urangesellschaft. Those federal, territorial, regional and municipal government agencies that have regulatory responsibilities for one or more aspects of the proposed mine development will have to do some of their own studies.

What will be produced from that is the environmental impact statement and government information responses. Now this segment of the process we cannot control as far as time is concerned. It all depends on the proponent. How long will it take the proponent to gather the information that we have said is necessary and to answer the concerns that have been raised by people? How long will that take? So it is really outside our control but we rather expect that we would probably see an environmental impact statement submitted by the company and government information responses probably late October or November of this year, 1989. Somewhere in that neighbourhood, because I am sure the company will use the summer months to do some field research on the very questions that we have raised.

The next step after that is that our panel will review the environmental and socio-economic studies and of course this environmental impact statement. We will also distribute that widely so that the public is aware of the company's proposal in full and how the company intends to address the concerns that were raised earlier. So it is not only the panel who have a chance to look at it. We will distribute it widely to the public. We would not start to hold public hearings until at least 45 days after that environmental impact statement is distributed because we know that people have to have time to look at it and refer it to some experts who can help them to interpret it and to generate their responses and continuing concerns, if any, about the project.

#### Control Of Process Held By Panel

So we would hope that if we were to receive an environmental impact statement in November that we probably could have completed our review of the document by February. Now that is providing the document is acceptable to us. It is at this point that our panel has quite a bit of control over the process because we have expressed or will be expressing concerns in the environmental guidelines and if, when the company comes back with its environmental impact statement, we feel that it has not adequately addressed the concerns that were raised, then we can send the company back to do more research and more studies, or also government departments if we feel they have not adequately answered the concerns, the requests for information that we gave them. So at that point we can send things back again and we can keep sending it back if we feel that we are not getting the information that we need, because we are very conscious of the fact that as a panel there is very weighty responsibility on us. People will be looking to us for a set of sound recommendations about this project and we feel we can only make sound recommendations if the information that we have been given is as complete and thorough as it is possible for that information to be. So we will be concerned definitely about getting an adequate environmental impact statement back from the company and adequate responses from government departments on information.

If all of that comes first time around we should have done our review somewhere around February of 1990. Then we will begin to hold public hearings and these are the hearings where interested parties will have the chance to speak. They will have read what the company says it is going to do, what its project is, how it feels it can address any concerns that people had, so individuals and concerned groups will have had the opportunity to review all of that. We will schedule public hearings then, at which time they can tell us what they feel about what they are hearing. These public hearings probably would be held over a period of a month or so and that is likely to be in the spring of 1990, somewhere around March or April of 1990, and of course we would try to keep in mind the fact that we would want to have hearings when people in the communities could get to them in order to express their opinions. And I must say that we intend to hold the bulk of those hearings in the Keewatin communities where the greatest concern is for this particular project. So it is our intention to do that although there may be some general hearings held here in Yellowknife which are highly technical but the majority will be in the Keewatin.

As a product of those hearings, there will be a transcript of all public hearings. Then finally when they are concluded it will be the job of the panel to sit privately for a period of time and discuss everything that we have heard and attempt to reach some conclusions and make some recommendations. None of the six panel members have made any conclusions about this project at all to this point. In other words, we are waiting to hear evidence from proponents and from concerned citizens and it is only after having heard that fully that we would be prepared to make any kind of recommendations about what ought to happen with respect to this project.

#### Final Recommendations Possible By September, 1990

And of course it is our duty once we have sat privately and determined what our recommendations are going to be that we submit those to the Government of Canada. It would particularly go to the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Indian Affairs and we will also submit our final panel report to the GWNT which was partly responsible for initiating the process, so we want to be sure the government has those recommendations too. And as Mr. Marshall has already said, the recommendations we make are not binding. We are an advisory panel but still I am confident we will have done the full job before we make those recommendations and as Mr. Marshall said, in the past, 99 per cent of the times in FEAROs experience, governments have accepted the recommendations of the environmental panels. Only on one occasion I think he said, did they not accept the essence of the panel's recommendations. So while they are not binding recommendations we assume that they will have a fair influence in any determination that is made afterwards. We expect that our panel report probably would be made in around September of 1990. We do not want to drag the process on and on so that is what we are sort of aiming for at the present time. There are some things that are not within our control, but if things are within our control that is what we are looking at, the final recommendations in September 1990.

Just to update Members, Mr. Chairman, on a couple of related issues that I think are very important for Members to know, I would like to turn it back to Mr. Marshall, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Marshall.

#### Activities Of Panel

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of highlights and some of the more current activities that the panel is engaged in, and also its secretariat. First of all, in order to facilitate this information gathering and information exchange that will be taking place over the next 12 to 18 months, we are going to make sure that all major documents are translated into Inuktitut. We feel this is very important and not only will the documents be translated, but I think, as Mr. MacQuarrie mentioned, we will be having simultaneous translation at our public workshops and public hearings.

We have also hired a community liaison person who lives in Baker Lake, a woman by the name of Ms Ruby Arnat'naaq who will act as a main contact point for the panel secretariat. She will not be representing Urangesellschaft. She will not be representing a government agency. She will strictly be working in the region on behalf of the panel and the panel secretariat to facilitate the information exchange that is required in order to reach the objectives associated with the review.

In addition, intervener funding, as you have mentioned, has also been made available. We are fortunate this afternoon to have the chairman of the funding committee with us, and he is prepared to answer any questions that some of the Members may have following our presentation and questioning. I think it is important to point out that the panel is totally separate from the intervener funding program. I think, for obvious reasons, we do not want to be associated with making any decisions as to who gets how much money. Up until now, a number of organizations, we have been informed, have received money and support; groups such as the Keewatin regional uranium intervention co-ordinating committee, the hamlet council of Baker Lake, Ecology North, Nuclear Free North, NWT Federation of Labour and the NWT Chamber of Mines. This particular process has just begun and will be continued throughout the entire panel process.



In addition, as many of you are probably aware already, some concerns have been raised with respect to the panel review process. These concerns have been mainly related to the timing for the scoping workshops, the provision of intervenor funding and the scope of the terms of reference. I think a good example of one of the particular concerns that has been met, and was met fairly quickly, was a request by the Keewatin regional uranium intervention co-ordinating committee to have more time to be able to prepare themselves to participate effectively at the scoping workshops. The panel considered this request and agreed that more time would benefit not only this particular committee but others as well. As a result, the scoping workshops were scheduled in May to give people a little bit more time.

Also, we have established a fairly comprehensive mailing list. We believe that all the MLAs are on the list, but if you are not receiving information please inform us and we will correct it immediately.

In addition, the Inuit Broadcasting Corporation, IBC, has agreed to videotape the scoping workshops and produce two one-half hour specials for open viewing, not only immediately after the scoping workshops but throughout the course of the next 12 months, for those who are interested and were not able to attend the scoping workshops.

In conclusion, once again I would like to thank you for the opportunity on behalf of Mr. MacQuarrie and myself, and our fellow panel members, to appear before you. Mr. Chairman, we are now available to answer any questions that Members may have. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Marshall and Mr. MacQuarrie. General comments. Mr. Wray.

#### Objective Viewpoint

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to say that as one who has lived in Baker Lake for the last 19 years, and had to go through numerous hearings and counter-arguments over mining in the late 1970s, I must inform the committee that so far I am extremely impressed with the process that the panel is laying out over the next 18 months for the work to be done with regard to Kiggavik. It is going to be fairly comprehensive in nature. I quite frankly admit that, knowing the three northern members of the panel, I am a lot more at ease in my own mind that whatever comes out in the fall of 1990 will be an objective viewpoint that has carefully considered all of the viewpoints that have been put before the panel. Mr. MacQuarrie, as you know, is a former Member of this House; Mr. Kudloo and Mr. Milani I have known for years because they lived in the region. I am very confident, and I am sure the southern members are equally as objective. I just do not know them.

I was going to ask a question on the translation because one of the reasons that I wanted to see the inquiry and the panel base much of its time and work in the Keewatin, and particularly Baker Lake, was because the inquiry itself will be very much of an education process for the community where community residents will be able to listen to both sides. I just wonder, do you know at this point in time how much of your time will be spent actually in the community of Baker Lake, approximately how many hearings you will be holding in that community, and would the bulk of your presentations be made in Baker Lake?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Marshall,

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The bulk of the hearings and the scoping workshops will take place in Baker Lake and the most potentially affected communities, such as Rankin Inlet and Chesterfield Inlet. As far as the number of times that the panel will be in those communities, we know right now there will be at least two occasions, and possibly three. The secretariat has been there on numerous occasions already, and will be in there on a very frequent basis, in addition to maintaining constant liaison with Ms Arnat'naaq. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Marshall. Mr. Wray.

Socio-Economic Impact

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. Just a couple of questions. I realize that the environmental side is perhaps a little bit more clear-cut than the socio-economic, inasmuch as environmentally either this thing will be safe or it will not be. The process will allow you to determine that. In terms of the process, what kind of criteria do you have to assess the socio-economic impact? Will you be assessing things like jobs, the amount of dollar spin-off into the community, into the region? What kind of criteria would you be using to assess the socio-economic impact?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: All the things you mentioned are already part of our consideration. I think that the panel generally feels that the socio-economic considerations are equally important as the environmental considerations. Neither one will get short shrift. In our draft scoping document we raised questions about job possibilities in the Keewatin and training possibilities in the Keewatin. We also raised questions initially as to if there are revenues generated for governments from the project, what is the intended use, how is it going to benefit people in that area or in the NWT and so on. So there is no question at all that social and economic concerns are very much to be addressed here.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Just a final question because I do not want to monopolize, but in terms of the socio-economic impact -- and I agree that the socio-economic impact is equally important as environmental if not more important -- would the panel, in terms of the way it conducts itself, would it itself look at situations that were not presented to it? If nobody made the case, for example, that perhaps economically or socio-economically there would not be much benefit to the community if it was not connected by road to the mine, if this mine was going to operate independently as a fly-in, fly-out, would the panel itself be looking at questions like that? You know, comparative economic benefits with different scenario?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Very much so, because the unique thing about panels of this nature is that we are allowed to solicit as much information from as many sources as possible, provided it falls within our terms of reference. We can do that a number of ways. The way that has been proven very successful over the years is through these technical specialists that I talked to you about earlier. One of their primary responsibilities will be to raise issues that otherwise may be overlooked, and in addition to that, receive some requests from not only review participants but panel members as well as to explore and obtain certain information. If it cannot be done through the technical specialists we also, as Mr. MacQuarrie mentioned, can request information from the proponent, government agencies, or there have even been occasions in the past where we have asked somebody to come in who has had a similar experience, but in a region outside the area that we are looking at, to ask them how certain issues were addressed during the particular activity that was associated with their proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Time For Raising Concerns

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I would just like to add something to that and that is that concerns are never so well expressed as when they are expressed by people who hold those concerns and therefore, I would recommend to anyone who hears what is happening here and has particular concerns to try to make sure, as early as possible, that those are raised. For example, at the scoping workshop in May would be a time for people who hold those particular concerns that were expressed by yourself, either you or someone that you feel that you have trust in, to make sure that those concerns are raised at the workshop so that right from the start the panel is aware of them and prepared to make the company address those concerns.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. General comments. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to welcome my old colleague back to this chamber with a question which probably relates to his current professional responsibilities. I have never heard of the word "scoping" before. Is it better to be scoped or is it better to do the scoping?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, well of course I am back teaching now but that was a word that was unfamiliar to me too. I think it is generated by FEARO. It is a little bit of jargon and what it means is that we are trying to determine what is the total scope or breadth of the concerns that people have with respect to this project. Whether they are environmental or social or economic, what are these concerns? So the scoping workshops are to find out what they are in their total breadth, all of the concerns, the great scope of concerns. So as to whether it is better to scope or be scoped, I cannot pass a judgment on that right now, Mr. Butters. I have not tried it either yet. Not a verb, no.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I believe there are going to be seminars and panels and opportunities to appear before the panel or group. It seems to me while this has a specific focus, some of the aspects and the mandate of the panel certainly have global implications for not only are you relating to and referring to the Kiggavik uranium mining project but I think that some of the mandate aspects of the panel deal with uranium mining in the Territories per se. Would that be a fair assessment of the manner in which the panel will interpret its mandate?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The panel has interpreted its mandate in the sense that we believe the primary focus is on the Kiggavik uranium mine proposal per se. We also recognize though, that there are some long-term implications of uranium mining in general. Our feeling is that our recommendations will be totally directed toward the Kiggavik proposal but we will pass on to the respective governments information or concerns that people have relating to issues beyond that particular term of reference, bringing this to their attention so that they can deal with it in the most appropriate and most effective manner that they have before it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Butters.

#### Present Consideration Of Previous Debates

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, Mr. MacQuarrie made it abundantly clear that the panel at this time is not going to invite or listen to opinions relative to the project. All the witnesses are here to do is to discuss the process. But I do believe that Mr. MacQuarrie is aware and I think did participate in the rolling debate on uranium mining some time ago in this House. Will that debate be considered by this committee or is that really a dead issue and not to be considered in the FEARO group's studies?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: In a formal sense and as a single panel, no I do not think necessarily the panel will but I quite believe that individual members who want to be as well informed as possible about the total issue will take the opportunity to review those debates and better understand the concerns that people have had, not only now but in the past, about this particular matter.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Well, that is what I was afraid of. I was hoping that the answer might be that that Assembly, while it had its being, has now disappeared into that place where all past

Assemblies go, whimpering or laughing or whatever and that if it should be read, it should be read for a historical aspect only. I would hope that they would not take away from that debate some of the concerns expressed then which I think may now have been addressed. At that time I was positive with regard to the nuclear battery and I still am positive with regard to that particular issue, but I just hope that they read that record for its interest sake but not as input to their committee's work. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I certainly understand the point that the Member is making and I am sure those panel members who may take the opportunity to review that material would keep that in mind. But occasionally things are said in past Councils and everywhere that have some sort of universal value and eternal value. I still read Aristotle's ethics, for example. He wrote them a long time ago but I still think there are some worthwhile things there so we will read it with that in mind.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. We will take a 15 minute coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Okay, the committee will now come back to order. I have got on my list, Mr. Lewis. General comments.

### Socio-Economic And Environmental Sides Of Hearings

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that interested me from some of the comments that Mr. MacQuarrie made, and also Mr. Wray in response to his comment, was the whole issue of the socio-economic side of the hearings and the environmental side. I know that in recent months the federal government -- I never know which Bouchard makes these statements, but anyway the Bouchard who looks after the environmental stuff in Ottawa -- stated recently that in any development that takes place in this country, he would hope that we would never sacrifice environment for jobs, because although we may be desperate for jobs, the environment is something that is not as short-lived as a job is. The problem that we face in the Territories is that we so desperately want work for northern people. It is a terrible dilemma for us. That is why we have this panel, because of the terrible dilemma that we face.

But we have had enough experiences over the last while. The discussions that we had on PCBs, for example. The tremendous concern that that caused nearly all Members of this House brought that to the forefront of our thinking. Our environment could be damaged forever if we do not protect it and look after it and do a lot of thinking. This morning we also had a statement by Mr. McLaughlin, with which I heartily agree, that although an awful lot of work went into the assessment of the potential impact of delivering oil by sea out of Valdez, that did not prevent one of these freak kinds of accidents from taking place which now causes a tremendous amount of grief all along that coast.

So when I hear Mr. Wray and Mr. MacQuarrie saying no, they are of equal concern to us, as far as we are concerned they have balanced things --- the jobs, the social environment, the socio-economic side of things, to us are very, very important and just as important as the environment. But this is an environmental assessment review panel. This is what this is. It is looking at environment. That is what its focus is. I was a little bit surprised to hear that comment, that even though this is an environmental panel that is looking at the impact on the environment, that we still would have a comment like that. It is a terrible dilemma that we face. Because I know that as a Member of our special committee on the northern economy, we know what tremendous challenges we face over the next 10 or 20 years or longer, because of all the economic disadvantages that we have. We just do not seem to have a lot of the advantages that everybody else has. It just happens that we are blessed by having a large part of the NWT on the Canadian Shield with tremendous mineral wealth. That, I suppose, represents a lot of wealth in the bank for us and we would want to be sure that when this wealth is developed it is done in a way that it really does protect the environment.

### Focus Should Be Environmental

I would have hoped to have heard both government Members and our co-chairmen here indicate that the focus really was the environment. This is why it was set up, to see what impact this whole project would have on our northern environment. But I share with Mr. Wray this conundrum, this puzzle, as to how we can proceed to give people some hope for an economic future when we have so many unknowns and so many fears about how we develop our Territories in a responsible way; how we can get sustainable development so that people will not regret it years down the road when things happen, such as the thing that happened in Alaska, and the type of thing that exists in the Eastern Arctic, and when we look at the impact of industrialization on our northern climate, certainly in our northern atmosphere.

So those are some of the concerns that I have. There are lots of others, but I was particularly struck by the comment made by Mr. MacQuarrie, especially, and Mr. Wray, that this was a balanced thing, to look at not just the environment but really to look at the potential economic benefit whatever the price is, I suppose, although I would not want to say that Mr. MacQuarrie has indicated that, by any means. I will just leave it at that for now, but I certainly feel very strongly that this is a major development in that part of the world and it has to be done right.

Everything I have heard so far, I was impressed with, except that one comment about maybe there has to be a break-off point where we say, "Well, there may be this much damage, but it is going to be worth it because at least we are going to have 30 people working." So maybe we can get some kind of response to that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

Environmental Impacts And Economic Benefits

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to respond to the concern raised by the Member for Yellowknife Centre, distinguished Member for Yellowknife Centre. It is a very serious concern and what I want to say is, when I said that they are equal in a sense, what I mean is that both things are part of our mandate. The panel is supposed to look at environmental impacts and socio-economic impacts. So my expression of equality, I guess, was at the input end of the thing and not at the output end. So to put that in other language, what I am saying is that this panel intends to examine environmental impacts thoroughly; economic benefits, if there are any, thoroughly; and social impacts as well. We must remember that part of the socio-economic package is what kind of social impacts there might be from a project such as this. So we will examine all of these as thoroughly as we can and we will want detailed information on all of those areas so that we can make the best possible judgment.

Now at the output end, as to how each of these things will be weighted in the minds of each of the panel members, it is impossible for me to say at this moment. That will be something for the minds and the conscience of each member of the panel as they attempt to make what they feel is a good decision for the people of the NWT. I did not wish to imply that each economic benefit would be equally weighty with each environmental concern that is raised. Perhaps Mr. Marshall would like to add something to that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to echo those remarks by Mr. MacQuarrie, because I think we all have to keep in mind that we are foremost and primarily an environmental and socio-economic assessment panel. So naturally we are going to make sure that we give full weight to those considerations. At the same time though, there is always a tendency to look at the negative side of things like these and not take a look at some of the benefits, some of the positive aspects. So in order to be fair to all proposals and parts of the proposal associated with this project, we feel it important that we do give equal consideration, but still recognizing that we are concentrating on environmental and socio-economic considerations. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: I am really pleased with that reassurance, but the fact still remains that one always has to pose the question whether the panel was established to determine whether something should go ahead or not or whether the foremost thinking was that it should go ahead but there are all kinds of conditions that had to be met. The reason I say that is that we already know that uranium mining takes place, it exists, it already happens. And presumably the same kinds of assessments were done before these mines were developed. So the general public concern, I would say, would be this: They already know that mining of uranium is a reality, it is an established fact and therefore what this team would be doing would simply be saying, "Okay, we know that mining exists; now what we are going to do is indicate the terms and conditions under which we would expect this mine to proceed." And therefore, I suppose, it would be misleading the public into thinking that it is a question of a yes or no response to uranium mining in Baker Lake. It is more likely one of saying, "We know that it can exist in all kinds of places, but maybe in Baker Lake there are some factors which have not been considered. There are some differences. And once those conditions that pertain to that particular environment have been met, then there would be no difficulty in mining proceeding."

### Public Perceptions Difficult To Change

The big problem that most of us have is that the public perception is such that once an idea has caught hold in people's minds that something is a bad thing, it is very, very difficult to change that. The word uranium -- as soon as the word is uttered, then there are all kinds of responses that automatically come to people's minds. It is very, very difficult to erase that once you hear the word uranium. There are all kinds of other connotations attached to it, and perhaps they get people very, very upset. It seems to me that we can have all kinds of very capable people who will do very good work and make all kinds of reassurances, and so on, about mining, but once the public perception is that this is a bad thing -- maybe for all the wrong reasons simply because of what people have been told informally, through all the different sources that are available to people these days about every subject under the sun -- it is going to be very difficult.

For example, and the people of that area do not want it, even if there is no harm, and it can be done in a very responsible manner and even can produce economic benefits, if people do not want it, that is a political problem. It seems to me that sometimes the review panels are set up to solve political problems -- not scientific problems -- a straight political problem. The public knows that it is a political process. We have independent people, well respected, knowledgeable, but it is a political problem that we were faced with as to how we handle it. Are we going to do it or not do it?

Right now it seems to me that by setting up this panel in the way we have, or at least by initiating it, what we are signalling to the public is that we know mining can take place but what we are going to get out of this panel is a recommendation that it go ahead, but these are the kind of conditions that have to be met. Mining is different in this place and that place, but in Baker Lake if we can solve these two things, no problem. Once the public will is there and the public opinion is so strongly against something, it seems to me that that is very, very difficult to conquer, to overcome that. It does not matter how many good arguments or good reasons can be advanced to support uranium mining in that area.

I know that uranium mining -- I am familiar with some of it -- does exist and the mines continue, and there does not seem to be a great public outcry in the places that they exist.

It seems to me that we have a much different problem in this part of the world than they have in other parts of the world, and it is a political problem. It is not scientific or technical; it is a political problem. It seems to me that that is what we are trying to solve, and I would have hoped that that could have been set straight right at the beginning. It seems to me that people do not want it, or at least a large number of people do not want it. How to convince them that it is a good thing is going to be the big challenge of this government, and also everybody else who is involved with the project, including the company itself. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt that a review such as this that has significant public interest has got a number of different aspects that we as panel members are going to have to evaluate and judge over the next 18 months. Yes, there are certainly a lot of political considerations associated with this. After all, it was politicians that have asked Mr. MacQuarrie and four panel members to do this particular job.

### Complex Scientific And Technical Issues

Also, there are some very complex scientific and technical issues associated with this particular project, such things as tailings disposal in arctic conditions, and permafrost or discontinuous permafrost; these are the things that we will be examining in great detail. As well, there will be a number of other issues that people will be raising that are very much political, or because they are not aware of some of the things that are going to be built into the project, or because there is a significant amount of perceived concern. Of course, a project or a proposal and a public

review such as this, to a certain extent, will not only help with an information base as far as communicating what is involved, but the proponent will have an opportunity to explain what is involved in their proposal and what they hope to do to mitigate any potential adverse effects.

However, I think as far as we are concerned as a panel, I do not think any one of us would have taken on the assignment if we were not given the option of looking at three different conclusions or recommendations: one recommending that the project proceed; one recommending that it not proceed; or one that we recommend that it proceed under certain terms and conditions. We feel that we have been given a fairly open slate on this, and once the recommendations are put into our report and passed on to the people such as yourselves, and the two Ministers within the federal government, I realize that they will have a difficult decision; but at the same time, hopefully, they will have a very solid set of recommendations based on a very comprehensive public review process upon which to make a very sound decision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, as Mr. Marshall indicated, there are three different possibilities and I really believe that as panel members we must be open to each of those possibilities when we begin the process. I would say that any panel member who really had foreclosed one of the options in his own mind before this process ever began would have been perpetrating an injustice. We must be open to each of them. That is to say, it should go ahead, it should go ahead with certain conditions, or it should not go ahead. I think, as far as I understand at this moment, all panel members are open to all of those options.

We are not politicians. I believe that this panel will make its recommendations on the basis of our best judgment as to whether this specific project is safe and beneficial, and that is the basis that we will try to make our judgment on. Then, once we have made our recommendations, if politicians should feel -- and they have every right to adopt a different point of view -- if they feel that politically there are reasons for doing something different from what the panel recommends, we have to live with that and accept that. That is not the basis on which I think the panel will make its recommendations; it will be on a fair and thorough hearing of social impact, economic impact, environmental impact, and in our best judgment what should happen after we have heard all that evidence.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Ernerk.

MR. ERNERK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased that the two co-chairpersons of the FEARO committee are here before us today. I do not really want to get into a lot of debate on this whole issue because your instruction was very simple and that is the process. Originally I have had two concerns with it during late 1988 as well as 1989 and that was with regard to funding of the FEARO hearings in terms of this process as well as the timing. I was one of the first ones to indicate that timing was short. It should have been carried out beginning many years ago, 1973-74 when I lived in Baker Lake. When I was a community councillor with the community council of Baker Lake we started asking the Government of Canada as well as the company itself, Urangesellschaft, to come and talk to us, to come and consult with us. The government did not but Urangesellschaft did once, in the spring of 1974.

#### Environmental Issues Top Priority For Inuit

Having said these two things I came to the conclusion that once you have given us the terms of reference, the environmental assessment panel review of the proposed Kiggavik uranium mine, Northwest Territories, there are two things that are contained here as most important items in the mandate of the panel and they include environmental as well as socio-economic effects both in the short term and the long term. So I guess I will try to make my remarks from those two headings, Mr. Chairman. During the federal election in 1988, the Government of Canada made environmental issues as a top priority in Canada. I thought that was very good because for Inuit, environmental issues, wildlife management, has always been the top priority because we live off the land. We use the resources and we conserve both the renewable resources and the environment that we have walked upon for thousands of years.



One of the things that I would like to mention because I may not have another opportunity to talk to the co-chairpersons on this important issue, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that Nunavut, which means "our land", is very important to us. If it happens to be destroyed, one dollar will not buy new land. No money will ever buy new land to replace the land that has been destroyed by any sort of destruction. I think we have to be more and more concerned now about our environment today, as Mr. Lewis said. Last month we talked much about the issue of PCBs and we just recently noticed and observed through the news media the oil spill in Valdez. So this project is going to be a big project. It talks about the terms of reference. It talks about transportation, I take it, through the Chesterfield Inlet channels. That in itself is a big issue for both the people of Baker Lake as well as the coastal communities which are located along the west coast of Hudson Bay because we fish the waters. We hunt seals. We go back and forth to north of Chesterfield Inlet both in the winter and in the summertime and use the renewable resources that are there for us to take, caribou, fish, seals, belugas, you name it.

The other thing I am most concerned about in this whole issue of taking a look at the environmental aspect is what grows for the animals to eat. I guess my main concern, once the mine is in operation, is about the tailings of the mine as to how much they would spread. We take a look at the Valdez accident and it spreads very quickly. It spreads very quickly because of the wind changes. In this wind, I imagine -- the mine is not there yet but I imagine its tailings flowing within the land itself because the land is not flat, it is rough and there is lower land and there is higher land. If it begins to flow through different areas and leaks into the lakes, what sort of action are we willing to take, are we going to take? What sort of action plan do we have? Same thing with the water. Water management. We fish in the lakes. We use the water for drinking. The fact is that we have so much to think about in the future and it is a long, long future so one must be prepared to think out these issues very, very carefully.

#### Socio-Economic Effects On Community

With regard to the socio-economic effects, I do not think anyone, either the government or the people of the Keewatin Region, has begun to think about the possible effects of a large operation such as the Kiggavik uranium mine. I can think of quite a lot of issues. I can only observe as to what happened to Rankin Inlet when the mine was in operation and then when the mine died. The Government of Canada tried to make some fast make-believe programs to replace employment opportunities and the wage economy that was in place during the life of the Rankin Inlet mine. What about taking a look at employment opportunities, you know, the wage economy after the mine closes? Because one thing I do know something about is that the mine dies after so many years. Cullaton Lake is another example.

The other thing that I want to touch briefly on is this transportation. I imagine today that a number of ships, and I am using some of the words of the panel, some of the crews of the transportation ships travelling through Chesterfield Inlet channel will not have enough experience in terms of travelling within that channel. I can recall a number of pilots, Inuit pilots, and they included people like Singiituuq and Naituuq who piloted ships from the mouth of Chesterfield Inlet to Baker Lake because it has got a very strong current throughout the course of the summer months. As a result, when it freezes in the winter, the ice is very rough.

In terms of economic benefits, I am sure it will produce a certain number of jobs for the people within Baker Lake as well as within the Keewatin Region itself. Perhaps some other regions in Canada will benefit more, as we have already seen. We have already seen that mines that have been operated in the Keewatin Region have benefited southern Canadians more than they did northern Canadians, original Canadians.

#### Training Programs For People Of Keewatin Region

This brings me to the point of one of my major concerns. The panel is going to put together its final report by September of 1990. What training programs, what training opportunities, is the panel, the Government of Canada, the Government of the Northwest Territories, putting together so that if the mine is recommended to operate we have enough trained persons from the

community of Baker Lake, as well as the people of the Keewatin Region, so that we can provide more job opportunities for the people of the Keewatin Region? That is one of my major concerns with regard to the training opportunities for the people of the Keewatin Region.

I am probably missing some of the things that I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, but I have quite a lot of concerns about it, especially from the environmental point of view. But one of the things I also want to say is that there should be many people who should be prepared to appear before the panel from the communities in the Keewatin Region so that their views are heard with regard to the use of the land and with regard to socio-economic issues. I would certainly like to be able to see these hearings produce some leaders from the Keewatin Region. I think it is very important that, especially this time, we begin to produce more leaders, especially from the younger generation who are our future.

In terms of a couple of questions, Mr. Chairman, what sort of public advertisements have been placed in the communities with regard to the timing of the hearings to be held in each community? That is my first question, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I cannot answer that specifically. I know that we gave directions to our staff that it is important to make sure that people know well ahead of time that the hearings are in place, and we gave a strong recommendation at that point that local radio should be used in order to make people aware of what was coming, that that might be the best method of doing it. It is some time since I have been in touch with the staff, and I am not sure whether steps have already been taken in that regard or not. Perhaps Mr. Marshall could add something to that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I believe that has taken place. Also, the latest newsletter has gone out to a very comprehensive mailing list that includes a number of residents in the region, and it has been translated, and that is in the process of being distributed as well.

As far as tackling all of the honourable Member's questions, it might be very difficult at this stage, but I think that we can say that there are an awful lot of those concerns that he has mentioned that have been raised to us already, and to the panel secretariat. We imagine that they will probably surface again at the scoping workshops. I myself, as one of the six panel members, am very interested in the transportation issue of the proposal. I am looking forward to an opportunity to be able to ask some questions myself as far as what Urangesellschaft was planning to do in that respect. I think these are the types of things that will be unfolding in the immediate future. As far as training is concerned, I think that is another one that we are obviously very interested in. If a proposal like this does proceed, there obviously has to be a lot of benefits and that certainly would be an area where there should be some. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Ernerk.

MR. ERNERK: Thank you for that answer, Mr. Chairman. I did not really expect both of you to answer out of the statements, because they were not questions. They were more or less comments and concerns.

Maybe I missed it when I believe it was Gordon Wray who was talking, but I also understand you to say, I think, that all of the documents that you will be putting together for the people to see before they appear before your committee will be translated into Inuktitut languages. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. General comments. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Just in response to Mr. Ernerk's last question, that also includes the major draft scoping document, Mr. Ernerk. That is also being translated into Inuktitut so that people will be aware of what concerns we are starting off with, and they can add to them then.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Ernerk.

MR. ERNERK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will any individual or groups of people, organizations, from the communities -- whether they are from the Keewatin Region or anywhere else in the NWT or Canada -- be able to appear as witnesses before the committee?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, that is correct, but they will have to come to the locations where the hearings are being held.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Ernerk.

MR. ERNERK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the funding turns out to be -- I believe it was approximately \$200,000 -- insufficient, is the Government of Canada prepared to provide supplementary funding?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: That is a tough one. I do not think I can answer that one. I think, as I mentioned before, the chairman of the funding committee is with us, and if you have any questions along those lines he would be willing to answer them. That is as far as I can go. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Do you require any further information on that, Mr. Ernerk?

MR. ERNERK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In terms of timing, you are to put together your final report by September of 1990. Suppose you have a lot of interest -- things never work the way they should; if you have a deadline it does not always work because of so many different circumstances that might appear between now and September of 1990 -- if timing seems short, which I think it is, is the FEARO panel given the authority to extend its timing beyond September 1990?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Basically, that timing is set by our panel, and it is a target, not a deadline. We do want to move through the process as expeditiously as possible. It is a target that we ourselves have kind of set, and if it appears that more time is necessary in order to do a thorough job, then the panel will decide that it will take more time in order to do it, and convey that necessity to the Government of Canada.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. General comments. Mr. Patterson.

#### Confidence In Panel's Approach

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, having listened carefully to the presentation of the co-chairmen, both of whom I have known for some years, I would like to say that I am very impressed with what they have said today and with the process that they have outlined. It seems sensitive and thorough and, most important, will be focussed in the area that could be most directly affected by this project. Our government has put great store in the FEARO process for an orderly and thorough review of this very important and significant proposal. I think from what we have heard today our confidence is well-placed in this process so that all members of the public will basically have the facts on which to make a proper judgment about what should be done.

So I just wanted to say that although there has been some criticism of our stand in putting our stock in the review process, I think what we have heard today gives me confidence that it is going to be an orderly and thorough approach to a sensitive subject. We very much look forward to following the panel's hearings and, of course, receiving the recommendations, and in the process of the hearings, learning just what the people who are most affected by this project have to say by way of questions and comments. Then I think our government will be in a much better position to determine what position we might take. It is an emotional subject and it is going to be a great challenge but I am satisfied from what I have heard that the approach being taken and the excellent composition of the panel will give us the very best chance of doing the best job in such a difficult challenge. So I wish the panel well and I would like to thank them for coming here today and we will very much look forward to their work and their recommendations. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe I have anything else to say other than again, once more, to thank you for the invitation of coming before you. As I think we mentioned at the outset we have a very challenging, very complex task ahead of us but we are quite confident that we have the assistance that we need in order to be able to do the job that is required and we look forward to the next 18 months ourselves. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, if I could just conclude as well I would like to say thank you to the Members for having us and thank you to the Government Leader for an expression of confidence and I think the whole panel will work hard to ensure that expression of confidence is warranted and merited.

Then just finally I would like to say, very personally, it is has been tremendous to be back inside the ropes again. It is rather a nice feeling; sort of makes me feel like Sugar Ray Leonard.

---Laughter

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. I believe Mr. Gargan wants to speak. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess at the beginning of his statement, Mr. Marshall did indicate that 99 per cent of the time the recommendations that come out of this panel have been supported and implemented. I would like to ask Mr. Marshall then, what has been implemented, the refusal of the mining starting or 99 per cent of the mining getting started?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Marshall.

#### Previous Recommendations Of Panels

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think one thing that I would like to clarify is that in the 99 per cent of the cases the basic thrust of the recommendations has been accepted by the government, but in not all cases has the proponent decided to proceed with the proposal in the situations that they have been given conditional acceptance. There have been other reasons why the proposals have not proceeded; economic reasons or other priorities or whatever. But I think as far as the proposals that have been under review that have not taken place, the panel has been very much involved in the recommendations that allowed for that, or at least how this came about.

One of them that you are probably very familiar with was a proposal to drill in Lancaster Sound back in the late 70s. In that particular situation the panel recommended that the industry was not prepared technically, that they did not have the technology available to drill safely in those waters. At the same time the panel recommended that the government should take a look at that particular body of water because of its strategic location and come up with some priorities and some regional land use planning for the area, which I think most of you are aware has taken place.

Another situation was a nuclear refinery proposal for southern Ontario. In that situation the panel recommended that technically it was okay but it was being proposed for the wrong location and made a recommendation that it be looked at in another area, which it was.

The third one was a situation where it was again a nuclear refinery being planned in Saskatchewan in a predominantly Mennonite community. In that situation the panel made a recommendation that again, from a biophysical point of view, there was no problem with allowing the thing to proceed. However, they needed more information from a socio-economic point of view. But at that stage the proponent believed that it probably was not such a good idea after all and then moved to another location. But in all other situations the recommendations have been oriented along the lines of a conditional -- or I should say, had terms of reference attached to them. In some of those situations the proposal proceeded as planned and in other cases, for other various reasons, the proposal did not take place.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Marshall. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: One of the mandates of the panel is the short and long-term socio-economic effect of such a mine being placed, in this case in Baker Lake. But in order to make those types of assessments there has to be some kind of a baseline study done. Is this panel going to recommend in the interim before any mine starts, that a baseline study be done, doing atmospheric tests, human tissue testing, water testing, ground testing, animal testing, that sort of thing, to determine whether or not, after the fact and once the mine starts, the effect of whatever problems come out of the mine is in fact because of the mine being there? That whatever, if it is cancer or anything else relating to mining, is because of such a mine being in place? Knowing that before the mine started this was what the environment was like, this was what the humans and animals were like, after the mine started you could probably make some pretty accurate determinations to say that, yes, because of the mine there has been an increase in the rate of cancer in Baker Lake, Rankin Inlet or Chesterfield Inlet. Are you going to be able to make that kind of recommendation?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we both would probably like to respond to this question if we may. I think, generically, the answer to the honourable Member's question is yes, the panel is able to make those types of recommendations. I think the key thing is that if the panel feels that the decision-makers, who are going to be making the ultimate decision on this project, need some very valuable information, that could be part of a recommendation. The particular example that the honourable Member was talking about is an area of major concern to the panel, and we have addressed that particular component in the draft guidelines. I think Mr. MacQuarrie is going to reference that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

#### Section In Draft Document On Wildlife

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I said, we already have a draft scoping document that expresses quite a number of the concerns that we as a panel have about this whole project, and we are going to add to this later on. But just reading very briefly from one section, may answer Mr. Gargan's concern? One of the sections here says, "wildlife", and we ask all people involved -- the company and any government departments that may be involved -- to identify and show the extent and distribution of all fish, birds and mammals that permanently or temporarily make use of the habitat in that area; also to identify important wildlife food sources not otherwise included. Are there any keystone species that play a particularly important role in maintaining the balance of the ecosystem? What role does each species play in maintaining the ecosystem balance? Include such factors as food supply competition, predation, habitat and consumption by humans. Are any wildlife species currently contaminated with radiological or non-radiological contaminants? Identify the source, degree, distribution and means of contamination. What radiological and non-radiological contaminants associated with the proposed

mine project could potentially contaminate wildlife species? What are the sources of these contaminants, and by what means would contamination occur? Include air deposition or fall-out, water, food supply and all other potential means of contamination. We are attempting to get baseline data first so that we know precisely what the circumstances are, and then we are insisting that the company indicate where the potential hazards are from their project as well. That should give us good information to make our judgment on.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Chairman, the panel also indicated on the \$200,000 that there are certain organizations that are going to be getting this money to make presentations. I guess one organization that has not requested it is the Denendeh Conservation Board, which should have a concern over the caribou that do migrate to those areas and back. Has the panel received any submissions either from the Dene Nation or the Denendeh Conservation Board?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could ask Mr. Robinson that question because he is chairman of the intervener funding committee, and he might be able to give some sort of indication as to what types of groups have submitted proposals. Is that possible?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Marshall. Does the committee agree that we invite Mr. Robinson? Sergeant-at-Arms, could you escort Mr. Robinson in please? Welcome, Mr. Robinson. Would you like to answer Mr. Gargan's question?

MR. ROBINSON: I am not certain that I picked up the whole of the question, but I gather that it related to the recipients who had received the moneys we had distributed already; was that the essence of the question?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Gargan, would you like to repeat your question please?

#### Assistance To Make Presentations

MR. GARGAN: I understand that certain organizations, both in the Eastern Arctic and the West, are getting some moneys to assist them in making presentations. Because the Porcupine caribou do migrate in the Baker Lake area and further down, and right back up into Alaska and that they would be concerned and make presentations; and I am just wondering whether or not the Dene Nation or maybe the Denendeh Conservation Board have submitted for assistance so they could also make presentations.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Robinson, would you like to answer that question now?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, sir. The answer essentially is no. We did not receive a request from that source and therefore no moneys were distributed. However, as you may be aware, there are essentially two phases to the funding program. The first phase was centred on preparations for the forthcoming scoping workshops, about which a fair amount has been said. The second phase is to assist people in examining the environmental impact statement itself and in providing comments to the panel about it. That obviously is the much more substantive stage, and I guess I could say at this point that the funding committee would welcome requests along the lines of those mentioned by the honourable Member before the much more, as I say, substantive stage that is yet to come.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you. Mr. Gargan, any further comments?

MR. GARGAN: Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie, the biological impact did refer to what is known as the ecosystem balance. What exactly does that mean?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: I had meant to say after I had finished reading that little section that that was just a section on wildlife, but we have sections on water in the area, and the surface features, and all of that sort of thing. What we are talking about basically when we refer to the ecosystem is that we are attempting to take an integrated approach to the study of this, not just examining something in isolation, but if something should occur as a result of the mine project, what impact will that have on a variety of things, particularly wildlife and the plants that are growing in the area, and the water sources? So it is each of these as they are linked to other things; that is what we are referring to, and that is the approach we intend to take, Mr. Gargan.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Gargan.

Baseline Studies

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Chairman, am I to assume correctly that the balance would not be addressed unless there is a concern that it should be addressed? In other words, if only the people in Baker Lake are concerned that the mine is affecting their water, that is going to determine whether or not the balance of nature has been disrupted, the ecosystem? But am I also correct then to assume, Mr. Marshall, that in most cases where mines are being started or implemented that there are no baseline studies being done before such a mine occurs? I refer specifically to uranium mines.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, I do not believe that is the case. I think in all situations there is a certain amount of baseline information that is collected. But that is one area that we will be looking at, and for the mining that is taking place in northern Saskatchewan, we have already tried to obtain as many of the relevant documents as possible that will explain to us exactly what was done prior to a particular mining operation taking place and what the effects were that were observed as a result of any type of monitoring program. So to the best of my knowledge, and I cannot answer the question completely, but to the best of my knowledge not too many mining developments would be allowed to proceed without that baseline information.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Marshall. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Looking at it as a panel if at all, should an invitation be given to northern Saskatchewan where there are three uranium mines and where the native people are being affected by those three mines being established in northern Saskatchewan, Black Lake, I believe?

The other thing is with regard to the mine that was established in Great Bear Lake too, Fort Reliance, that area too. There were studies being done after the mine was established. To my knowledge the results of the study were never made public. I would like to know if that type of information is also going to be used so that we know what happens when such a mine does occur.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, the panel does not intend to travel extensively. As I remember, for example, in Alberta there was a panel on labour relations. I think they travelled around the world to gather their information and we do not intend to do that. We have no firm plans for this at the moment, but the panel has already discussed the matter and informally decided that we will want to go to northern Saskatchewan to have a look on site at the uranium mining that has been going on there. The panel members are aware, in addition, that there are native people who live in the area where the uranium mining is going on who have concerns about what has been happening there. We will be taking that into account.

In addition you say that there were some studies done with respect to that. I cannot claim to know what they are or to have read about them but we certainly are giving instructions to our staff to get hold of everything that is relevant in that area. I have a lot of confidence in our staff members, so I am sure that they will get whatever material is available for us.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Chairman, I was just referring to the uranium mine that was in the Great Bear area, Fort Reliance, I believe it was.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Did you wish to comment? No? Any further comments? Mr. Kilabuk.

Mine Tailings

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a short question. This is just a concern that I have in regard to uranium because it could be a health hazard to an individual. I just want to ask a question. Say, for instance, if a Baker Lake uranium mine is opened, I guess there are going to be a lot of tailings, I just want to know whether there are going to be tailings by the mine. Would it be that way? Would there be tailings right beside the mine? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, that is a question that requires a factual answer so we are not getting into the issues at all and we can easily say yes, there are tailings involved at mine sites and there will be tailings at this particular site if it should go ahead.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the concern that I have, the tailings from the mine. I know that pollution from the tailings might not just touch the Baker Lake area because it might seep underground and affect the other regions in the way of their water and wildlife. I am just concerned about the environment if it seeps through the ground into the other areas because it would have a great impact on the wildlife. I am mostly concerned about the caribou that migrate in that area. I just wondered if there had been a thought about putting the tailings further away from the mine just to protect the caribou. Has there been any consideration by the mines to do that?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk. Who would like to respond to that? Mr. Marshall.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I think that is another technical issue that we are also as panel members very concerned about and we have asked questions on that subject in our scoping document and our draft guidelines. We will be very interested to hear from the proponent, Urangesellschaft, what they plan to do about that particular issue and what types of technical mitigation measures they will do in order to avoid those types of effects from occurring. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Thank you, Mr. Marshall. Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) This is not a question but it is a comment. We have heard through the news everywhere that uranium mining is very dangerous and there is going to be a mine opening in the NWT and I just thought I would mention that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Any further general comments? If not, does the committee agree that this matter is concluded? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed



CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): I would like to thank the witnesses for appearing before this Legislative Assembly this afternoon. Thank you very much.

---Applause

What is the committee's wish? Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I would like to recognize the clock at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ernerk): Your motion is in order. There is no quorum. Mr. Clerk, please ring the bells. Thank you. We have a motion to recognize the clock. All those in favour, please raise your hand. All those opposed? Motion is carried.

---Carried

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ernerk.

ITEM 18: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF APPEARANCE OF FEARO WITNESSES

MR. ERNERK: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering the appearance of FEARO witnesses and wishes to report that this matter is concluded. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ernerk. The House has heard the report of the chairman of the committee of the whole. Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The House is agreed.

Item 19, third reading of bills. Item 20, Mr. Clerk, orders of the day.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Announcements, Mr. Speaker. There will be a meeting of the standing committee on legislation immediately after adjournment; tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. a meeting of ajauqtit; at 10:00 a.m. a meeting of the Management and Services Board.

ITEM 20: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Thursday, April 6th.

1. Prayer
2. Ministers' Statements
3. Members' Statements
4. Returns to Oral Questions
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. Tabling of Documents
12. Notices of Motion
13. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
14. Motions
15. First Reading of Bills
16. Second Reading of Bills
17. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Tabled Documents 76-89(1), 58-89(1), 59-89(1); Appearance of Constitutional Alliance Witnesses; Bill 3-89(1)
18. Report of Committee of the Whole
19. Third Reading of Bills
20. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. This House stands adjourned until Thursday, April 6th, at 1:00 p.m.

---ADJOURNMENT

Available from the  
Publications Clerk, Department of Culture and Communications  
Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T.  
\$1.00 per day; \$40.00 for 1st session, \$20.00 for 2nd and 3rd session; or \$60.00 per year  
Published under the Authority of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly  
of the Northwest Territories