



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

4th Session

11th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
Day 29

Thursday, April 6, 1989

Pages 1371 - 1413

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

Cournoyca, The Hon. Nellie, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1184
Inuvik, N.W.T.
XOE OT0
(403) 873-7128 (Office)
(403) 977-2405 (Tuktuyaktuk)
(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

Kakwi, 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 Hami'ton
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

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1989

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	1371
Ministers' Statements	
- 35-89(1) Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act	1371
- 36-89(1) Concerns About Alaskan Oil Spill	1371
Members' Statements	
- Mr. Whitford on Dangers of Smoking	1372
- Mr. Lewis on Northern Businesses	1373
- Mr. Gargan on Education Funding for Status Indians and Inuit	1373
Returns to Oral Questions	1374
Oral Questions	1375
Tabling of Documents	1381
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Appearance of Constitutional Alliance Witnesses	1382
- Tabled Document 58-89(1) Report of the Regional and Tribal Council Review Co-ordinating Committee	1382
- Tabled Document 59-89(1) Government Response to the Report of the Regional and Tribal Councils Review Co-ordinating Committee	1382
- Tabled Document 76-89(1) Political and Constitutional Development in the NWT	1382
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Appearance of Constitutional Alliance Witnesses	1412
- Tabled Document 58-89(1) Report of the Regional and Tribal Councils Review Co-ordinating Committee	1412
- Tabled Document 59-89(1) Government Responses to the Report of the Regional and Tribal Councils Review Co-ordinating Committee	1412

TABLE OF CONTENTS, THURSDAY APRIL 6, 1989 (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
- Tabled Document 76-89(1) Political and Constitutional Development in the NWT	1412
Orders of the Day	1412

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1989

MEMBERS PRESENT

Hon. Titus Alloodoo, Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Hon. Michael Ballantyne, Hon. Tom Butters, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Mr. Crow, Mr. Gargan, Hon. Stephen Kakfwi, Mr. Kilabuk, Mr. Lewis, Hon. Jeannie Marie-Jewell, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Nerysoo, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Hon. Red Pedersen, Mr. Pollard, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Whitford, Hon. Gordon Wray

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Red Pedersen): Orders of the day for Thursday, April 6th, 1989. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Ministers' Statement 35-89(1): Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, the Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act was proclaimed on December 31, 1988. This legislation addresses the problem of non-payment of family maintenance, which often presents constant worry and hardship to the spouse with custody of children. Non-payment of maintenance also puts a serious strain on social welfare resources, as many individuals who do not receive maintenance payments end up on welfare. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, the Department of Justice assisted in the enforcement of orders for maintenance made in other jurisdictions. Under the new legislation, the maintenance enforcement officer has the authority to assist people in enforcing orders made in Northwest Territories courts, as well. Since the proclamation of the Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act, the maintenance enforcement program has become fully operational.

In January, the program was widely advertised throughout the Northwest Territories. As of March 15th, 46 Northwest Territories orders were registered, in addition to the 105 "reciprocal" cases for enforcement of maintenance orders from other jurisdictions. From the experience in other jurisdictions, we anticipate that the case load will increase in the first year by between 100 and 200 per cent. This program is a significant development in assisting people, mainly women with small children, to benefit from our justice system. The act gives the maintenance enforcement officer the authority to assist these people by requiring those who have family obligations to fulfil them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Ministers' statements. Ms Cournoyea.

Ministers' Statement 36-89(1): Concerns About Alaskan Oil Spill

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, over the last week many people in the North and throughout Canada and the US have expressed their concerns about the environmental impacts of the Alaskan oil spill. It has reminded us of the seriousness of the environmental impacts of resource activity and of the common concerns of coastal people. Beaufort residents have particular cause to consider the possibility of oil spills that may occur in the Northwest Territories if and when Mackenzie Delta and Beaufort development proceeds.

In addition, Northerners want to make sure that their support for the recent natural gas export licence applications by Esso, Shell and Gulf are conditioned by a renewed commitment to environmental protection. As the Minister for Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources, and in association with the Hon. Titus Allooloo, Minister of Renewable Resources, I can reconfirm the Government of the Northwest Territories' commitment to ensuring that maximum environmental protection is part of every exploration and development program.

Right now industry activities in the Beaufort are limited to exploration programs -- and oil production is many years off. To date there has been only carefully controlled short-term summer use of a tanker for the transport of production from testing at the Amauligak field. Even at these early stages Beaufort explorers continue to develop their oil spill response capability and hopefully will learn much from the terrible Alaska disaster. Oil spill response equipment from the industry bases in Tuk has already been loaned to Alaskan officials.

Throughout the Beaufort Sea environmental assessment panel hearings, the Government of the Northwest Territories and Northerners clearly stated their support for the use of pipelines to transport Beaufort crude instead of oil tankers. This continues to be our position. In the High Arctic, Panarctic has used an ice-strengthened class III tanker to transport 100,000 barrels of oil at the end of each summer season. When it has been prudent, the MV Arctic has been accompanied by a Canadian coast guard ice-breaker. As well, the company has recognized in its plans that shipping may be prevented because of later or early ice, and it is prepared to forego its annual production in those circumstances. For next summer's offshore drilling programs, I know that both our departments have a renewed commitment to ensuring the adequacy of industry's contingency plans.

This is one of the reasons that the Northern Accord is so fundamental to acceptable development. We believe northern managers will have the political strength and will to establish rigorous standards and to carefully scrutinize the activities of northern operators. This applies equally to onshore natural gas as Beaufort crude oil or pipeline routing. For example, some people have assumed that natural gas development will inevitably lead to development of the North Slope. Our government remains committed to the ban of activities in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge and on the North Slope of Yukon. These areas are critical sites for the calving of the Porcupine caribou herd, for waterfowl nesting and for polar bear populations, and must not be sacrificed to development interests.

It must also be added that while many development scenarios have been discussed recently, the National Energy Board is currently considering only natural gas export applications by Esso, Shell and Gulf. Gas is a much safer product and uses a much safer transportation method. We are only at the very early stages of a long and orderly development process that will see the full involvement of the Government of the Northwest Territories. We are confident that Northerners have the skills to ensure that development proceeds in a way that protects our northern environment and realizes long-lasting economic benefits for northern communities. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Minister. Ministers' statements. Item 3, Members' statements. Mr. Whitford.

ITEM 3: MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Member's Statement On Dangers Of Smoking

MR. WHITFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to congratulate the Minister of Health on her and her department's successful efforts to bring to Yellowknife the circumpolar conference on tobacco and health. From what I have heard of it, and from what I have seen of it, it is accomplishing quite a lot. It will go a long way to assisting people in understanding the long-term effects of tobacco on people. Tobacco, in my opinion, sir, is -- if not the number one -- is certainly a very close runner to that in the illness area. It causes an awful lot of problems and it

is something that we must continue to be made aware of. We must continue the efforts, individually, to try to encourage people to quit, or not to start, in particular.

I see young people in schools attempting to smoke, and they are using role models of older people, and they say, "Well, the older people have smoked for years and years, yet nothing has happened to them." Today we have information at our fingertips that says there are long-term dangers from tobacco and we are having a tremendous fight against the industry to change that opinion of it. They show youthful, outgoing people in pristine environments smoking cigarettes and telling them how much fun it is. I think if we were to show them the other side of the coin, perhaps show them the case histories of people who are suffering from lip cancer, lung cancer and throat cancer, that might change a few opinions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

---Applause

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

Member's Statement On Northern Business

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope this meets your criterion that any Member's statement must be on one subject. The concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is the definition we sometimes use for northern business, and how we use the term "northern preference". It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, and especially after the meeting of the standing committee on public accounts on Monday and Tuesday, that this government still has a problem in making sure that whatever moneys are given to companies, either in the form of loans or in the form of contracts, that that money accrues to the benefit of the Northwest Territories. We continue to see money being given to companies that have no real presence in the NWT. In some real cases they may be no more than a file in a lawyer's office or in other cases, a company that just happens to come here for the season when the weather is good.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that I notice that many businessmen who make their homes in the NWT and are real residents are the people who contribute to community life. I saw evidence of this on the weekend at the Caribou Carnival. All kinds of local business people were involved, giving up their time and their energy; and I notice that when it comes time to give money to charities, to service clubs, it is always the guy who is on the street here, who has his business readily available to people, that ends up coughing up money to support the voluntary sector of the NWT, a very important sector.

So Mr. Speaker, I would like to once more caution the government that it has to do something about redefining what a northern company is so that we can get the benefits for northern people to a greater degree than we do at present. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Member's Statement On Education Funding For Status Indians And Inuit

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the federal Department of Indian Affairs decision to put a cap on funding for education for status native people and Inuit that came into effect April 1st. Under the old policy, aboriginal students could receive funding for up to eight years and this time was often needed as students sometimes could not finish their studies in consecutive years. Under this new policy, native students will only have one chance to complete their education and will lose their grants if they are not successful in their studies. In addition, a cap on total funding will mean that in the future not all willing and qualified students will receive funding and may not get a post secondary education. This policy, the new post secondary student assistance program, will not help Canadian native people achieve the education levels that are required for Canada's aboriginal people to achieve economic and political self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, native and non-native people have protested across the country against this new policy. On my recent trip to Vancouver, I myself was part of a demonstration on March 22. I noticed in the April 5th Globe and Mail that there is also a protest going on in Northern Ontario. Currently there are eight students there who are on a hunger strike to protest this new funding policy. These students have now been fasting for two weeks, Mr. Speaker. Cutting off the financial assistance that native people need for tuition and living costs in order to go to university and get a job is not acceptable and I want this government to take a strong stand and work toward getting this regressive policy scrapped. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. The Chair would like to recognize in the gallery today Mr. George Eckalook, the mayor of Resolute Bay and also chairman of the Baffin Regional Health Board. Welcome.

---Applause

Item 3, Members' statements. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Further Return To Question O101-89(1): Number Of Submissions Re Tax Options Paper

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a reply to a question asked by Mr. Lewis to do with the tax options paper. Approximately 1000 copies of the "Northwest Territories Tax Options" public consultation paper were distributed to organizations in the Northwest Territories. In addition, close to 20,000 English and 5000 Inuktitut copies of a shorter summary pamphlet were distributed to households. As of February 27, 1989, 14 written responses to the Northwest Territories Tax Options document have been received. Six of these came from private citizens and eight were sent by municipalities and organizations.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Returns to oral questions. Mr. Butters.

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

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yesterday, the honourable Member for Baffin South, Mr. Arlooktoo, raised a question regarding the social housing allocations for the community of Lake Harbour. As I indicated to the Member, and I would confirm today, the statement that was made in his constituency some three months ago in response to a similar question remains exactly the same. That is, during the fiscal year 1989-90 the community is to receive two northern rental replacement units, two-bedroom duplex, to be completed by December 1989. As well, the community of Lake Harbour will also benefit from the retrofit of two units under the retrofit II program.

According to the corporation's 1988 housing needs survey, Lake Harbour has a requirement for 14 houses. As I think Members know, across the Northwest Territories there is a total housing need of some 2971 units. Since the Housing Corporation's capital budget allows for the construction of only some 300 new housing units a year, the corporation, regrettably, can only meet one tenth of the housing need in any given year. The Housing Corporation allocates its budget for 300 new houses according to each community's portion of the total need, which is determined as a result of the needs survey. In the case of Lake Harbour, this calculation, which is 14 divided by 2971 and multiplied by 300, equals 1.4 houses.

Obviously it is impossible for the corporation to deliver a part of a house, and it is not cost-effective to deliver only one housing unit in a community in a year, so what the corporation does in these cases -- and we recognize there is an entitlement to Lake Harbour for 1.4 houses -- is to build two years worth of new houses every other year in the very small communities. Last year the corporation delivered two new units in Lake Harbour, that is in 1988-89. There are no new houses planned for this year, 1989-90, but next year we will add on and deliver three new houses into the Lake Harbour community.

The community of Lake Harbour is not being singled out for this alternating pattern. We also deliver houses in the same manner in six other communities; Grise Fiord, Resolute Bay, Arctic Red River, Paulatuk, Sachs Harbour and Whale Cove. As I have said, that is based on the needs of economics. I trust that this will provide the honourable Member with the information he requires and give him some assurance that we are attempting to meet the needs of his community, which we have seen and recognize, in an equitable and fair manner.

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

Further Return To Question O415-89(1): Trips To Ottawa To Deal With Arctic Airports

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to a question asked by Mr. Zoe, on arctic airports program devolution, on March 15, 1989. In response to Mr. Zoe's request for information on the meetings between officials of my department and officials of Transport Canada on the devolution of the arctic B and C airports program, later today I will make available to each Member a report on the key correspondence and meetings since the initiation of the proposed devolution in October 1985.

A query from Mr. Angottitauruq was also directed to me in Mr. Zoe's question. I immediately replied and outlined the general background on the priorities for airport construction in NWT communities which did not receive assistance under the federal arctic air facilities policy, which expired in March of 1983. For further information, I will be providing each Member with a paper detailing the airport construction priorities for which the GNWT is seeking federal funding under the arctic airports devolution proposal, and the rationale for each community's place on the priority list. Thank you.

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

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question O477-89(1): Relocation Of Duplex To Lake Harbour

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was not going to ask a question after receiving the response from the Minister of Housing. When we met this past winter, when I made the motion on the duplex, that it was going to be in Cape Dorset, and if that could be relocated to Lake Harbour -- that was the only question I had. It seems that I did not get any response concerning this, along with the response you made. So my question is the same. Did the cabinet deny this, or what is happening? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters.

Return To Question O477-89(1): Relocation Of Duplex To Lake Harbour

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not respond to that question. I will have to determine from the corporation whether an adequate consultation process has gone on with the Cape Dorset community and the housing association to accede to the Member's request. I will try and respond to that tomorrow if they have done that consultation work, and indicate what response we get from the Cape Dorset community.

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

Question O478-89(1): Economic Use For Sharks

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. In my area the fishing is going very well with halibut and they also net some sharks. I think you are aware there are sharks in our area. My question is, can we utilize any of these sharks? Can we make products out of the skins of sharks? If you could look into

this then we will not waste the sharks that are caught, if they can be marketed to other countries we will not be wasting our resources. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O478-89(1): Economic Use For Sharks

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, as the Member has indicated I have only recently become aware that as a by-product of the halibut and turbot fishery, in fact Greenland sharks are being caught. I most certainly will be directing the department to take a look at the possibility of using these for some by-products. I know that shark skin is a very exclusive type of skin for things like shoes and in other areas. So if there are sufficient numbers of sharks being caught then we will most certainly look at any commercial by-products that may occur from that. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Supplementary, Mr. Kilabuk.

Supplementary To Question O478-89(1): Economic Use For Sharks

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, supplementary. I am not only speaking of Pangnirtung, but also for the coastal communities. I think they all have sharks and have caught sharks. If once the studies are completed on the possibilities of marketing the skins, those hunters who do not have other by-products to sell, could they also be included? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Further Return To Question O478-89(1): Economic Use For Sharks

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. Yes, most certainly we will be looking at that. As I said, it has only recently come to our attention that there appears to be a fairly large quantity of sharks in that area, in the Baffin, and so we will be looking at the potential there. Thanks.

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

Question O479-89(1): Enlargement Of Fish Plant, Pangnirtung

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An entirely different question. Perhaps this question is directed to the same Minister. I am not sure where to direct this question, whether to the Minister of Renewable Resources or the Minister of Economic Development. In Pangnirtung the deep sea fisheries is developing quite fast and they have harvested quite an amount of halibut. Our fish plant is quite small, therefore the Pangnirtung residents are wondering if they could get a larger fish plant in the future. So they are in the planning stages of trying to obtain a bigger fish plant, possibly in the year 1990 and 1991. They are wondering if they could be assisted by either the Department of Renewable Resources or the Department of Economic Development. So I would really appreciate it if either one of those departments could assist the community in obtaining a larger fish plant.

We are aware that Mr. Patterson has seen the fish plant in Pangnirtung and also the federal Minister for small businesses has visited the community. They have both seen the fish plant, and I am sure that they thought that the fish plant was too small. So therefore we will be expecting a larger fish plant in the year 1990 or 1991. So in consideration of this either the Renewable Resources department or the Economic Development department, would either one of them be able to support the community in trying to obtain a larger fish plant? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O479-89(1): Enlargement Of Fish Plant, Pangnirtung

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are aware of the success of the Pangnirtung fishery, obviously. I myself had a chance to go through the fish plant in Pangnirtung in early March and I know the federal Minister and Mr. Patterson went through it just recently. While I cannot promise today that we will support a larger fish plant, the fact is that the fishery in Pangnirtung is becoming quite a success story. So far they have handled over 70,000 pounds of fish and I am sure that economics will justify in the not too distant future, a larger fish plant in that community. But there is some preliminary work that has to be done in looking at the present capacity and what it is handling, and how big a plant do we need there, and how big do we have to go, and how big is the fishing going to get. But it is certainly something that we are aware of and if it can be justified in terms of usage and the amount of fish going through the plant, then I am sure that the community will receive the support for a larger fish plant.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Kilabuk.

MR. KILABUK: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, supplementary. At the present time I think they have harvested about 70,000 pounds of fish. That is not including what the hunters have harvested. So I would like you to consider this. I am just telling you this ahead of time so that you could give us support in the future. At the present time they are trying to make some money through fisheries, so I just wanted you to be aware that they are counting the pounds of fish that they have harvested so perhaps you will be able to support us on the planning stages. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Kilabuk for that information. That was not a question though. Oral questions. Mr. Lewis.

Question O480-89(1): Status Of Urangesellschaft In Canada

MR. LEWIS: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister responsible for Energy and Mines. Could the Minister tell me whether the company Urangesellschaft is a company that is a subsidiary which has a presence in Canada or is it a company which is a European company and has no real presence in Canada? It is a question maybe that the Minister would not have all the details about but I am trying to get a feel for how well she knows the company that is of great concern and interest to this House today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Cournoyea.

Return To Question O480-89(1): Status Of Urangesellschaft In Canada

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the Urangesellschaft is a subsidiary of a West German company. It has its head office in Toronto and it has operated for a number of years at their site in Baker Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Lewis.

Supplementary To Question O480-89(1): Status Of Urangesellschaft In Canada

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask then as a supplementary. Does this mean that the head office of this German company is in Canada and not in Germany?

MR. SPEAKER: Madam Minister.

Further Return To Question O480-89(1): Status Of Urangesellschaft In Canada

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, the head office is in West Germany and the Canadian arm of the company is situated in Toronto.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Further supplementary, Mr. Lewis.

Supplementary To Question 0480-89(1): Status Of Urangesellschaft In Canada

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate to the House whether in fact this company is engaged in other activities in Canada besides the one at Baker Lake?

MR. SPEAKER: Madam Minister.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take that under advisement because the information I have in my mind, I am not totally sure it is correct, but I will answer that question tomorrow. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Minister. The supplementary is taken as notice. Mr. Gargan was next.

Question O481-89(1): Protection In Transportation Of Dangerous Goods

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Transportation. Mr. Speaker, I was quite impressed with the statement made by Ms Cournoyea with regard to maximum environmental protection on exploration and development. My question to the Minister of Transportation is with regard to the transportation of dangerous goods which cross the Mackenzie River, the Mackenzie ice bridge, and which go on through to Hay River. Some of it is also carried in by barges. I would like to ask the Minister whether there are any emergency procedures, or any kind of emergency equipment, here in Yellowknife or in Fort Rae, Fort Providence, or Hay River, to deal with any kind of spill related to dangerous goods.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: I am afraid I will have to take that question under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question O482-89(1): Appointment Of New Commissioner

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Government Leader. Has the Government Leader had any contact with the federal government with regard to the appointment of a new Commissioner, or conversely, has the federal government solicited his opinion on who this replacement should be?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Return To Question O482-89(1): Appointment Of New Commissioner

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Yes, to both questions, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

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

Question O483-89(1): Definition Of Highways

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, under the Motor Vehicles Act, I would like to ask Mr. Butters on the definition of highways. The meaning refers to roads, places, bridges or structures, whether publicly or privately owned, that the public is ordinarily entitled or permitted to use. With that definition, I guess it would mean commonly used roads, and I would like to ask the Minister whether or not seismic lines, secondary roads, that are used semi-annually for trapping activities and such, are also defined under the highways definition, and that seat belts do apply.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Is this Mr. Wray's jurisdiction now? The question does cross about three ministries, seat belts, highways and licensing. Mr. Wray, would you like to handle it? Thank you.

HON. GORDON WRAY: I will just give notice and get back to the Member. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The question is taken as notice. Mr. Arlooktoo was next.

Question O484-89(1): Question To Be Addressed To MLA

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not trying to make any arguments, but I would like to ask a question of the Government Leader, Mr. Patterson. I have asked the Minister responsible for Housing. He stated that he has to ask the municipality of Cape Dorset concerning the duplex. I think that I, as the elected Member, should be the person you should ask. It seems as if you are going through a different route. I think the cabinet should be asking me, instead of the community of Cape Dorset. I feel you should be asking the question to me since I have been elected by 1100 people in the communities of Lake Harbour and Cape Dorset. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Return To Question O484-89(1): Question To Be Addressed To MLA

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Member for that advice, which I will pass on to the Minister responsible for Housing. Thank you.

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

Question O485-89(1): Announcement Of Ministerial Responsibilities

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Speaker, this question is to the Government Leader. Recently there was an announcement in which additional responsibilities were given to Executive Council Members. By making this a public announcement, was it the Government Leader's intention to treat Members of this House in the same way that it does the general public by allowing us to read this information in the press?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Government Leader.

Return To Question O485-89(1): Announcement Of Ministerial Responsibilities

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, the new responsibilities of Ministers were effective on April 1st, and I made the announcement shortly before April 1st when, unfortunately, the House was not in session. Had the House been in session, the announcement would have been made during the session. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. Lewis.

Supplementary To Question O485-89(1): Announcement Of Ministerial Responsibilities

MR. LEWIS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the Government Leader give consideration to the fact that in this modern age of fantastic communications, that even though the House was not sitting he could have informed Members of his intentions with regard to these new responsibilities?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question O485-89(1): Announcement Of Ministerial Responsibilities

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that on the day in question the announcement in question was transmitted to the Legislature with a view to informing Members in that manner. I also made arrangements for the press to be properly notified of the announcement and it apparently was announced in the press on the same day. Thank you.

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

Question O486-89(1): Method Of Informing MLAs Of New Appointments

MR. POLLARD: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to Mr. Lewis. Why did the Government Leader not make arrangements to have faxed to, or calls made to MLAs or letters sent to MLAs instead of saying that he advised the Legislature to advise the rest of the Members? Why could his office not have got a hold of MLAs, because I myself, Mr. Speaker, was phoned by the press and asked for my comments on the shuffle. I did not even know it had taken place, Mr. Speaker. So why could not the Government Leader have contacted ordinary MLAs himself? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Government Leader.

Return To Question O486-89(1): Method Of Informing MLAs Of New Appointments

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I could have gone to the effort to do that and obviously in light of the questions, efforts should have been made to do that. I certainly regret if there was any confusion caused as a result of the manner in which this announcement was handled. I will undertake that should similar announcements be made in the future, I will take steps to reach MLAs so that they can be informed in a timely manner.

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

Question O487-89(1): Year-Round Highway To Trout Lake

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, at a regional meeting of Deh Cho communities in late March, it was requested of me by the Trout Lake delegation that they would like a year-round road to their community. I am not certain whether it is a result of the announcement that Mr. Patterson made in the creation of a new Department of Transportation. Perhaps there is a feeling out in the public that the government is going to do something now and build more highways throughout the North.

I would like to ask the Minister responsible for highways whether he or she would consider a year-round highway to Trout Lake. They presently have a winter road. As I said, there is this public expectation and hope that more highways would be built. And so on behalf of the people of Trout Lake, will this government build them a highway to their community, which is approximately only 100 kilometres or so from the main highway? I think it is within the realm of possibility, I do think.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question O487-89(1): Year-Round Highway To Trout Lake

HON. GORDON WRAY: I think it would be the hope that at some point in time a lot of communities, and some substantially larger than Trout Lake, could get highway service. At this point in time there may be an expectation that more highways will be built, but unless the federal government comes across with an awful lot of money it is going to stay that way, just an expectation. There has been no increased funding made available as of yet from the federal government and all the funding that we do have is already committed to other projects. So it certainly will go on the books with all the other requests. I do not see much hope at this point in time but we never know. Maybe the federal government will open their purse strings. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wray. Supplementary, Mr. Sibbeston.

Supplementary To Question O487-89(1): Year-Round Highway To Trout Lake

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be too good if I could not at least give the people of Trout Lake some hope. Politicians, MLAs, I think, are in the business of providing hope to people. And in my case the people of Trout Lake are very serious about their highway. I wonder if the Minister could perhaps be a little bit more positive and say that he will consider the matter and look at the costs involved in building the highway and even if it is five, 10, 15 years from now, give us an idea of when, whether it is in this century or not, the people of Trout Lake can expect a highway so I can bring something back to the people of Trout Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Further Return To Question O487-89(1): Year-Round Highway To Trout Lake

HON. GORDON WRAY: I cannot give you any money but I can always give lots of hope, I guess.

---Laughter

Obviously one of the priorities of the Department of Transportation is going to be sitting down and looking at the transportation needs right across the North and obviously Trout Lake falls into that category that at some point in time we will devise a transportation strategy for the North and Trout Lake, like every other community, will be included. So in that respect, yes there is hope I guess that 15 or 20 years or whenever, that something will happen. I just do not want to be specific because the first thing I want to do is see how much money we can get from the federal government and then secondly, sit down and come up with a transportation strategy. We will not forget Trout Lake in our plan.

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I am very encouraged by that and I will definitely reply to the people of Trout Lake about the Minister's answer. I believe that the cause of a highway to Trout Lake has been greatly advanced. The Government Leader sent me a note asking me whether I wanted two or four lanes.

---Laughter

So for now, two lanes would be fine.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you for that additional comment. Oral questions. Item 6, written questions.

Item 7, 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. Pudluk.

ITEM 11: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Tabled Document 84-89(1), a letter regarding the planned staff reduction at Umimmak School in Grise Fiord for the 1989-90 school year. Thank you.

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

Item 12, notices of motion.

Item 13, 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: Tabled Document 76-89(1) with the appearance of Constitutional Alliance 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 TABLED DOCUMENT 76-89(1), POLITICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NWT; APPEARANCE OF CONSTITUTIONAL ALLIANCE WITNESSES; TABLED DOCUMENT 58-89(1), REPORT OF THE REGIONAL AND TRIBAL COUNCILS REVIEW CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE; TABLED DOCUMENT 59-89(1), GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE REGIONAL AND TRIBAL COUNCILS REVIEW CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

Appearance Of Constitutional Alliance Witnesses

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The committee will now come to order. We are dealing with Tabled Document 76-89(1), Political and Constitutional Development in the NWT; Appearance of Constitutional Alliance Witnesses; Tabled Document 58-89(1), Report of the Regional and Tribal Councils Review Co-ordinating Committee; and Tabled Document 59-89(1), Government Response to the Report of the Regional and Tribal Councils Review Co-ordinating Committee. Those documents are all in Members' folders. I would like to ask the Government Leader how he wishes to proceed with this.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have invited witnesses to appear before the committee today. I would suggest that the first order of business might be to hear from whatever witnesses are available and at that point, time could be set aside for questions and comments from Members on those presentations. Following that, I would suggest that Members of the Legislature might make some comments. Since the government has prepared a discussion paper, I would propose that myself and Mr. Ballantyne and perhaps other Ministers could lead off the discussion with some comments on the paper and the issues.

I might mention that Mr. Kakfwi would have been participating today but unfortunately he is suffering from a minor injury to his eye, and I do not think he will be available this afternoon. But should the debate continue tomorrow he would hopefully be able to participate tomorrow. So that is the process that we would recommend, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Does the committee agree with this process?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Agreed. Okay. The Chair also understands that Mr. Roger Gruben is in the House and is the only witness to appear at this time. How does the Minister wish to proceed with this? Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, before we get into the matter of inviting in the witnesses, can I ask the Government Leader why is it that there are not any more native organization leaders willing to participate on this subject?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. SIBBESTON: I certainly would be interested to know. Maybe he knows, maybe he has had contact or attempted to find out from various organizations if they are willing to participate in discussion on this. So if the Government Leader knows, I certainly would be interested.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Sibbeston, there was a motion passed in this House to invite all members of the Constitutional Alliance and the only witness to appear today is Mr. Gruben, due to other commitments by the other native organizations. Perhaps Mr. Patterson has further information.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat concerned that we do not have the representation from the members of the Constitutional Alliance that we had hoped for. I am pleased that Mr. Gruben is here and ready, and I think we certainly should hear from him. I have no particular information about why they are not here except that we were informed through the Constitutional Alliance that there are other conflicting obligations. Of course it is well known that there is a leadership meeting going on with the Dene/Metis currently at which subjects relating to political and constitutional development are being discussed; in fact, they are being discussed today, I understand, in Fort Smith. So the Dene/Metis have their own leadership meeting going on and it is apparently taking precedence over the appearance here at the Legislature.

As far as the TFN are concerned, I do know that they have been very actively involved in land claims negotiations and I suspect that it is those pressures that have prevented them from participating here today. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a major issue and it is not an issue that we are going to necessarily solve in a short period of time or in the next two days. So I would recommend to the committee that if native organizations who are members of the alliance are unable to be present today, we might wish to consider allowing them other opportunities to make presentations before we conclude this discussion, either later this session or perhaps at another convenient time, because I think it is the government's intention and probably the Legislature's intention that we have a shared dialogue and hopefully come up with a shared agreement on where we should be heading as far as political and constitutional development is concerned and the participation of the aboriginal organizations is critical if there is to be that sort of an agreement. So that would be my recommendation. Thank you.

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

MR. PUDLUK: When did we pass that motion to invite these groups to appear before us? Maybe it was too short of notice and they already had plans for the other things. That is why I would like to know when we passed that motion. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): This motion, Mr. Pudluk, was passed on March 15. We sent the motion to the Constitutional Alliance, which met on March 18. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I think this was too short of notice for them. Would the committee agree that we defer this item till the fall session so that they can participate in this House? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Pudluk, some of our Members are going to Greenland all next week and this is the only opportunity we have. Mr. Pudluk, any item that is on the order paper can be deferred. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind if we start it today. I sure do not want to conclude it in this session at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Pollard.

MR. POLLARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am disappointed that the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly are being held up by people who cannot be here. So I am wondering who marches to whose tune around here. I think this is the government and this is the Legislative Assembly, and what I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that Mr. Gruben has been kind enough to come here today, and I think it would be wrong of us not to hear Mr. Gruben. I think

Mr. Gruben should be ushered into the ropes immediately and perhaps Mr. Gruben could shed some light on why other members of that particular alliance are not here today. I wonder if the committee could see its way clear to do that, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. SIBBESTON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do agree that we should proceed today. Mr. Gruben has taken our request seriously and is here, and I think we should hear him, but lest anybody think differently and believe that we as MLAs are the only ones in the North that have a mandate to discuss political and constitutional changes, they are wrong. We are only part of the people that decide these things. There are other significant people in the North; the leaders and the native organizations are tremendously significant in this process. This is why I think it is imperative that they also be involved. If they are not available today, then I think we should commence the discussion with the view to continuing it, leaving it on the agenda, and taking it up at a later time when other people, as I mentioned, can also be here.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Then it is agreed that we invite Mr. Gruben in. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Okay. Sergeant-at-Arms, will you escort the witness in please? I would like to welcome the witnesses. For the record, Mr. Gruben, perhaps you could introduce your witness.

MR. GRUBEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To my right is John Banksland, who is the deputy chief regional councillor of the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Gruben. You can go ahead with your opening remarks.

Presentation By Mr. Roger Gruben

MR. GRUBEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting the IRC to make our comments known about future constitutional and political development in the Northwest Territories. I am very pleased that the committee of the whole allowed me to make my presentation today. It is unfortunate that the other members of the alliance could not be here, but as I heard it mentioned a few minutes ago, other duties have called them away, and have not allowed them to be here today, but I am sure that, as members of the Constitutional Alliance, they are more than interested in offering comments on the future political and constitutional development of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Speaker, constitutional and political development in the NWT is probably the single most important issue facing Canada and the Territories for the balance of the 20th century. On behalf of the Inuvialuit of the Western Arctic, I and John Banksland are pleased to participate in these proceedings today. We believe that we have a meaningful contribution to make. For two decades the Inuvialuit have been in the forefront in proposing and implementing large and significant changes affecting the relationships between our people and the Northwest Territories, and we wish to continue in this tradition.

I suppose at this time I should table the document that we have prepared for our proceedings today, Mr. Chairman. It is the Inuvialuit perspective of the discussion paper on political and constitutional development in the NWT, and we will leave that here for the pleasure of the Members of the committee of the whole.

Role Of The Constitutional Alliance

If I can begin, Mr. Chairman, by making reference to the role of the Constitutional Alliance. In the view of the Inuvialuit, the Constitutional Alliance has a very important and very vital role to play.

We represent a major portion, if not the majority at this time, of the people who reside in the Territories. We in the past have been given a mandate to assist the Legislative Assembly in the development of future constitutions for one or more territories. We have been given the mandate by the Assembly to assist in the defining of the governing structures for these constitutions. In effect, Mr. Chairman, what we have been given is the authority to work hand in hand and in association with the Legislative Assembly to define the future role of constitutional and political development of the NWT. With the development of the political discussion paper, unfortunately the role of the Constitutional Alliance was minimized. We, as the Inuvialuit, would encourage the more active involvement of members of the Constitutional Alliance to participate and assist the Legislative Assembly in the development of future structures for the North.

We believe that as the Constitutional Alliance involves all of the major players in the North at this particular time, and we are speaking in terms of the aboriginal associations who represent their constituents at the territorial level and the Members of the Legislative Assembly, that we do indeed have the proper mix to develop the structures and the direction that is required for this Legislative Assembly to continue their objective of developing the future constitution of the NWT. I would say that what is critical at this particular time is for the Legislative Assembly to reaffirm their commitment to the continuance of the work of the Constitutional Alliance. What we need is direction from this House as to a renewed mandate for the alliance that will define the goals and objectives of the work of the alliance. This Assembly has to very specifically allocate the proper funding and resources to the alliance to allow the alliance to do its job.

I would suggest that, as well, part of the direction that this Assembly provides to the alliance should include future steps with a specific time frame as to what this Assembly is looking for in terms of accomplishments by the alliance. I would also recommend to this House that we look at timing of the future tasks of the alliance to coincide with the life of this particular sitting of the Assembly. I would also put forward the idea, Mr. Chairman, that when you as the body are providing direction to the alliance that we do not necessarily make specific reference to the Iqaluit agreement. Now as many of you know around the table, our point of view from the Inuvialuit is that we disagree with the Iqaluit agreement, although we do see that there are some possibilities that can benefit many peoples of the Territories that are currently within the Iqaluit agreement. We do not feel that the Iqaluit agreement is a document that is effective at this time. Again in the opinion of the Inuvialuit, it is null and void because of the specific requirements of certain aboriginal groups in the Territories to conclude an arrangement regarding a boundary within a stipulated time frame that was not adhered to.

Very shortly, Mr. Chairman, the work of the alliance I believe has to be positive in us -- the IRC is only one Member of the alliance. It should be given the authority and the responsibility to work with the Dene/Metis, to work co-operatively with TFN and with the Legislative Assembly Members on the alliance to define in more specific detail the principles that one can use to build a constitution or constitutions for one or more territories. We should be defining in more detail the components of the governing structures that we can use to implement the constitutions. I certainly believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to address the issue of how much it is likely to cost for the implementation of either one territory with improvements or the creation of one or more territories. That is one particular question that we certainly have not addressed in any great detail to at least the satisfaction of the Inuvialuit.

Cost Of Creation Of New Territory

Now I asked a question which I am sure can only be answered by different Members of the Assembly and those within the Constitutional Alliance. What is it going to cost to create a new territory? I keep on hearing figures that it is going to cost in the neighbourhood of \$100 million. I do not know. Does anyone know? Nobody has done that kind of research. And how can we bring to the public our request for them to make an informed decision on the creation of another territory when we have not indicated to the public that we have done our homework? How can we ask them to make a decision on the creation of another territory which is going to cost X millions of dollars when we are dealing with something that is possibly 10, 15, 20 years in the future? Right now you have communities in my own constituency -- and I use the issue of political wishes and an airport that can cost in the neighbourhood of five million dollars. How can

we realistically ask members in my constituency to approve of an unknown concept with questions that are left unanswered at this particular point, when they can see right next to their community an airstrip that is required for them to upgrade their living at this particular point in time? I guess the issue that we are raising here, Mr. Chairman, is that there is a lot of work that has to be done before we can meaningfully address the issue of where a particular boundary should be placed that can divide the Territories. And we have got to be seen to be doing that work by the people that we represent.

So again from the Inuvialuit I would request that the House here very seriously consider giving their support to the continued work of the alliance, that they give a mandate to the alliance to develop the governing structures that we deem necessary, that we direct the members of the alliance to do the proper kind of research that would allow the public to support us as we request them to support us in our findings. And thirdly, let us be pragmatic. Let us use some common sense. Let us not put the cart before the horse by talking about the issue of a boundary before we are giving the proper kind of work to the research that is required. Again, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that it is very, very important that we attach some time frames to the kind of research that is going to have to be addressed. I would suggest that we give serious consideration to attaching the time frame for the alliance to do the work that is required during the life of this particular Assembly.

I would like now, Mr. Chairman, to move on to more comments, particularly in light of the political discussion paper that was prepared for the House. The Inuvialuit put forward the view that all governments should basically fall into the three categories or principles that they should abide by. One is that there should be efficiency; number two, that there should be equity and fairness; and number three, that there has to be meaningful constituent input into the workings of all levels of government.

We also stress the importance of addressing the issue of devolution. We as the Inuvialuit feel that it is important that the devolution of powers continue; however, we qualify that by saying it is essential that the issue of devolution be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the wishes and aspirations of the aboriginal peoples of the Territories.

We also put forward the idea that the aboriginal groups should be part of the team with the Members of the government that will be responsible for the negotiation of further powers from Canada to the territorial government and onwards down to the regional level.

Prime Public Authority Concept

Mr. Chairman, I wish to bring to the attention of those here with us this afternoon an initiative that the Inuvialuit Regional Corporation has recently undertaken with the support of the Executive Council. The work that we have undertaken is to visit our communities, to carry on with community consultation to determine what my constituents think with regard to the concept of prime public authority. Very simply, Mr. Chairman, if I can give you a very quick synopsis of what prime public authority is, and keep in mind, Mr. Chairman, that my own definition of prime public authority can very much differ from other definitions people may have within the room. We stress the viewpoint that there is already some particular type of legislation that defines the actual structure of a community, through the Charter Communities Act. Within that particular act a community can have the responsibility for describing the composition of its council; it can specify the length of term of its councillors and its mayors; it can specify how the different seats within that council can be allocated; it can specify the manner in which council members can be elected or appointed; and it also specifies the powers that a particular community can assume upon gaining their community charter.

Within that charter there is also the possibility or the option that a community charter may define the relationship between the council and any band council or other local aboriginal organization in or near the municipality. I make reference to that particular phrase with emphasis, sir, because in there is where we, as the Inuvialuit, are attempting to do our research as to what make-up there can be in terms of defining one community body that can carry on effectively the requirements and the responsibilities within the municipality. There can be, with discussion amongst the

different agencies within the community, representation by the local education authority on the council. There can be representation by the municipality as a hamlet. There can be representation through claims-created institutions, such as within the Inuvialuit area, the community corporations or the hunters and trappers committee. We can have, as representatives to the community council, social and service committees. In effect, what we are describing here, under this particular option, is the ability of those community agencies to work together to form one community body or one community agency that can run and govern the affairs of the community.

Now the powers of the charter community, as we understand them at this particular time, is that there can be an option for taxing authority within that municipality. It can govern its own financial affairs and set its own budgets and it may pass by-laws regulating matters relating to roads, sewage, business licensing, firearms, fireworks, etc.

Definition Of Prime Public Authority

Now we come to what we call the definition of prime public authority. In all the publications that we have been viewing, as the Inuvialuit, we have not come across yet a definition of prime public authority, so we have come up with one ourselves. And I take it literally from the political discussion paper that was prepared for this House by the Members of the Executive Committee that a community government is what the community itself defines as its own government. The community government sets up as one prime body which has representation from those agencies that I named a few minutes ago -- the LEAs, community corporations, HTAs, hamlet councils, etc. The community will govern itself as the different agencies see fit.

The research that we have embarked upon within the Inuvialuit communities is to question them as to what their thoughts are in terms of acceptance or non-acceptance of the prime public authority concept. Would they wish to develop the concept further to the point where there is one agency that can govern the affairs of the town? When one considers the issue of cost effectiveness, the issue of non-duplication of services, the non-competitiveness of different agencies going to the same pot of money for very limited amounts -- now what my communities have been telling me, which I have prepared and submitted to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs, is that they are in support of developing this prime public authority concept further. However, they do need further information, further training to allow them to make an informed decision on whether to accept the prime public authority concept in full.

What they are requesting is for the IRC, Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, to approach the Executive Council for further funding to carry on the work that we have begun. I would say, Mr. Chairman, in many ways we are conducting the work that has been identified within the political discussion paper that will be discussed in further detail by those around the table later on. They wish to proceed to the next step, to define their capabilities as a municipality, as the one public authority within the community governing the affairs of the community, as to what they are capable of assuming in further powers. They are also looking at defining in more detail the cost of assuming those particular powers. They are also looking for more information as to what is the most efficient mechanism of delivery for the particular program.

For instance, in terms of housing, we all know that housing across the Territories is an issue that is very, very important and dear to the hearts of all the residents of the NWT. We also know that those in the communities wish to assume the authority for housing, to be allowed to make the decisions that affect their community residents, to make those decisions within the community, as it affects the community. Now if that were allowed to happen, those decisions hopefully would be more reflective of the concerns of the people within the community, which would in turn make the housing authority more effective within that community. It would also offer the opportunity for better management of moneys that have been allocated to the local housing authority. They have been given certain responsibilities for maintenance of the housing units within that particular community. So why, if they have been given certain responsibilities, can they not assume further responsibilities to manage housing within their community without undue interference from the regional office? If the community were able to be given that extra authority, one would assume that there would be less management from the regional level in terms of visits to the particular

community, which would eventually lead to cost savings which then could be turned over to the local housing authority to better manage their own affairs. That is only one example of where there could be some efficiency and better co-ordination, more effective use of the allocated moneys within a particular community on a particular portfolio.

Pilot Project In Beaufort-Delta Area

I would propose to the Executive Council and to this Legislative Assembly that as we are already in the process of conducting research into the prime public authority concept -- and by way of information one of the communities that I represent, the community of Sachs Harbour, is now in the final stages of drafting its community charter. Hopefully, that is going to be done before too long. I would hope that those around the table would give direction to the Members of the Executive to fund properly the Inuvialuit to carry on this concept further, so that possibly we may use the Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort Sea area as a pilot project to see whether we can more properly define what we mean by the Charter Communities Act and the prime public authority concept. We would encourage this Assembly to support us in that endeavour to, if you will, break new ground or gain the experience that is going to be required to allow you as the legislators to put together the parameters as to how you would like to see the concepts implemented in the future.

In response to one of the concepts that has been put forward within the political discussion paper, there is much reference that is made only to a two-tiered level of government. That is based on the premise that there is going to be one level of government at the community level and another level of government which is going to be the centralized government. I have to ask the question of where does the issue of a regional body be considered in the context of better co-ordination, more effectiveness and better utilization of moneys?

We support fully the idea that for future constitutional and political development of the NWT, we must use the community as a cornerstone as your building block, as your base. The communities themselves will define the kinds of authorities and responsibilities they wish to assume. The communities themselves will make the decision on whether they wish to assume a certain responsibility such as housing at some point in the future, but it is they themselves that will define whether they are capable at this particular time of adequately delivering that particular program. In the event that they do decide that they are incapable at a particular time to take over the program effectively, it should be the option of the community, and the decision of the community, that they can turn that authority over to a regional body and this regional body can, in turn, hold that authority in trust, if you will, for that community until such time as that community is able to retain that authority.

There is also the issue of co-ordination and cost-effectiveness that one must bring into the issue of retaining authorities at the regional level for a particular community. Reality and pragmatism tells you that in a particular region there are commonalities of services that a government must provide to the region as a whole, so that in itself is an argument that says there should be a regional body created to deliver those services on behalf of the central authority to the region that is in question at this particular time.

Responsibilities Defined

How does one begin to seriously look at the workings between a central authority, a regional body and a community charter? The concept that I have always developed -- and I must admit that this concept requires a lot more work -- is that the central authority should always retain the prime responsibility for the development of policy. It should always retain the prime responsibility for defining the directions, the goals and the objectives of the overall program that is going to be delivered; policy direction at the central authority level. At the regional level, the proper delivery of services, where one can enter into the issue of co-ordination, effectiveness of delivery. Down at the community level, it is up to the community to define the kinds of authorities that it may wish to assume, but once it has defined those authorities they have to ensure that the proper allocations of money are given to that community to deliver the services properly.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to touch upon the jurisdictional areas of responsibility between the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Inuvialuit. We all know that the Government of the NWT has been given responsibilities for certain programs such as education, housing, public works, as examples. However, the Inuvialuit have been given certain responsibilities as well, for the issue of housing, for the issue of education, for the issue of mental health, that have been constitutionally protected by the Government of Canada, when we signed our Inuvialuit final agreement on June 5, 1984. Recognizing that there are two areas of jurisdiction for -- again I use it as an example, education -- we have no difficulty in allowing the territorial government to still be in the process of developing the policy direction as to how education can proceed further in the NWT, provided that the Inuvialuit are involved meaningfully in the development of that policy.

We also offer to the territorial government, that because we do have shared responsibility, we should be entering into a joint and co-operative venture for the promotion of education for the people that we represent. I would say, on that one particular issue, in terms of education -- as you can say for any other program or department that the territorial government is responsible for -- that the territorial government can never ever lay claim to total success in the development of policy, or the delivery of that program, without the full co-operation and without the full acknowledgment and assistance of the aboriginal group within the affected area.

Research On Prime Public Authority

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by again going back for a minute to the issue of prime public authority concept. The research that we have been charged with doing by the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs was only for those Inuvialuit communities of Tuktoyaktuk, Paulatuk, Holman and Sachs Harbour. In many ways, it was an easy task to do the work in those communities because you are dealing primarily with one ethnic group of people. Because there is really only one group of people in those particular communities, it was easy for those community members to say that, unofficially, they are already practising the issue of prime public authority, because those people who are on the municipal council in many cases also sit on the local education authority, they also sit on the community corporations, and they also sit on hunters and trappers committees.

The IRC fully supports the concept that we should avoid duplication of agencies as much as possible. As a matter of fact, yesterday when I was talking about the prime public authority concept, someone told me, in a joking manner, "It is starting to be difficult for us to find people to go to meetings because they are on so many committees right now." The issue of duplication is something that can be avoided with a prime public authority.

Another issue is that if you have a local education authority which is fighting for \$5000 from the Department of Education, you have a social services committee which is fighting for \$5000 from the Department of Social Services, and there is also the hunters and trappers association who is wishing to gain \$5000 from the Department of Renewable Resources, independently they may only go so far to carry on a certain program that is very similar to what is being proposed or carried on by another department. Would it not be better for them to come together as one agency, to pool their three pots of \$5000, and gain \$15,000 to carry the project that much further?

Another final issue that we have to address, and the IRC at this particular time is quite prepared to address is the issue of where you have more than one particular group of people in one community. Taking a look at the issue of Aklavik where John Banksland comes from, the mix of that community is you have Inuvialuit, there are Dene, there are Metis and there are others. How do we bring the different concepts all together? I do not know. Can we even work together? I do not know. But we should be attempting to find out and propose a mechanism as to where we can improve the livelihood of all those who are within the community.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we live in a unique part of Canada and with imagination, creativity and hard work, the people of the NWT can create a form of government that accommodates our

geographic and demographic needs. And we as the Inuvialuit welcome the opportunity to participate in this endeavour. Thank you.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Gruben. Is there any further discussion with regard to the witness? Does Mr. Banksland wish to add anything further to what Mr. Gruben has said already? Mr. Gruben.

MR. GRUBEN: He declines the offer, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Okay, the floor is open for questions to the witnesses. Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: First of all, welcome Mr. Gruben and Mr. Banksland. As always, the Inuvialuit make a very valuable contribution to our discussions in this area. At this particular time I would like to commend the paper as put forward by Mr. Gruben as being very thoughtful, very reasonable and something I think that we as a government will consider very seriously. I do not have any questions to ask of Mr. Gruben but I would like to commend the spirit in which the paper was put forward, acknowledging that we are all entering into a difficult and complex area, and the willingness to work together with governments and other aboriginal organizations, and the realization that mistakes will be made. People will obviously have differing opinions on many of these very important topics. I think it is a very positive contribution. I hope that of all the different partners here in the NWT who ultimately will have to reach a consensus on political and constitutional development will come forward in the same spirit of being prepared, being open to innovation and being open to a practical approach. I think I am quite optimistic that we have a good chance to come up with something that we all can live with. So thank you very much for your presentation. It was very well done.

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

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could make a few comments. I would like to say that I found the presentation thoughtful and constructive and I am pleased to see that in several regards, the Inuvialuit support some of the concerns expressed in the paper developed by the government which is before the committee today. I am pleased to see that there is agreement that there is a need to avoid fragmentation and the proliferation of bodies with various powers and small budgets and their own administrations struggling to survive within a community, where if there was a pooling of resources and what you call in your paper an overall decision-making body at the community level, there could be a lot more effectiveness and better use of moneys that are sometimes unfortunately in short supply.

Confirmation Of Support For Constitutional Alliance

So I am pleased to see the endorsement of the prime public authority concept. That certainly is very much in keeping with the priority of this government. I would like to also make another comment on Mr. Gruben's remarks with respect to the Constitutional Alliance. Mr. Chairman, perhaps there might have been more recognition given to the alliance in the paper developed by the government. However, I would like to assure Mr. Gruben and the Inuvialuit that our government is anxious to support and see the results of the work of the Constitutional Alliance. We are participating through several of our Ministers in the Constitutional Alliance and recently through the provision of funding, and I do think that during this important debate that we should as a Legislature confirm our support for the Constitutional Alliance. That is something that has occurred in previous Legislatures but I think that the current Legislature while it has appointed Members to the Constitutional Alliance and provided the Constitutional Alliance with some funding while there was a shortfall due to federal funding uncertainty, we do need to clarify to the public and for that matter to the alliance that we consider the body to be very valuable and that we support their work and are looking forward to receiving their advice on constitutional development in the NWT in the future.

The alliance after all was a body that was originally endorsed by this Legislature I think around some eight or 10 years ago. It is really a creature that was recommended as a result of the desire of this Legislature to develop good relations with aboriginal organizations and to develop public government. And I think that need today is even greater than it might have been in the past. So I would like to clarify that although the alliance may not have been represented as prominently as we might have liked to have seen in the paper, it does not mean it is not an important body from whom we have great expectations about advice they might give.

Mr. Chairman, I think the paper deserves more study on the part of the government and I am not really prepared to comment in detail on some of the other recommendations at this time but I would like to say generally that I welcome its constructive positive tone. I think that we should take up the offer of the Inuvialuit to make the prime public authority concept work in that region. I think that the best way of showing what we mean by the prime public authority concept would be to demonstrate how it can work in a real live community, or perhaps a number of communities, and thereby show other communities which may be curious, or even doubtful, that it can be an effective way of consolidating power and improving efficiency in decision making, and the handling of public money, at the community level. I would like to say that we look forward to taking up that challenge and working with the Inuvialuit and their certain communities to operationalize the concept, if I may use that term.

Encouragement Of Grass-Roots Participation

There are other important comments in the paper made about regional bodies. I think the general flavour of the government's paper is that we would like to see regional bodies formed as a result of the grass-roots participation of communities, and that rather than a sort of from the top down evolution whereby regional bodies are created and attention is not necessarily paid to what happens at the community level, our first priority as a government would be to see strong community governments develop. Once they have been established, if they decide that there are certain authorities and certain powers that they would wish to surrender, shall I say, to a regional body and collectively endorse being given to a regional body, then if the decision comes from the grass roots then it is a decision that our government would respect.

I think our emphasis on the prime public authority concept is not necessarily incompatible with your aspirations of developing regional bodies, but we have to be extremely careful to make sure that they spring from the community, as it were, and that it is very clear that it is a decision based in the communities; otherwise those bodies may result in confusion about authorities and responsibilities, and they may also jeopardize community authority and/or syphon off precious public funds that might be in short supply in a particular region or area.

I do not want to say much more about that concept, but I think it deserves further exploration and I welcome the constructive approach taken by the Inuvialuit representatives in their comments today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Gruben.

MR. GRUBEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to offer a few additional comments to the words of the Government Leader, and make specific reference here now to the mention of regional government in the Iqaluit agreement whereby the agreement at that time, which was given conditional support by the Assembly, makes specific reference in part II, "Matters of Concern to the Western Constitutional Forum", section 1.c)i) says that "Government decision making should rest as closely as possible with those governed; people and communities should have control over those matters which affect them exclusively, and they should have input in, and influence over those decisions which affect them, as well as others."

Also a quotation from the constitutional and political discussion paper put together by the Executive Council, in section 3.1, titled "The Community Option", it says that "Municipal and community governments in the Northwest Territories will get additional direct responsibilities. An increased measure of control and planning would give full meaning to the prime public authority at the local level."

In the paper that the Inuvialuit submitted to the Legislative Assembly on October 7, 1986, the Inuvialuit used the particular phrase that, "On an efficiency and equity basis Western Arctic communities may choose to make some decisions and/or deliver some services through a regional entity, as delegated functions, and this route of government evolution must be open for consideration." Again we refer to the Iqaluit agreement, part II, under section 2, "Provisional Principles for Regional Government in a Western Jurisdiction", subsection a) says that, "Under the constitution of the Western jurisdiction, community governments will have the right to form a regional government" and subsection d) says in part to include within their mandate such matters as education, economic development, policing, game management, etc. This is again reaffirmed by part III, section 2.b) of the Iqaluit agreement, that "The development of a workable form of regional authority within Nunavut reflecting the strength of community life as the centre of Nunavut society and the need for a strong Nunavut government capable of dealing with the large challenges facing the Nunavut region, is a priority. Regional institutions in Nunavut have helped provide the experience and infrastructure needed for a successful Nunavut government."

The point of all this, Mr. Chairman, is that there has been much thought given to regional government as early as 1986 by the Inuvialuit in revisions to our previous thoughts and documents, and as well, with conditional endorsement by this Legislative Assembly, to the Iqaluit agreement which makes very specific reference to the issue and concept of regional government. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Gruben. The Chair would like to ask committee Members if they have any further questions of the witnesses before the break. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, just a question of Mr. Gruben with respect to his views on regional government. It just seems as if in the North we went through a whole phase in the late 1970s when a lot of the native organizations and native people were very much against the government, and during that period, as in any time of difficulty when people are not in general support of the main government, there are proposals to have their own governments. This happened with the Dene people when they proposed the Denendeh government, a Dene senate, and to an extent the whole movement of the Eastern Arctic to have Nunavut is in part a reaction, I believe, against the central government, feeling distant from it and feeling alienated from it, and so forth.

Change Of Attitude Toward Central Government

Since Mr. Patterson has become Government Leader, there are not too many cries from the Eastern Arctic for Nunavut. The whole movement toward division seems to have stopped. I know up in the Delta at various times when maybe relations were not that good with our government, there was a cry or there was a desire to have WARM, which is Western Arctic regional municipality government, and so we have a history of this sort of thing. As we are unhappy with a central government we talk of regional governments and so forth. I know in our own area initially in the late 70s we thought that a regional council would eventually evolve into a regional form of government because even in our own area we did not like the government very much. Some of the people in Liard still feel distant from government. But I am just wondering, these things do change and at the moment the people of the Western Arctic I think are very ably represented by their MLA who is now a part of the government and someone like Mr. Red Pedersen who is from the Coppermine/Cambridge area is very much involved in our Assembly. So to a certain extent representatives of the Inuvialuit people are very much involved in this government.

Has this changed the attitude of people in your area toward our government in seeing the government as more satisfactory and having more confidence in our government? Would this take away from your expression of support for regional government? Would it be enough if regional administration as it were, were changed from Inuvik to Tuktoyaktuk for the Inuvialuit people and for the Dene people, if the regional administration centre let us say was changed to McPherson? Would these sorts of things do a lot to take away the desire for a third level of government, the regional governments?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Gruben.

Concept Of Western Arctic Regional Government

MR. GRUBEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I value the question from the honourable Member. Obviously he has given a lot of thought to the issue of the evolution of government from the mid 70s to today. There are a number of questions in his statements and I will try to address them as I recall them.

The Inuvialuit developed the original concept of WARM, the Western Arctic regional municipality, in response to gaining better representation at the regional level from the central authority. Now, our thinking evolved at that time to WARG, the Western Arctic regional government, which defined in further detail the types of responsibilities that we felt we should have, including the powers of taxation, including the ability to administer services and education, housing, policing and the ability to legislate as well, all in response at that particular time to what we saw as possible improvements to the governmental system at the time.

Now as you know, Mr. Chairman, the Inuvialuit signed our final agreement a few years ago. In there we have certain responsibilities that we feel could mix co-operatively with those authorities and responsibilities given to the central government. And also, at the time, we recognized that those who were within government were attempting and working very diligently and with some success to meet the requirements of those residents in the regions that were being served by the government they were running. So with those two factors together, yes, we saw that there were improved deliveries of programs. But, as always there is a need for refinement and as one of the comments we heard from Paulatuk, I believe it was, when we were making our round of community consultations on the prime public body authority, one of the comments that I cannot forget from one resident was, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." I use the example that the territorial government is not as seriously "broke" as it was 10 years ago. It has improved, but we are willing to assist the government to improve it further. Thus the evolution of the concepts of particular types of government. I think the operative words here, Mr. Sibbeston, are that with effective participation, meaningful participation and co-operation, we should be able to develop those structures that are required by those we represent.

Now as to whether we would have greater efficiency if we were to remove the regional government office in Inuvik and relocate to either Tuk or Fort McPherson, I think at this time the question is immaterial, based on the concept that once we have developed the issue of prime public authority, if you are able to define your membership on the public body governing the community, at least my own thought and those that I represent has always been that maybe it would be advisable to assign portfolio systems to the councillors on the municipal body. For instance, one councillor might be responsible for education; another councillor might be responsible for social services; another one for housing; and so on. And now with the four or five or six communities in the Mackenzie Delta/Beaufort Sea area, all those who have the responsibility for education, let us say, would meet at the regional level to define how to deliver the policy direction provided by the central government. And would it not be a possibility that those responsible for education, then, can provide that policy direction with a mechanism for delivery to the regional office to have them deliver the programs on their behalf? Now those are just initial thoughts. As I said earlier on, we certainly have a lot of work that we have to do but we are prepared to move ahead.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. I believe the caucus has to meet, so we will take a 15 minute coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The committee will now come back to order. Are there any questions directed specifically to the witness? Mr. Gruben, if you would like to make closing remarks, please.

Mr. Gruben's Closing Remarks

MR. GRUBEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the position that we have tabled here today, I have not touched upon the issue of aboriginal self-government, although I do refer to it in the paper we have tabled. I would like to say that through the final agreement that we have signed, the Inuvialuit have the constitutional right to participate in the discussions and development of government structures. I would refer to a particular statement that is a generally held view by different people of the NWT, that refers specifically to the discussions that we have had here today. It very simply is that locally important decisions must be made by local populations, and further to that, that in some areas local decisions that affect the aboriginal populations sometimes are a decision that only the aboriginal groups can make.

Again I would ask the Members of the House to consider very strongly the statements that we have put forward in regard to the Constitutional Alliance. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to moving further in the development of the concepts of prime public authority with the appropriate governmental agency. I would like it to be a co-operative approach, whereas we know in our particular area we are moving ahead on the development of new structures and we would wish to move ahead with the involvement and the assistance of the appropriate governmental department. We also look forward to the continued participation by our particular group in what I am sure will result in renewed confidence, and in further research on what could be future constitutional structures for the NWT, whether it remains as one or whether it evolves into one or more. Thank you for the opportunity to allow us to make our presentation to this House.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Gruben. I would like to thank you and Mr. Banksland. Does the committee agree that we are finished with the witnesses?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you very much. We are still on the tabled documents on constitutional development, regional and tribal councils, and perhaps I could ask the Government Leader if he is ready with his opening statement.

Government Leader's Opening Remarks

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course the purpose of this session is to hear from Members of the Legislature and to get, hopefully, a consensus from the Legislature on political and constitutional development, which was why this paper had been put together as a discussion paper by the government. While I will have some opening comments, I want to make it clear that it is of primary importance that Members of the government responsible for political and constitutional development -- there are four Ministers involved -- are anxious to hear the views of MLAs as well as the aboriginal organizations, should they choose to participate.

Mr. Chairman, political and constitutional development is a complex process, increasingly complex process, involving activity in a number of areas. There are about eight areas that I would identify right now as being critical to contributing to the shaping of our political and constitutional future.

First, and very important, are the claims negotiations in the Dene/Metis and Tungavik Federation of Nunavut claims. Secondly are the implementation of existing claim agreements, obviously the Inuvialuit final agreement, particularly. Thirdly is formal constitutional development in the context of activity within the Constitutional Alliance, about which I spoke earlier this afternoon. We do consider that work important and we are very interested in seeing the results of the consensus which will hopefully emerge from the alliance. Fourthly, intergovernmental relations -- the evolution of our relations with the Government of Canada and with the provinces. This has to do with national issues, which Mr. Ballantyne will be addressing. Fifthly, ongoing political and

constitutional evolution such as the role of the Executive Council, the Commissioner, and the Legislative Assembly; the growth of community government; and the relationship of our government to the Government of Canada and the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, in particular. Sixthly, that issue includes discussions that are going on between the Government of Canada and our government and the native people on the matter of delivery of services to the native people. Seventh, the discussions on the meaning of aboriginal self-government in the NWT. What does it mean in the NWT? Eighth, discussions and negotiations pertaining to the ongoing devolution of provincial powers to the North, including the Northern Energy Accord.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that a great deal of progress has been made in the last couple of decades in political and constitutional development in the NWT, and I think we are now at a crossroads. The people of the NWT are at a stage where progress in the different areas which make up political and constitutional development has reached the point where critical decisions must be made. We have tried to describe the challenges faced in the discussion paper which is before this committee, entitled "Political and Constitutional Development in the Northwest Territories". I think the challenge to this Assembly is how to co-ordinate all these activities and the results of all these activities to ensure that the outcome responds best to the total interests of all the people of the NWT.

New Social Contracts

I would like to suggest that political and constitutional development in the NWT is a process which could lead to the formation of what I would describe as new social contracts. The first of these social contracts is between the aboriginal people and the non-aboriginal people of the NWT and will provide for the sharing of power and responsibility for their lives and futures. The second social contract is between the people of the NWT, aboriginal and non-aboriginal, and the people of the rest of Canada and will provide for the place of northern people in the Canadian constitutional family and will identify the power and authority that Northerners will have.

Now I would prefer to call the outcome of the formation of these new social contracts, "northern self-government". In suggesting this phrase, I do not propose this as an alternative to aboriginal self-government, but rather as a concept which embraces aboriginal self-government. I think that because of important historical reasons and because of the make-up of our population, which is reflected in this Legislature, aboriginal self-government has quite a different meaning in the NWT than in southern Canada or even than in the Yukon. We can understand why the emphasis in the South is on aboriginal self-government as what I would describe as ethnically exclusive jurisdictions. There are important historical reasons and political reasons for this in southern Canada. But to apply the same emphasis to the NWT may not make sense. Here reserves exist only on a very limited basis. Our communities have a mixed population and the aboriginal people form a significant percentage of the population.

So I think in the NWT it is at least as important to identify how aboriginal people and non-aboriginal people will share power and live together as it is to identify how they will live apart and separate from each other. To this end, I see political and constitutional development as a partnership, both in the process of arriving at a constitution and in the end result.

I would like to suggest that northern self-government has two dimensions: northern self-government at the territorial level and northern community self-government. I think that aboriginal people in the South often envy the degree of self-government northern aboriginal people have already achieved at the territorial level. I think there are ways we could go further and we must pursue those vigorously. But I think we should step back for a moment at times and acknowledge that we have already come a lot further along than other jurisdictions, particularly in their treatment and respect for the rights of aboriginal people within the government process.

Constitutional Alliance

A word about the Constitutional Alliance. Since it was formed in the early 80s, the Constitutional Alliance has been supported by the Legislative Assembly as a forum where representatives of our people have come together to plan for their political and constitutional future, or to work toward

the creation of the social contracts I have described above. The role of the alliance was to decide how power would be shared between the aboriginal and non-aboriginal peoples and between eastern and western parts of the Territories. The theme throughout has been one of partnership; partnership of peoples in the process of political and constitutional development and partnership of peoples in the anticipated outcome.

I think we should acknowledge that the process of political and constitutional development suffered a severe set back when the Dene/Metis and the TFN failed in their bid to reach agreement on the boundary between their settlement areas in early 1987. I think we should acknowledge that the Constitutional Alliance, as it was then constituted, ceased to function, for all practical purposes. However, the Constitutional Alliance has been revived in the summer of 1988, with the help of interim funding from our government. We will be proposing a resolution of support for the alliance during this session. If the theme of partnership in political and constitutional development is to survive and to have control over the agenda of political and constitutional development sitting in the NWT and not in Ottawa, then it is essential that the Constitutional Alliance, or a like structure, be the forum for recommending political and constitutional development.

I believe that the federal government may be finding it difficult to support the alliance in a time of fiscal restraint and therefore our government is exploring the idea of sharing the costs of funding the alliance with the federal government, as an expression of our confidence and as an expression of a shared confidence in the alliance.

Division Of The NWT

I would like to touch on division, Mr. Chairman. I think our government recognizes that in the long term, division of the NWT will likely occur. I still believe that division is a fundamental desire of the people of Nunavut. Most people I talk to from Nunavut say it is a question of when, not if. But I believe that in the meantime, political and constitutional development must continue, albeit in ways which do not prejudice the realization of division. We also must recognize that division cannot happen without the resolution of the Dene/Metis and the TFN claims boundaries.

Prime Public Authority

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make some comments on prime public authority and the Charter Communities Act. Over the years the people of the NWT at the community level have called for the exercise of more power and responsibility at that level. Our government and this Legislature, in consultation with communities and their leaders, have tried to respond by developing the prime public authority concept and the Charter Communities Act. In fact, the Charter Communities Act came out of specific requests which came from the communities of Fort Good Hope and Fort Resolution initially. Together these two concepts represent the opportunity to make government at the local level accountable to community residents and to design community government constitutions which reflect the different characteristics of communities, such as differences in ethnic composition.

The prime public authority concept recognizes that the community governments have evolved to the point where they must be fully and formally recognized as the legitimate, representative, democratic, and responsible bodies acting on behalf of community residents. The objective of the prime public authority concept is to strengthen and enhance the responsibilities and authorities of local governments. It is the intention that local government responsibilities, as well as the role of special purpose bodies, will be subject to increased accountability to the local government. In addition, we will examine expanded program areas and increase decision making authority with a view to allowing for, not just a delegated administrative responsibility, but an enhanced and expanded devolved authority as well.

Charter Communities Act

The Charter Communities Act sets the legislative base for the design and development of local government structures which meet the needs of a particular community. That concept evolved

from the desire, as expressed by chiefs and band councils in the West, to have aboriginal structures recognized and incorporated into the public governing structures at the local level. I think there was a time when our government did not properly recognize the traditional aboriginal government structures of chief and band council. But the Charter Communities Act has changed all that. So if the membership of a community is predominantly treaty Indian, the chief and council structure will likely form the nucleus of local government structures, while allowances are made for the participation of community residents who are not treaty Indian. I believe that the combination of the prime public authority concept and the Charter Communities Act, together with other policies and initiatives to the same end, represents the NWT answer to aboriginal self-government at the community level.

Now this is perhaps not the complete answer. There is certainly room for evolution and modification and perhaps even protection in the NWT constitution for this form of aboriginal self-government at the community level. But as it stands, I think that we should recognize that the actions of this government and the Legislature in these directions, do represent a significant achievement.

Devolution Of Provincial Type Of Powers

With regard to devolution, Mr. Chairman, we have reached progress over the past two years in the devolution of health, forestry and the northern scientific resources program. An agreement in principle on the Northern Accord was also signed last summer. These mark a major step forward in devolution of provincial-type powers to the GNWT. The negotiation of the accord itself is going to be a major challenge to this government. We should not expect that it will be easy to secure the same control over the exploration, development and production of oil and gas as the provinces, as there are powerful interests committed to the status quo. Support from the previous Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs was critical to reaching the Northern Accord enabling agreement.

The major remaining area to be devolved, an area of provincial-type responsibility, is the administration of land, water and renewable resources, and I should say that we expect responsibility for minerals to follow along with responsibility for oil and gas. This project of obtaining responsibility for administration of land, water and renewable resources is at least equal to the Northern Accord in complexity and importance. It is also intricately connected to the implementation of the Dene/Metis and TFN land claims. The exercise, if we are to succeed in obtaining this control over our own lands and water and renewable resources, must require a major commitment from all parties including the federal government, if devolution and claims implementation are to be rationally integrated, or even to result. Now I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that the ownership of public lands and resources in our view can only be pursued after land claims are settled.

Provincial Status

A word about provincial status, Mr. Chairman. The transfer of provincial-type powers has become a fundamental element of political and constitutional development in the Territories. If we are to have the level of power and control over our lives that is enjoyed by other Canadians then people in the NWT must have provincial-type powers.

Intergovernmental Relations

I would like to touch on intergovernmental relations, Mr. Chairman, because with the evolution toward provincial status and the decline of the role of the federal government in territorial affairs, federal/territorial relations will change and how the GNWT relates to the Government of Canada will have to be formalized. For example, how will our government relate to the federal government as the northern program of Indian and Northern Affairs is phased out?

Territorial participation at First Ministers' Conferences is also a pressing constitutional issue. The constitutional evolution of Canada has made it increasingly important to be a member of the First

Ministers' "club". Whether we like it or not, power has shifted to that forum and if the NWT is not a member, the people of the NWT will simply not be a party to decisions which fundamentally affect their lives and futures.

The experience of Meech Lake perfectly demonstrates this fact. Meech Lake -- and I am almost at the end of my remarks, Mr. Chairman -- Meech Lake, whether it is implemented or not, has given the provinces a not fully-defined but a very real interest and role in the political and constitutional evolution of the Territories. This becomes more important as we approach provincial status. Intergovernmental relations with the provinces will become an increasingly important issue in the NWT.

Consensus Government Unique

Mr. Chairman, we have a unique form of government in our Legislature; unique in Canada, something I think we can be proud of, and that is consensus government. I believe consensus government must be given a chance to evolve as a feature of northern self-government. I think this unique form of government has evolved in response to northern circumstances and initiatives. It may have its imperfections but I believe that the alternatives, such as party politics, may introduce changes which are so drastic that the search for unique solutions which are truly responsive to northern conditions may be irretrievably damaged.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the discussion paper that we have presented will provide an outline of the many issues that we have to deal with in this increasingly complicated area of political and constitutional development, and will be useful to Members in addressing these issues. I would like to emphasize that it is a discussion paper and if Members have comments on it, including critical comments, this is the time to hear them. Hopefully with those comments and with the participation of aboriginal organizations, we can come forward with a vision of where we are headed in future, so that we can work together toward realizing our goals in continuing the evolution of our constitution and our body politic. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Are there any further general questions directed to Mr. Patterson? Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of papers, one on financing and one on national issues. What I think I will do today, so that people will have an opportunity to respond to what Mr. Patterson said and to what I will say about financing, I will just do the financing one today and tomorrow I can do the one on national issues.

Government Role In Financing

I think it is really important, when we discuss political and constitutional development, that we always keep in mind as a backdrop to these discussions, how we pay for it. I think sometimes all of us who are involved in it can get carried away with the mystique of political and constitutional development. We can come up with all sorts of forms of wonderful institutions of government and we forget sometimes that we still have to pay for and we still have to provide basic services to people. This paper that I am giving to you right now -- most of you are aware of the background but I thought it important to put on the record in this debate the background as to how we got to where we are right now and how we deal with financing in this government. That is, I think, a dilemma. No matter what form of government we choose ultimately, that government or those governments are going to have to deal with the same realities. There are a lot of demands out there. There is only so much money. It is a matter of deciding how to best spend your money.

When we are talking about financing of government, ultimately the activities of government are paid for by taxpayers. In our case, a goodly percentage, over 80 per cent of the money to finance our government, is paid for by Canadian taxpayers, not by NWT taxpayers. I think Canadian taxpayers have been quite reasonable over the years with the amount of expenditures here in the Territories.

Under a system of responsible government, whatever that system may be, the role of elected representatives is to determine how money should be raised and where and how it should be spent. There lies the dilemma of politics. Raising money is always harder than spending money, as we see now with the huge federal deficit. For the next 15 years we are probably going to have to deal with that, as a country. Under that process these elected representatives who make those decisions are accountable to their constituents for their decisions, and in order for the system to work there has to be that accountability. You are an elected representative, you make a decision to raise or to spend money, and if your constituents do not like any of the methods you may choose, they have the right to throw you out. That is really the essence of public government. The system is supposed to ensure that the decisions of government reasonably reflect the desires of the public at large. So whatever we do here, no matter what form of government we take, I think that is a certain reality that we are going to have to deal with.

Here in the NWT, I think most of you are aware of the evolution in public finance. It has been one of increasing responsibility for elected representatives. I think some of you remember the frustrations of the early years, with an overwhelming federal and bureaucratic presence in determining budgetary priorities. By the late 1970s elected representatives had a somewhat more expanded role in the budgetary process, but at that time the appointed Members of the territorial Council still dominated the presence. They had no accountability, no accountability to the people here in the NWT. One of the major problems we had then is that the federal and bureaucratic influence was very strong, so that oftentimes our budget would reflect federal priorities, and not necessarily territorial priorities. That was, I think, quite frustrating for the politicians of the day.

Earlier Authority To Levy Taxes

Although our government had an authority in those days to levy most types of taxes, we did very little because we did not know if there would be any lasting fiscal benefit to the government. If we raised taxes, they could just lower the yearly grant. At that time the government, for obvious reasons, did not exercise their power as far as raising revenues was concerned.

At that time there was very limited representation in the budgetary process on the part of Ministers and Members of the Legislative Assembly, particularly in areas like capital planning. One of the reasons, originally, that regional councils were developed -- and I say only one because there are all sorts of fact and fantasy about how it all happened -- was that this was an opportunity for the bureaucracy to at least have some kind of a co-ordinated feedback from regions.

With the advent of an entirely elected Legislature and cabinet, and following implementation of formula financing, the Government of the Northwest Territories is now fully accountable to its constituents on financial matters. The cabinet is responsible for developing a fiscal framework, and revenue and expenditure proposals, and we have to retain the confidence of what is now a knowledgeable and strong Legislative Assembly. If we do not retain your confidence, you can toss us out. I remember in the last three years during a couple of budget debates there were days when that eventuality was definitely possible. I think that some of us that went through those days will remember some interesting moments that demonstrated the accountability, now, of this cabinet to the Assembly, and of this Assembly to the public. The formula financing agreement with Canada, I think, and cabinet thinks, and I am sure most of you would agree, was one of the biggest strides that we made in political and constitutional development. It meant that for five years -- and this is the last of those five years -- funding levels were calculated independently of federal priorities and gave us some lead time to do some proper planning.

I remember when Mr. Nerysoo was Government Leader, for the first time the concept of priorities entered the lexicon of the Legislative Assembly. Before that, we had no luxury to even think about priorities. It was the first time that we started to look at the long term and deal with issues that were important to us in the North, and not just important to federal bureaucrats. It also meant, for the first time, that any increased tax effort would accrue to us.

Accountability For Decision

I guess one thing that has happened out of it, and I am sure not to the satisfaction of everybody -- but at least an improvement, and we still have some way to go -- is that now that Members of the Assembly and their committees play a larger role in the budgetary process. The Assembly is accountable, the Executive is accountable for budgetary decisions; regional interests are now at least more democratically represented and better represented. I know there are arguments that it is not good enough yet, and that may well be, but we have come a long way I think, from 10 or 15 years ago.

Our government finances its expenditures, as you all know again, from two main sources, tax revenues and transfers from the federal government. In 1988-89, 80 per cent of the government's revenues are expected to come from the federal government. That is a reality, I think, that has to be -- and I emphasize has to be -- a backdrop to any discussions or decisions we make on political and constitutional development. We still are vulnerable to whims of the federal government, so I think we have to continue to be pragmatic and realistic as we develop and improve and evolve forms of government here in the NWT.

Uncertain Fiscal Future

We all know our problem with rapidly increasing expenditures and a limited capacity to increase our revenues. I guess that fiscal realism leads to an acknowledgement of a very significant chasm between expenditure needs and financial resources. This is going to be true however we evolve as a government. It is a fact of life that we are going to have to continue to come to grips with. We know our population growth, we know our infrastructure base, we know all the problems that we have here on the expenditure side. We have an increasingly literate and knowledgeable population who are demanding better services, and quite rightly so. They are aware of what other Canadians are getting, and they are demanding better services. The pressure on elected representatives, whatever the forum, is going to get greater and greater. I do not think we should forget that side.

On the revenue side, we have a narrow tax base. There is not a lot we can do really realistically to increase substantially our revenues from taxes. The other scary thing is that at the end of this year the formula financing agreement comes to an end. There is uncertainty down the road.

As we escalate our discussions on political and constitutional development on the one hand, on the other hand we are facing quite an uncertain fiscal future. The thing that we are, in the last few years, beginning to have to come to grips with is that there is more to funding public government than just the availability of money. That is a constraint -- but there are other factors obviously other than whether or not you have the money. I guess the thing that we always have to keep in mind is that the underlying program benefits have to be the principal factor. Why do you have a government? Because people need services; they need housing. People have problems; people are having social problems; they need jobs; they need education. I guess as we discuss the sexy issue of political and constitutional development, there are some hard realities there, that at the community level people are probably more interested in whether or not they have an adequate house, whether or not their kids get educated, whether they have a job or food on the table. I mean the fundamentals are still all-important at the community level and whatever we do has got to ensure that the government can address those very fundamental needs. So I guess we have to recognize the reality that programs cost money and that we have to attempt to deliver programs in the most efficient and effective manner.

Institutions In The NWT

When we look at the Territories, I guess we all acknowledge that there are too many institutions. We will disagree on which ones should be there and which ones should not be there. I think we can have a healthy debate about what are the important institutions out there and which ones are just costly and duplicating services. But I think we have to recognize, with the literally hundreds of different institutions that we and the federal government over the years have created, that there

is less money for basic programs, less money to provide services. So I guess in the midst of all this discussion we are going to have to decide which of those institutions are the most effective or the most efficient and are accomplishing the objectives that we set out. I do not think it is enough any more that just because something was set up 15 years ago and because we might know people who are on the board who might perform some viable functions that are also being performed by other organizations -- whatever we evolve to people, they are going to have to make hard decisions. Fifty-two thousand people cannot afford the myriad of institutions that we have here in the North. It is just not possible.

In the literally hundreds of millions of dollars that we are spending in these institutions, I think there lies a lot of potential for the future here in the Territories. And bureaucracies, whether little or big, are still bureaucracies. I am not saying that we have all the answers now, because we do not, but as we work this out I think we all have to acknowledge that and try to streamline the political system here in the North. I do not care who is in charge up here; there are going to be major problems for whoever is in charge.

Some of the things that we talked about in our paper I think are worth discussing. I know there have been differences of opinion about what public government means, what aboriginal self-government means, what community government means. I think the differences can be healthy but I think along the line that, whether it is now or in the fall, we should put it on the table and ask, rather than what do we call institutions, what are we trying to achieve? And once we figure out what we are trying to achieve collectively for aboriginal people, for non-aboriginal people, then we can probably better define what institutions we want to serve the wishes that we have.

Financial And National Realities To Keep In Mind

I guess in this particular little talk I am giving here is that I just hope we do not lose sight of those financial realities. There is a national reality I think that we always have to keep in mind because here in the North we have been shielded by a lot of realities that southern Canadians have not been shielded by. We have not had the same economic problems that, say, Newfoundland has had over the years. We have been able to provide better housing than most provinces in Canada. I think we have been able to provide better services than most provinces are able to provide -- especially the poorer provinces -- to their people. So it has not been all bad up here and I think we have enjoyed some fairly significant benefits, but we are talking about aboriginal self-government, public government. I do not think we are talking about -- we cannot be talking about two solitudes because the reality is that in the NWT, aboriginal people have every right to expect a government that reflects their interest. Every right. That is a fact, and I think everybody around this table would agree to that, but it is also a fact that there is a large percentage of people who live in the NWT that are not aboriginal people and they also have every right to have their interests looked after.

So somewhere along the line the two solitudes of aboriginal self-government, whatever that is, and public government, whatever that is, are going to have to come together. It is a reality no matter how we cut it. They are both going to be financed from the same source. You know, there is only so much in the well and we can kid ourselves that we are going to double up in funding but that is not what is going to happen. There is only going to be so much money available and how we work it is going to be up to us. And no matter what we do up here with aboriginal self-government, public government, or what I hope will be a sort of combination of both, the economy is going to be acting according to the same factors that affect other economies everywhere in the world. I do not care what our form of government here is, funding from the federal government to finance it will not be enough for us to meet the needs of the people in the NWT. We are going to have to be able to develop our resources whether they are renewable or non-renewable. We are going to have to have regulatory process up here that does not scare away investors. We are going to have to do that. I just hope, as this debate focusses over the next couple of years, that we recognize that we are all in this together. I think there are enough threads to tie us together and we can come up with a model that will work.

I quite enjoyed Mr. Gruben's comments to us. I do not necessarily agree with everything but he is coming from the point of view of being pragmatic. Let us see how we can work together. We are very weak here in the Territories both politically and economically. That is a fact and I

think we have to recognize it. And if we rip ourselves apart on a prolonged, protracted political and constitutional debate, I will tell you there are a lot of people that are going to really enjoy that and we are going to end up with nothing. Nobody is going to end up with anything up here. So with that and this one that is all I have to say right now, Mr. Chairman, about financing up here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. Mr. McLaughlin.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I get on to what I was going to say, I was just thinking, listening to Mr. Ballantyne, especially when he first started talking, I was thinking, "What happened to that person who said you cannot put a price on democracy?" I guess that is what happens when you become a Finance Minister. Anyway I just wanted to say that light-heartedly.

I would just like to say, having represented the western non-native Members on the Constitutional Alliance in the last meeting in Ottawa, that at the meeting, a pretty responsible financial position was taken there as to what that group would try to do with a reasonable amount of funds from the federal and territorial governments and some funding from their own organizations for minor expenses. At the same time I would like to commend my colleague, Mr. Kakfwi, who, at the meeting I think of all the Members of the Constitutional Alliance was sort of the anchor who made sure that we stuck to our agenda and made decisions on each agenda item so that we got work done. I would like to acknowledge that his presence at the meeting was very significant and important to us because he did keep all of us at that meeting on the agenda and his words, I guess, forced us into making decisions to keep the process moving and at the same time moving within a range of reasonable expectations and not getting off on tangents which would create expectations which could not be realized.

Role Still Exists For Constitutional Alliance

Having said that, I would just like to say that I see a role for that body, because we cannot sit in a cocoon here and say that we represent everything that is happening politically in the Territories. As Mr. Sibbeston said earlier, there are other constitutional objectives and processes happening within aboriginal organizations at the same time. I will be fairly brief and would just like to say that I believe that that constitutional organization is probably the only mechanism we have to make sure that both aboriginal organizations and their expectations, which are legally in place because of the fact there are treaties and there are land claim negotiations going on; and they are constitutionally in place because aboriginal rights are recognized in principle in the new constitution of our country. We do need that organization as a mechanism for us to move ahead constitutionally, and even though there may be disagreement amongst the Assembly and some of the organizations that some of the Members in this Assembly represent, the aboriginal organizations -- and maybe even the majority of the items before us constitutionally -- there are areas where we can agree. I see that as the only organization that will allow us to move in the areas where there is agreement. Without that organization, we probably would not have any movement at all, and I see it as the possibility for us to make some movement in some areas. There may not be as large a movement as some people would like to see, and they may not cover all areas that some people would like to see, but at least it is a vehicle that will allow us -- once we have agreed unanimously in some areas -- to at least make some movement in some areas.

I would like to put on record that I, personally, as a Member, support the funding of the organization to the degree that it can continue to bring together the various organizations that have constitutional objectives up here under one roof, and through it I think we can make some advances, if not global advances, at least advances in certain areas where there is agreement. I said at the meeting in Ottawa, and I will say it here too, that I think that that organization is made up mostly of politicians and it is our opportunity, as politicians and organizations, to come to some political agreement in certain areas and then take those agreements to the politicians in Ottawa, not the bureaucrats in Ottawa. I, personally, and I said it at that meeting in Ottawa, see the bureaucrats as our opposition. I agree with what Mr. Ballantyne has said, that disagreement and fights amongst ourselves will make the people in Ottawa clap with glee, especially the bureaucrats.

There are going to be politicians in Ottawa, in particular the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, who have agendas that we may not 100 per cent agree with from time to time, but I think they are politicians and no matter what their general attitude is toward the North, or aboriginal people, or constitutional development of the North; the fact is that they are politicians. If all the politicians in the NWT, including the Members of this Assembly and the aboriginal organizations, and the Members of Parliament that we have, can go to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs and the Prime Minister and say unanimously that "This is what we want to do up North", they are going to be damn hard pressed to say no. I would like to say that having a political organization like this is the key to us making advancements. If we are not together, the bureaucrats -- and they are our enemies, I am 100 per cent convinced that the bureaucrats in Ottawa -- and I know Mr. Lewis has talked about this, that there are people there that have different objectives than we do. They are our enemies, they are the ones that want the status quo, they are the ones whose jobs will ultimately disappear if aboriginal people and northerners become constitutionally self-sufficient. I would just like to emphasize my support of this organization as being probably being the only avenue where we can make unanimous advances, if not on the big picture, at least on small parts of it from time to time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Thank you, Mr. McLaughlin. Members' comments. Mr. Lewis.

MR. LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also listened with interest to Mr. Gruben's presentation and was impressed by the very reasonableness of what he had to say, but as always when a presentation is made of that nature we tend to be nice to the individual because there are some things in it that we are pleased with, and the things we are not too happy with, we tend to gloss over and pretend they are not there. It is very clear that although it has been many years since 1984, when the agreement was implemented for the Inuvialuit, the feeling is still very strong within that general community that they would like to have another level of government, which is of course pretty well in opposition to the stated position of our own government. That is one area which obviously needs resolution over the coming years.

Steady Progress In Evolution Of Territorial Government

My major interest, Mr. Chairman, today is to try to indicate to Members here that I get a bit depressed when I hear people talking about interim governments and interim this and things are going to be so vastly different when all these problems have been resolved, because my reading of almost every development that has taken place in government has been one of steady evolution. There have been cases, obviously, which are threaded throughout our history books of change by revolution, where there is bloodshed, there is war, there is civil disorder, and things have to be pretty bad to bring about changes in that fashion. The general trend has been toward the evolution of government over a long period of time so that the changes that are required will reflect, basically, the major concerns that people have.

My own reflection on the development of government since before the recommendations of the Carrothers report were implemented, is that we have come from a colonial era, and I remember those days very well, when northern native people had absolutely no idea whatsoever as to what was going on, simply because government was something that happened to you, not something that you did. People had no real awareness of what Ottawa was, what the federal government was, it was something that was very remote from your everyday life. The only connection you saw was the occasional visit from some dignitary from Ottawa, or as government began to evolve, some colonial administrator who arrived in your community as the new agent or the new administrator, and you were really not involved in your own government.

My own concern, Mr. Chairman, is that people do not seem to appreciate the tremendous evolution that has taken place over a period of two decades. Because now people are involved in every phase of political life in the NWT. We must be the most over politicized part of Canada, by far. In fact in our special committee on the northern economy work, we have found that one of the major forms of employment for a large slice of our population is an involvement in political life. In fact we have 2000 elected people throughout the NWT, of one kind or another, which is an amazing number of people for a population that is only around 56,000.

So I do get concerned when I hear that there is tremendous discontent. I wonder sometimes how this discontent is expressed. Usually you make changes, and I would like to reiterate a phrase made by Mr. Gruben about not fixing things that are not broken. If there was tremendous discontent with the evolution of government that has taken place over the last 20 years, there would be tremendous concern on the streets. You would have scenes, the like of which we have never experienced, even in those dark days when we had no government to speak of. I find that the interest in government in the NWT has grown immensely since people have been so much more heavily involved in it. My guess is that although no doubt this government will change its face many times over the next decades, a process has begun in which accommodations and conciliations and agreements and co-operation have resulted in a form of government in the NWT which is unique. My guess is that even if we were to become even more like the way government is exercised in southern Canada, we would still retain a very distinctive type of government, reflective of our northern needs.

Mr. Chairman, many of us can recall very well the crisis that Canada as a nation itself faced in the 60s when Mr. Lester B. Pearson looked around him on the eve of his retirement and wondered whether Canada would survive as a nation. And from the inspiration, I suppose, of Expo in 1967, we saw a new attempt to give a place for Quebec in Confederation. There was a tremendous price to be paid. But there had been a period of history, over 100 years, in which the people of Quebec had said, "That government in Ottawa is not our government. We go there and we do not recognize it. The people who are there are all Anglophones, we do not feel at home there. We cannot speak our own language there. It is something that we find oppressive and if something is not done about it, then this country of ours will not hold together." In my opinion, although from time to time we will get moves of separatism and moods of separatism in Quebec, the great crises of the 60s are now over and although Quebec is a very distinctive society, with its own National Assembly and its own distinctive form of politics, I think most people would accept today that it is firmly part of the Canadian Confederation.

Government Evolves In Response To Changing Times

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will accept that evolution is the form that we will choose for the development of our government. And the use of the word "interim" will suddenly be struck from the records. We will no longer be talking about interim, we are talking about a government that is always changing. It is incredible the number of changes that have taken place in this government since it started in 1967. It has evolved to the stage where I do not hear people on the streets saying that that is the kind of government that is no good, that we do not like it. We get probably no more discontent with our government than any person living south of the 60th parallel talking about discontent with its government. We take our lumps. People like some things and they do not like other things. So I think we are becoming very, very much in the mainstream of Canadian politics in that sense, although we are different and we try to be responsive and to deliver good services. We are a government that has evolved in a different way to other ones and we accept that responsibility and all the burdens and the discontents that sometimes go with it. But I do not hear people on the streets expressing tremendous discontent that this is a terrible thing and we have to throw it all away and start all over again, because that will not happen. We will not start all over again. Everything we do will be an evolution from where we are right now. And I see tremendous changes taking place, much in the same way that the federal government has changed as it met its crisis in the 60s. We even have talk now of an elected senate which was unheard of in the 60s; it was just muttered, I suppose, in the odd corner. But even in southern Canada, the federal government is also evolving into a different kind of shape, different form, as it tries to respond to the demands that are made on it by the different parts of the Confederation.

So, Mr. Chairman, although we will get continuing concerns about having more regional forms of government, different forms of delivery, I think that everything we do is going to be an evolution from what is taking place to date. We are not going to suddenly say that we are going to throw it away and that we are going to try a new model. There will be no new model. It is not even possible, in my opinion, to have a new model, unless something that has never happened before,

without revolution, were to take place. So I see us developing and evolving much in the same way that governments evolve in other parts of the world, through the process already mentioned by Mr. Patterson and also by Mr. Gruben.

The Two Solitudes Of The Northwest Territories

There has to be continued dialogue and we cannot have continued examples of mistrust when agreements are made with some degree of solemnity and are then broken. Because it is my perception that in the development of government in the NWT, there have been two kinds of solitudes. When I lived in the Eastern Arctic, the West did not even exist, it may as well have been on the moon. It was so remote and so far away and so completely different. I fully understand, after sitting in this House for a year and a half, how the perceptions of government could be so different in the West from what they are in the East. Because in my opinion, from what I have been able to observe, on the whole the federal government had made all its mistakes before it began to provide the administration of good government in the Eastern Arctic, despite the fact that it began with colonial regimes. The history of contact with governments of one form or another in the West has made western people far more cynical about what is meant by good faith and honesty and justice. So many broken promises, so many broken treaties, and so on. I fully understand why there is the degree of cynicism in the West that maybe surprises people that come from the Eastern Arctic where, in fact, the contact with government has been so recent and where, perhaps the federal government had learned by its mistakes and did not screw things up so badly as they did in the West.

So I think we should bear that in mind, that when we hear people talking about their uncertainty and cynicism, there may be very well good foundation for it. Because the history, as I see it, of contact that existed in the West here, has been so different. I can see the reasons why there could be a greater degree of mistrust about the future evolution of public government and perhaps a lack of faith that some kind of inclusion of aboriginal self-government of various kinds or forms, could not be accommodated within it. My own feeling is that we will evolve in such a way that many of the major concerns of northern native people will in fact be met but it is going to take an awful lot of patience and an awful lot of good will on both parts and a co-operative effort for it to succeed. But at the moment what I see in fact is this continued feeling that there have been so many mistakes made in the past that people would want to proceed cautiously and my guess is that this degree of caution will persist for many, many years to come and we are not going to come with a swift accommodation to meet everybody's needs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Perhaps you are right. We have never had a coup d'etat in the North before but perhaps we could put it on the agenda for next year. Any further comments on the subject. Members comments. Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend necessarily to get involved and say too much at this point. I think generally what is written on paper is fine in the sense that there is nothing that much wrong with what is on paper. It is more or less in tune with what many of us think but I think that the matter should not be concluded today. It should be left open to hear from other representatives, people involved in the Constitutional Alliance and the heads of some of the major native organizations.

Present Form Of Government Not Necessarily Popular Choice

I have to take issue with the thinking of Mr. Lewis because I interpret what he says as asking what are people talking or complaining about. Why are native people talking about wanting changes? What are they really talking about? Mr. Lewis suggests that what we have here is fine, that there have been changes and it is fine and if we just keep going somehow or another we will end up satisfied. We will end up with the status quo just continuing and keeping going. But it is not quite as simple as that although living here in Yellowknife if you are used to the way the government is, if you are used to the way the system is, you might get the impression that things are fine. Things could just necessarily roll along. But I think that what I can do is take a look at government from the perspective of my own constituency, some of the small communities and the Dene/Metis people that live there. My general conclusion is there has been lots of progress

over the last few years; native peoples have become involved in political institutions and held important positions and so forth; there has been progress. We have got local people a lot of the things they want in terms of new community halls, better airstrips and so forth. Despite all that, it is not concluded. It is not conclusively decided by local people that this system of our government is necessarily the one that they want to endorse for the rest of their lives.

If you look at the small communities there has been tremendous improvement in government services and programs and that in itself does a lot to endear the government to the people. Secondly, if they can see their own people hold government positions and be major influencers of government, that connects them. Then there is some tie with government. They see some of their representatives in government or as MLAs and that goes some distance to feeling a connection to government. But as I say, while the state of the nation or state of the community is generally fine there is still some real question as to whether people are going to accept the government as it is in the long term.

Reserve System May Be Viable Alternative

An alternative to the community government or the way things are in the community is the reserve. I think there is something to be said for a reserve in the sense that native people have complete jurisdiction with respect to matters on a reserve. They can control everything that happens on a reserve. There is something to be said for that. The federal government can be fairly generous. The federal government has sometimes, when our government has resisted certain things, come forward and provided those things in, as an example, the area of economic development.

So native people still think at the back of their minds, "Well, if we were to have stronger ties with the federal government through the system of reserves maybe we would be better off in terms of moneys and things that we presently cannot get, particularly for economic development and better housing and so forth." And to native people in the small communities, government is still very much of a puzzle. People cannot imagine, people do not understand government as it exists in a place like Yellowknife. In our area people cannot understand why government controls are so far off in Fort Smith. So people have some difficulty with that. Civil servants are seen as a whole lot of non-native people that come in from the South and get into these positions and who make a living in part, in a large part, on the fact that they have to govern and provide a service to the majority of people in the North, who are native. The government civil service is seen that way. It is something that they have a hard time understanding.

And also the institutions, the government set-up, the way the civil servants work is foreign. It is a system that is brought in from the South from the federal government approach and it is a foreign way of operating things. Harry Deneron in Liard cannot understand the way the government civil servants work. There are a number of issues he wants to resolve. In the last few months there have been planeloads of people that have come to Liard, three or four people per plane as it were, to look at a matter and then fly away again. But he feels that his main issues of wanting to get work for people, wanting to get native people on their feet in Liard, is not being dealt with. So there is a certain amount of strangeness and foreignness to the system of government, the civil service system and the way that they operate.

People in the small communities, oftentimes the things that they want are very simple. I cite as an example, in Nahanni Butte when I go over there sometimes, in terms of better housing sometimes all people want is a stove, a new kitchen stove, and that is all they want but the system as we have it set up in terms of policies and so forth does not allow the government to provide a little stove. There are provisions in terms of policies to provide housing and other things but if you are tenth on the list you are out of luck. So it is a challenge to make government programs and institutions work for people and this is at the back of the minds of people when they think, "Well, if we had control of these things, if we had direct lines with the federal government, maybe all these things would be much better and would be much simpler and things would come much more readily than they do now."

Division Of Territories May Affect Form Of Government

So without question even in terms of this Assembly, I think native people over the course of the years have done reasonably well in being effective and being involved. But there is a basic fear that this may not continue into the long-term future. There is some real concern that if division occur in particular in the West, the native people are not going to be in the majority and there is going to be need for some provision for native people's involvement in the very long-term future.

So this Assembly as it is, with the rules and the way things are set up is good for now perhaps but it is not going to be satisfactory in the long term. There has to be some guarantee for native peoples' participation in the Assembly and in the executive of government. So there are reasons, there is a basis for native peoples, particularly those in the small and distant communities, to still have hopes that things can be improved more than they are. There is still not 100 per cent acceptance of government as we know it today. The people look to the Dene Nation, the Metis Association, these organizations, to be their speakers and their leaders, to fix things up for them and secure things for their successful future. Lest people have the impression that we are just going to go along, and the government as we know it is going to exist into eternity, I really do not agree with them. Particularly if you look at things from the small communities, from the native people, as to where they come from and where they are now; it is a long way from Fort Liard or Wrigley to Yellowknife, and to this government. There is that big gap that has to be filled in terms of communications also. There is a big problem in that people in small communities speak Slavey, and a completely different language than the majority of people that work for this government. There is a big gap, too, between people and the government and the civil service.

For all those reasons there is this tremendous amount of work to do and there necessarily have to be changes in our government and civil service before people fully accept and endorse the government as it is. I just wanted to say this much. It is not something that I thought at the start of this afternoon I would say, but I think it is important to indicate that everything is not hunky-dory. Everything is not secure yet. We do not have a government in place, necessarily, that is going to last forever in its present state. This is really an interim government. We have made some steps, good changes the last few years, but we are still some distance from having a government that is finally and fully endorsed by the majority of the people of the NWT. Mahsi cho. Do you agree with me?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Mr. Nerysoo is next.

Misunderstandings About Social Contracts

MR. NERYSOO: Probably if there is anybody that is going to disagree with what the government has said so far, it will probably be myself, more in the context of, I think, a clear understanding about, firstly, the history of the Northwest Territories, and in particular the West. Secondly, there are some misunderstandings about the so-called social contracts that are supposedly to be signed or pursued. I must say that Mr. Lewis made it very clear that the history of the Dene/Metis has not been as smooth in terms of its relationship to government, both federal and territorial, as it has been for the Inuit. I think that the Dene/Metis have encountered many treaties, many arrangements, that have been broken in many cases. Those treaties, and I can probably refer to Treaty 8 and Treaty 11 in the Territories, but there were also other arrangements that were made with the Dene/Metis that did not always turn out the way the people were told they would turn out to be. I think that Mr. Lewis, in indicating that there were those problems, particularly in terms of interpretation, and in terms of implementation -- even today, even the way in which people deal with those issues today, they do not accommodate them, do not deal with them and do not recognize them. You have to understand why the Dene/Metis do not feel comfortable with the way things are working out.

The other point I wanted to make, and I think it is an important one, is when Mr. Lewis made mention of the issue of a social contract between Quebec and Canada. It is between Quebec and Canada. It is not between the people of Quebec and the Government of Quebec. What the

aboriginal people, the Inuit included, and the Dene/Metis, are trying to do is to develop a social contract between the Dene/Metis and the people of Canada, and the Government of Canada, so that no matter what happens in the future they will always have an equal say in what goes on.

I really think that the suggestions that are being made of a social contract internally, that would always accommodate the aboriginal people, is not possible. It is not possible because history has shown that it has been very difficult for aboriginal people in the provinces, with the changes in numbers, with the changes in status of those people, to retain the kind of social contracts that they thought they had with the provinces. In fact, in some cases, the provinces do not want to recognize the contracts that have been signed. They do not recognize treaty people; they do very little in terms of providing services to treaty people. In fact, what they do say is, "Despite the fact that you elect us, we have no relationship to you at all, and if you want to make a deal it is only a small deal, and that small deal will only be in terms of what we feel as a provincial government is in our interest to give to you for political reasons." And with that kind of history, I do not think there is a situation right now that can allow for aboriginal people to not have a social contract with the people of Canada. Not the Dene and Metis, and I would not recommend that to them, that they should not have a social contract with Canada, the country of Canada, so that no matter who is elected here, that social contract is always applicable.

Constitutionally Protected Social Contract Sought

The other point I wanted to make is that the social contract that the aboriginal people are seeking is constitutionally protected. It is protected in the Constitution of Canada. In other words, no one, not this Legislature, not the federal government, could make a change to that social contract without the consent of everyone. And I think that is a hell of a better situation than having the territorial government say, "We have a constitution and this body here has a right to amend that constitution." Because every province has the right to amend their own constitution. What they cannot do is they cannot amend the Canadian constitution without the consent of all First Ministers.

I think that when you are talking about trying to protect aboriginal people, that is what we are looking for. An ability to protect ourselves in the future. Not with the ability of some elected body to say, "Oh, we were elected. We are representatives and we are capable of amending a contract with you." That has been the very problem throughout the history of our country and we cannot allow that to happen any longer. Sure we can make changes here in this Legislature, but how does that change, or accommodate the aboriginal people? When the aboriginal people say we want these things to be put in place, what have we done here to accommodate that? What have we done? In some cases we have introduced some policies. In others we have changed policies to make it more difficult for aboriginal people. And you wonder why people in the communities say, "Well, what is going on here?"

People use the argument that we have a majority of aboriginal people here in this Assembly. That is the argument. But that is not the issue. The issue is, are we introducing policies to accommodate a better relationship between aboriginal people and non-aboriginal people of the NWT? That is the question, and I find that sometimes we are not doing that. And probably in many cases we are not. Instead we are more concerned about what it is we feel individually is more politically expedient and is going to get us more votes in the next election. That is what we are here for. Well, some are.

Consensus Government Not Practised Well

And we talk about this idea of consensus government. I wish we practised it in this Assembly. I really do, because if we practised consensus government the way aboriginal people, Inuit included, and Dene/Metis, practised it, it is to sit down and listen to the concerns that other people have and to try to come to an accommodation so that you are capable, in the Delta, in the Baffin, to try to work out a solution. Maybe a different solution, but deal with the same problem and come to a conclusion on it. We do not do that here. It is more like "Let's Make a Deal". Why do we not call Bob Barker into this Assembly?

MR. POLLARD: We have already got Mike.

MR. NERYSOO: That is exactly what this whole process is about. I really find that if we talk about consensus, then let us deal with it in the process of consensus. Mr. Patterson mentioned earlier that is the best approach to take. Well I probably would agree with you but then let us practice that.

The other thing that is important to recognize is that we have -- and it is a point made by Mr. Patterson -- sure we are trying to make this Assembly more accountable, but how are we doing it? What are we doing to make it more accountable? Are we trying to make changes so that people of the NWT have a decision making role in choosing our leader to the point of not allowing for the possibility of a party system that our leader does not agree with? What role are the people of the NWT going to have in that selection process, if any? We do not know. We have never talked about that. I assume that one of the things that our boundaries commission may be talking about is to consider that. But we do not talk about those things. Instead we look at ourselves and we say, "Let us retain the power of decision making in the hands of 24 people." So how do you think the people in the communities look at us when we make decisions and say, "We did not have a say in that"? No, instead, as I said, we want to retain here and say that we represent the people. We want the total authority.

I will give you a good example of how hard we have been fighting together in terms of trying to gain political power. Maybe we should learn from that. Look at the fight that we have all had together in this Assembly against the federal government about trying to take over responsibility for programs, services and, most important, the ability to make decisions for our people. We ask people in Ottawa to give us that responsibility so that the people, not elected people here but the people, can have influence on the decision making process. Instead it stops here in this Assembly. It stops here. We do not move it toward the communities where many of the decisions can be made better than we can make them. That is what we should be talking about, when we talk about political and constitutional development.

Mr. Lewis said that we are over-politicized. I am glad we are over-politicized. I am glad we have people in the communities that know all about the decision making process and can make people accountable. People in the South and throughout the history of our country have fought to have a say in their governments. Here in the North we are very fortunate, as Mr. Lewis has said; we have never had to have those kinds of fights. At least, we have made ourselves capable of understanding the political process. I just find that this argument of ridding ourselves of a colonized attitude, colonialism, from Ottawa to us -- maybe we should begin the process of decolonizing ourselves in the Territories, being a little more understanding of why it is that we fight so hard to bring into the Territories the ability to make decisions on those issues that affect us. We have to remember that.

Aboriginal Self-Government Not Only Ethnic In Context

The other point I want to make is that I do not know how in the world we get into a situation of interpreting the issue of aboriginal self-government as ethnic in its total context. Yes, aboriginal people want to protect themselves in government, they want to have a social contract that will always allow them to have a say in government. How in the world we always say that it is only dealing with the question of ethnicity is beyond me, because that is not always the situation. It is like everybody else in Canada, everybody else in the world that has sought to try to ensure that they had a role in government, had a say in government on those issues and matters that affect them.

The provinces have done that. Our history shows that Alberta and Saskatchewan were created out of the Territories. Why? Because they wanted a say, and they had a social contract in the Alberta Act that was very clear as to their authority. I really feel that maybe that is what we have to try to understand. There is nothing in the process that has ever said that the aboriginal people are not going to be prepared to look at the total issues. Nothing. What we need is a process, and this is the process that we find is best for us.

As I indicated, the social contract is with the federal government. It is with the people of Canada. That is what this whole claim is about, right here; that is what it is all about. I think that whatever we put in this agreement is something that will be respected, not only by the Government of Canada, but has to be respected by our future governments -- not individuals here -- but our governments. I just wanted to make those comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Members' comments. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. Just a few points. I guess the idea of putting the paper out is to get some sense of where it is that we are going as a jurisdiction, because whether or not in this social contract with the Government of Canada all these things are taking place, the fact is that we have to live up here and we have to deal with the daily problems of life, just surviving in our communities on a daily basis.

I am surprised to hear us sort of being accused of being colonizers ourselves, because it has only been three years since the Commissioner no longer sat as chairman of the Executive Council. We have only had a fully elected government for eight years. In that eight years we have been passing power to the community and regional level at a rate that, at times, is unbelievable. When we say that decisions have to go to the community level, I cannot help but think about education boards, health boards, municipal and community affairs, renewable resources. When I look at our budget and ourselves as a Legislature, and I look at how much money we really control now, I bet we control, as a government, less than half of our budget. Almost half of our budget has been given out to the regions and the communities in an extremely short period of time, six to seven years. I do not know of any other jurisdiction in the country that has had to undergo that kind of process in such a short period of time.

Problems Attributable To Reserve System

Not being born in this country, I did not grow up with the prejudices, maybe, that Canadians have grown up with, but when I look to the South and I see the problems that particularly the Indian people have in the South, it almost looks like it is directly attributable to the reserve system, this special status that was set up years ago to have this direct relationship with the Government of Canada. What you had was people who set themselves apart in the provinces and said they were going to deal only with the federal government. Of course trying to deal with a government that is 3000 or 4000 miles away that really did not have your interests at heart, as opposed to dealing with a government that is right at your back door and a government that you can control, seems to me to have been one of the biggest problems in the South. A reserve system was set up and people removed themselves from the mainstream of political life and said we are not going to deal with the people that live around us or the government in this area. We are going to deal with some strange government that is thousands and thousands of miles away. Maybe I am not thinking this out but it seems to me that is what has created all of the problems and that is what the many social and economic problems that you see in southern Canada are directly attributable to.

One thing that I have learned in the six or seven years I have been in the Legislature -- I was no great particular support to the territorial government but I have managed to travel around in the North of all of the provinces, into Alaska, Greenland next week, into the Soviet Union, almost everywhere where native people reside and I do not think this government or this Legislature has to apologize to anybody for the job that it is doing because I have not seen a jurisdiction yet that is coming anywhere close to doing what we are doing.

Again sometimes we do not realize what we are doing. Maybe we do by default but I was in Rankin on the weekend and there was a guy there called Jim Brown, who is the chairman of native economic development fund, and who was telling me that native groups in the South, in Quebec and other places, are taking our ideas and running with them because our ideas are by far and away the most innovative in the country when it comes to dealing with native people and dealing with native issues. I met with Lucien Bouchard, the Minister of the Environment, two weeks ago in Quebec City. He could not believe the fact that our Legislature operated in five or six languages. He was astonished that we would even try such a thing.

Control Of Budget To Other Groups

So I do not think we should be down on ourselves too hard because I, myself, happen to think we are doing a pretty damn good job. Sure people are impatient and people want to get more control but if you look at what we have been doing and how we have been going, I do not think we can hand out control any faster than we are already doing. Here is a government that has freely given away half of its budget within seven years to groups other than itself to control. Now that is approaching about \$450 million spread among 55,000 people. Well, that is not bad in terms of giving control away.

I know there is a nervousness about the future and the possible population changes up here. With development and that, it is not that hard to imagine in the East the Inuit being a minority, because you are only talking about 20,000 and it does not take long for people from the South to move in and become the majority. But on the other hand there are protections that you can build in. I would agree with Mr. Nerysoo in one respect, that there has to be some element of constitutional protection. He is right. We can pass a law right now that says yes, we are going to guarantee this, but if the population mix changes, and the mixture of this Legislature changes, then so can that law. I have to agree with him on that, but there are things that we can do to even stop that process. I do not think we should throw up our hands and say that what we are doing is not working. I think what we should be doing is taking what we have and refining it, and making sure that we make it work even better.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. GORDON WRAY: As somebody from Baker Lake, the Eastern Arctic, if it comes down to dealing with some nameless or faceless bureaucrat in Ottawa, or dealing with a bureaucrat in Yellowknife, then I will take the bureaucrat in Yellowknife any day to deal with, because at least I can influence that bureaucrat and there is political power and persuasion that can be brought to bear on that bureaucrat that cannot be in Ottawa. I think we have to be careful before we dismantle anything that we have to be sure we know what we want and why we want it, and not just do it because it seems like the right thing to do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Thank you, Mr. Wray. Any other comments? We have only four minutes left on the clock. Mr. Nerysoo was the next on the agenda and then Mr. Patterson. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, let me say that money is not always control. I think the simple fact is that one of the major items of decision making that people have a lot of concern about, and this Assembly had it, in fact, in many of the transfers and devolution, is policy making, the ability to make a decision on those things that affect you, policy. People in the communities do not always see the transfer of money to them as the ability to make some decision. When we talk about this concept of responsibility it is more than handling money, that is administration. What we have to do, clearly, is find a way that deals with that issue and we are not doing it. That is basically what I am trying to deal with. The question of having influence over moneys is one aspect, but the most important thing is policy decision making. How quickly and how soon do we move those things to the communities? In our own discussions, I think that that is something we have to consider. We may not have a solution at this particular time, but I think it is very important.

The other important thing I wanted to make mention of is that Mr. Wray is absolutely correct, we are doing a better job in all programs and services we offer to our people. In Alaska, for instance, the major issues on such things as decisions, on regional by-laws, regional laws, are made at a regional level. Even revenue sharing is collected at a regional level. We do a lot of good things. I am not disputing that, but there are also other issues that in terms of the discussion we have, those things have to be looked at and considered. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. One minute to the hour, I have to recognize the clock. Is it the wish of the House that we continue? Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say I welcome Mr. Nerysoo's somewhat critical comments. I do not think we should be defensive. Certainly we are not perfect. I would just simply say to him that I am delighted if he has ideas about making the government more accountable. Let us hear the ideas he has on methods by which the Government Leader could be selected at large. I am very open to that. I would like tomorrow to hear exactly how we could go about it because I think it could be more representative than it is now. I would like to hear some ideas coming up with means for guaranteed representation and if the consensus government system could be made more accountable, I am open to it. I do not think we can have 24 MLAs sitting in cabinet every time a decision is made, but if there were ways in which it could be made more accountable, I am open to these ideas. I think the critical thing about consensus government is that the cabinet is chosen by the MLAs, not by a premier...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Whitford): Time, Mr. Patterson.

---Laughter

The Chair recognizes the clock. Thank you, Mr. Patterson.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will come back to order. Chairman Whitford, please.

ITEM 18: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF TABLED DOCUMENT 76-89(1), POLITICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE NWT; APPEARANCE OF CONSTITUTIONAL ALLIANCE WITNESSES; TABLED DOCUMENT 58-89(1), REPORT OF THE REGIONAL AND TRIBAL COUNCILS REVIEW CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE; TABLED DOCUMENT 59-89(1), GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE REGIONAL AND TRIBAL COUNCILS REVIEW CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

MR. WHITFORD: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Tabled Documents 76-89(1), 58-89(1) and 59-89(1), and the Appearance of Constitutional Alliance Witnesses, and wishes to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Whitford. The appearance of the witnesses is concluded. The House has heard the report of the chairman of committee of the whole. Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. 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 special committee on the northern economy immediately after adjournment today; a meeting of ajauqtit at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

ITEM 20: ORDERS OF THE DAY

Orders of the day for Friday, April 7th.

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); 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 Friday, April 7th, at 10:00 a.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