



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

4th Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
DAY 29

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1985

Pages 1084 to 1144

Speaker: The Honourable Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Speaker

The Hon. Donald M. Stewart, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1877
Hay River, N.W.T., X0E 0R0
Office (403) 874-2324
Home (403) 874-6560
Office (403) 873-7629 (Yellowknife)
(Hay River)

Angottitauruq, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.
Gjoa Haven, N.W.T.
X0E 1J0
Phone (403) 360-7141 (Hamlet Office)
(Kitikmeot East)

Appaqaq, Mr. Moses, M.L.A.
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.
X0A 0W0
Office (819) 266-8860
Home (819) 266-8931
(Hudson Bay)

Arlooktoo, Mr. Joe, M.L.A.
Lake Harbour, N.W.T.
X0A 0N0
Phone (819) 939-2363
(Baffin South)

Ballantyne, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1091
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N8
Office (403) 873-8093
Home (403) 873-5232
(Yellowknife North)

Butters, The Hon. Thomas H., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 908
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N7
Office (403) 873-7128
Home (403) 920-4411 (Yellowknife)
(403) 979-2373 (Inuvik)
(Inuvik)
Minister of Finance and Government
Services

Cournoyea, The Hon. Nellie J., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1184
Inuvik, N.W.T.
X0E 0T0
Office (403) 873-7959
Home (403) 979-2740
(Nunakput)
Minister of Renewable Resources and
Information

Curley, The Hon. Tagak E.C., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 36
Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.
X0C 0G0
Office (403) 873-7139
Home (819) 645-2951
(Aivilik)
Minister of Economic Development and
Tourism

Erkloo, Mr. Elijah, M.L.A.
Pond Inlet, N.W.T.
X0A 0S0
Phone (819) 899-8845
(Foxe Basin)

Gargan, Mr. Samuel, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2131
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2P6
Office (403) 873-7999
Home (403) 699-3171
(Deh Cho)

Lawrence, Mrs. Eliza, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2053
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 1W9
Office (403) 920-8052
Home (403) 873-2457
(Tu Nedhe)

MacQuarrie, Mr. Robert, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2895
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2R2
Office (403) 873-7918
Home (403) 873-8857
(Yellowknife Centre)

McCallum, Mr. Arnold, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 454
Fort Smith, N.W.T.
X0E 0P0
Phone (403) 872-2246
(Slave River)

McLaughlin, The Hon. Bruce, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 555
Pine Point, N.W.T.
X0E 0W0
Office (403) 873-7113
Home (403) 393-2226
(Pine Point)
Minister of Health and Social Services

Nerysoo, The Hon. Richard W., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
Office (403) 873-7112
Home (403) 873-5310
(Mackenzie Delta)
Government Leader and Minister of Justice
and Public Services

Paniloo, Mr. Pauloosie, M.L.A.
Clyde River, N.W.T.
X0A 0E0
Phone (819) 924-6220 (Hamlet Office)
(Baffin Central)

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 310
Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
Office (819) 979-5941
(403) 873-7123
Home (819) 979-6618
(Iqaluit)
Minister of Education

Pedersen, Mr. Red, M.L.A.
Coppermine, N.W.T.
X0E 0E0
Phone (403) 982-5221
(Kitikmeot West)

Pudluk, Mr. Ludy, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 22
Resolute Bay, N.W.T.
X0A 0V0
Phone (819) 252-3737
(High Arctic)

Richard, Mr. Ted, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1320
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2L9
Office (403) 873-7920
Home (403) 873-3667
(Yellowknife South)

Sibbeston, The Hon. Nick G., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 560
Fort Simpson, N.W.T.
X0E 0N0
Office (403) 873-7658
Home (403) 695-2565
(Deh Cho Gah)
Minister of Local Government

T'Seleie, Mr. John, M.L.A.
Fort Good Hope, N.W.T.
X0E 0H0
Phone (403) 598-2303
(Sahtu)

Wah-Shee, Mr. James, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 471
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N4
Office (403) 873-8099
Home (403) 873-8012
(Rae-Lac La Martre)
Deputy Speaker

Wray, The Hon. Gordon, M.L.A.
Baker Lake, N.W.T.
X0C 0A0
Office (403) 873-7962
Home (819) 793-2700
(Kivallivik)
Minister of Public Works

Officers

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

Law Clerk
Mr. Joel Fournier
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Clerk Assistant (Procedural)
Mr. Albert J. Canadien
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

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

Clerk Assistant (Administrative)
Mr. S. James Mikeli
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

Sergeant-at-Arms
S/Sgt. David Williamson
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1985

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	1084
Members' Replies	
- Mrs. Lawrence's Reply	1084
- Mr. Wray's Reply	1086
- Mr. Butters' Reply	1098
- Mr. McCallum's Reply	1099
- Mr. Pudluk's Reply	1101
- Mr. Nerysoo's Reply	1102
- Mr. Wah-Shee's Reply	1110
- Mr. Pedersen's Reply	1114
Ministers' Statements	
- Minister's Statement on Expo '86	1118
Oral Questions	1119
Returns	1124
Petitions	1128
Reports of Standing and Special Committees	
- Report of Standing Committee on Finance on Bill 8-85(1), Bill 9-85(1), Bill 10-85(1)	1126
- Report of Standing Committee on Legislation	1127
Motions	1129

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1985

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Ballantyne, Hon. Tom Butters, Hon. Nellie Cournoyea, Mr. Gargan, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. McCallum, Hon. Bruce McLaughlin, Hon. Richard Nerysoo, Mr. Paniloo, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Mr. Pedersen, Mr. Pudluk, Hon. Nick Sibbeston, Hon. Don Stewart, Mr. T'Seleie, Mr. Wah-Shee, Hon. Gordon Wray

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): Orders of the day for Wednesday, March the 27th. Item 2, Members' replies. Mrs. Lawrence.

ITEM 2: MEMBERS' REPLIES

Mrs. Lawrence's Reply

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a short speech in reply to the Commissioner's Address. I realize that almost every program of the government seems to be a priority but I am very concerned about our youth, especially since this is the International Year of the Youth. The children today are our future and the only time some of our young people receive any attention is when they have committed a serious crime and by then it is too late. Putting young people in an institution does not help them either, they need help before they get into trouble.

Supervision In Student Residences

Education remains a serious concern to me and parents in my constituency of Tu Nedhe. Dropping out of school is a big problem, especially among young children from small communities. I realize living in residences like Akaitcho Hall is a difficult adjustment for many of our young people and it is often easier for the administrator to send children home on their first offence because there is a waiting list to get into the residence. Serious damage is done to these young people because there is no one for them to turn to for help when they go back into their own community. Some just hang around town with no job, no hope and no future. They need special attention while they are in school but lack of staff, in many cases, means they do not get this attention. Supervisors are overworked with many students to supervise.

People working in this system must be sensitive to the special needs of our young people. Going by the book when children start acting up does not work. Without some understanding of these children, all the degrees in the world would not help. Many times the Department of Education assumes an individual is qualified because they have a degree, but the supervisors need to have experience with our children and some knowledge of the background that they come from.

I understand only too well how some of these students feel as I come from a small settlement. It is not in our culture to open up or feel comfortable with just anybody. I would like to suggest to the Minister that a small home set-up with adequate one to one counselling services would help our students to feel more comfortable in this strange environment. I guess what I am trying to say is

that right now the system is not serving some of our troubled students as well as it should. Changes have to be made in this area and I urge the Member to give serious consideration to making some changes so that we can make sure that services are available to our young people. It is very sad and frustrating for me to see when the funding could be spent much more constructively.

Problems Concerning Division

On another subject, I would like to say that events around our main topic lately, the NCF and WCF, recently made proof that some communities are not ready for division. Maybe we should put the idea of division aside for the rest of the life of this Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: No way!

MRS. LAWRENCE: I do not wish to speak on this too much, a lot has been said on it already. How do we know that the federal government will provide adequate funds to form two governments anyway? We do not even have adequate funding for many programs that are existing. Some countries that are divided experience many problems including war. We have certainly had problems, our share of them, with division since February.

Economic Development In Tu Nedhe

It is over a year now since my election and I sometimes feel that I have met very few of my constituency's needs. Everything seems to take so long, with all due respect to the Executive Members who say that economic development is one of the government's priorities. I have found that funding such as the native economic development program often does not reach the people it is meant for. In my area we have tried to make some progress over the past year in the area of economic development. With the Deninoo council hiring an economic development planner in Resolution we were able to take new directions with the Slave River sawmill. The management of the sawmill have done their part in making efforts to sell more lumber. However, because of the run-down equipment and the weather conditions, the sawmill has not been producing to its full capacity. So I would like to urge the Minister and his department to consider further funding in this area as the sawmill is very important to my constituents.

Housing continues to be a crucial need in my constituency, especially in Snowdrift. I would like to emphasize to the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation, the urgency in moving quickly to provide programs and funding for housing, especially in Snowdrift.

Some good things have happened in the past year too. A renewable resource officer will be hired as soon as accommodation can be confirmed. This will be an important addition to the people of Tu Nedhe. With the help of my colleagues I was able to put forth a motion asking for special funding for improvement to the Little Buffalo bridge. The problem of the condition of the highway was partially resolved during a special meeting of Department of Highway officials and the Deninoo council when the department agreed to set up a permanent maintenance camp at the Little Buffalo River.

I would like to compliment the community development committee in Fort Resolution for taking the initial step in tackling the problems of alcohol and drug abuse in the community by volunteering their services in putting together a proposal to seek funds and donations from government and businesses. It is a long and frustrating process but it took many years for the problem to get where it is at and it will take a long time for us to deal with the problem. But we have to keep trying.

I would like to thank the Executive for the response to funding requests that I made on behalf of my constituency. I want you to know that I appreciate this but I think it is important that Members be involved in the capital planning at the community level, so we can be sure there are no oversights. I would also like to thank all the Members for their assistance at all times. Some issues are very confusing and other Members have been very co-operative in explaining them. Maybe to the public we seem to be arguing a lot but deep down, some of us still retain our culture and tradition of helping each other.

I would also like to thank the two interpreters, Sabet Biscaye and Leona Poitras, who have been very willing and helpful and the staff of the Legislative Assembly and the special committees, and especially Kevin O'Keefe in assisting me with any research material that I need. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Lawrence. Replies to the Commissioner's Address. Mr. Wray.

Mr. Wray's Reply

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not at my best this morning. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I represent the constituency of Kivallivik. Kivallivik consists of the communities of Eskimo Point, Whale Cove and Baker Lake. It is unique in a number of ways, one of the major ones being that the constituency has the only inland Inuit community in Canada. It is a large constituency in terms of this House. I did not know this but just learned in the last few days, from looking at some documents provided to us by the Clerk's office, that in terms of population only the constituencies of Inuvik, Frobisher, Fort Smith, Hay River and Yellowknife Centre are larger. Certainly in terms of geographic area, it is the largest.

Mr. Richard is not here but I would like to make my pitch right now because if indeed there is to be another seat added to this House which I think is still there, then I think this constituency should be one of the prime candidates for that seat. However I will not be bringing any motion to that effect because I would not want to open up that can of worms again. But I would just like to be on record that Kivallivik is the next obvious choice for an MLA.

Business Development In Eskimo Point

In the community of Eskimo Point some major things have been happening. It is a pleasure for me to see tourism on the increase in that community. It has become a major business. I believe last summer somewhere in excess of 2000 tourists visited the community of Eskimo Point. The community is taking major strides toward the establishment of small business in that community. In fact I think it would be safe to say that in the Keewatin Region, Eskimo Point is the leader in small business. It is certainly a town full of entrepreneurs. The community has expanded very rapidly in the last seven to eight years and the population increase has been phenomenal. The situation in the school is one that indicates that. It has the second largest enrolment of any school in the Eastern Arctic. I believe only Nakasuk in Frobisher Bay has a larger enrolment in its school and even at that it is only a matter of six or seven people.

Housing continues to be a major problem in the community along with unemployment. Eskimo Point, along with the other community of Baker Lake, has one of the largest welfare rolls of any of the communities in the NWT, I think more because of its size than anything else, Mr. Speaker. The community is very concerned about unemployment and would like to see some form of economic development. I have to say that Cullaton Lake has not been a good experience for Eskimo Point or for the Keewatin as a whole. While there has been some employment for the community of Eskimo Point and some of the other communities, by and large the mine of Cullaton Lake has not put any money into the regional economy, or any substantial amount of money into the economy.

New Primary School In Capital Plan

The community is very pleased and I would like to thank the Minister of Education for finally responding to the community. We now see the capital plan money to build a new primary school which has been long overdue. In fact I wish the government had been as quick to respond to the community of Eskimo Point as it was to the community of Yellowknife. To handle the overload something like six or seven portable classrooms have had to be built, which is a very costly way to build schools. It ties up land and is not a desirable way to go. However Education does now have the new primary school in their plan and I am very pleased to see this and I know the community is very pleased.

The other item that I think is of major concern to the community is the water supply. As you know there has been an historical problem with water in Eskimo Point. In talking with some of the older residents they will tell you quite out front that the community should never have been built where it was, particularly a community of that size, because the water supply is just not good. The community desperately wants to build a road to the Maguse River. I support them in this because not only will it provide access to fresh water but it will supply major access for tourism purposes. This is what the community has in mind -- the approach to building the road with two purposes.

Community Of Whale Cove

With regard to Whale Cove, Whale Cove is a small community. It is like a lot of small communities, it is there, it exists, people like to live there. It is somewhat in a state of flux right now because it is situated between two major communities, Eskimo Point and Rankin Inlet. It has seen some of its population move to these communities because of the services they provide. However, people move back in after they find that the quality of life in larger communities is not much better than in their own community. It also has a major problem of housing and unemployment. The community would very much like to get an RCMP. I tabled a letter in this House from the community about that subject. Probably in the scheme of things they have a low priority for an RCMP. It is still something that they desire because they are a community that has prohibition and I think they find it difficult at times to enforce some of the laws because there is no law enforcement in Whale Cove, the nearest RCMP being in Rankin Inlet, which of course is time consuming. Therefore it is very difficult for the RCMP to respond very quickly.

Concerns Of Baker Lake

The other community in my constituency is Baker Lake. As you know Baker Lake is a well-known community. It has made its mark in the North over the years in a number of ways. The major concerns in the community, again, are housing and unemployment. Housing is the number one priority due to a number of reasons, some of which this government can be blamed for and some of which the community has to be blamed for. The community was forgotten when it came to the supply of housing. It has the highest number of northern rentals of any community in the Northwest Territories and it has the worst condition of housing in the region with the possible exception of Whale Cove. There is a major deficiency of housing in that community. This has forced a number of people to leave the community and it is a major concern to us because some of them move to Gjoa Haven where they also create a housing shortage.

With regard to recreation facilities and the budget just passed by Local Government, finally the government has agreed to build a recreation complex. This is something the community has been attempting to get since 1974. In fact, they were led to believe by the government in 1979 that it was going to go ahead. However, the way these things work it was lost in the planning after the community had done a lot of work but now it is back on track and I am very pleased to see it. Recreation is very important to us in some of these larger communities because as you know we have a large number of young people. The crime rate, the use of alcohol and drugs is increasing tremendously among the young people. The increase of crime of breaking and entering, vandalism, is also on the way up in a major way.

Most of this is due to the fact that there are young people with nothing to do. Most of them have dropped out of school, they cannot find employment and even if they did have an education, it would be doubtful if they could find employment because the jobs are just not there to find. Therefore, we have to provide them with the facilities which will allow them to use their spare time constructively.

All in all the constituency of Kivallivik has a fair amount of problems. I think they can be summed up in three parts, Mr. Speaker, housing, unemployment and education.

Education In Kivallivik

Education is the key for most of us to get ourselves out of the hole which we have dug for ourselves. The drop-out rate in my constituency is, I believe, similar to other constituencies with the possible exception of the major communities here in the West, and is approaching 85 per cent by grade eight. Now, you have to understand the background of my community to understand why we see this as such a problem. In the 1950s and 1960s and into the early 1970s, Baker Lake in particular, and this is confirmed by studies through Polar Gas and other agencies, had the most grade twelve graduates per capita of any community in the Northwest Territories. The honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre, who was a principal there for a number of years, will confirm that the community had a very high regard for education. It was determined that its children should be educated in the best possible manner and achieve the highest possible education in the academic world. It was very successful. However, since the mid 1970s, coinciding with the time that this government took over education, education standards have dropped and dropped fast to the point where Baker Lake has a hard time to put together even a grade nine or a grade 10 class. The same can be held true for Eskimo Point and Whale Cove and I believe held true for most of the communities in the East. That is a major problem.

If our children are not educated and do not have the ability to grasp employment opportunities, government opportunities, private sector opportunities then we are condemning the people in our communities to a life on welfare. I do not need to elaborate on what that would do to the social structure in our communities. I think there are enough experiences in this country, particularly among native people in the South, to show what happens when communities depend almost entirely on welfare for their source of income.

As you know, my communities have fought bitterly at times to get their own high school and institutions into those communities. I have always supported them in that endeavour. I am pleased to see that the government has finally recognized that in the Keewatin you have a situation where you have three communities of equal size and hopefully Education's decision to allow grade 10 and possibly grade 11 and 12, if the numbers warrant it, into the communities of Eskimo Point and Baker Lake will somehow alleviate the problems. I, myself, do not think that merely providing facilities is going to solve the problem. I think we have major problems in the attitude of teachers and principals. I think that an attitude has prevailed that, "Well, let's put the kids into programs other than academic because basically that is all they can cope with," and as such we have seen a drastic reduction in the number of academic students coming out of our school system.

Failure To Achieve Goal

I think we have an attitude problem among the parents. I think many parents have either given up on education or to this day still do not realize the value that education can have to a child. I dare say I can count on one hand, maybe two hands, the number of our children that are going to university. This is causing increasing concern because even the jobs that were traditionally occupied by people from the communities -- jobs in the housing associations, jobs with the hamlet councils, in the small business sector -- people are now going outside to hire for those jobs because we do not have that capability now. There is nobody to hire in the communities. If the capability is there, it is very quickly snapped up by federal and/or territorial government. I think that education has failed and failed miserably over the last 10 or 12 years. It has not done the job that we want it to do, even though we have poured literally hundreds of millions of dollars into it.

We must move quickly to solve the problem. One of the major reasons that this government was created and one of the major reasons for the existence of this government and this Legislature is in the area of education. While maybe there are only X number of dollars identified in the Education budget, I know for a fact, that a major portion of this government's budget through various other departments is also devoted to education. Whether it be the maintenance of schools, the building of schools, staff houses, a lot of our money is going into education. Yet we do not appear to be moving forward. We appear to be moving backward sometimes.

I think we have not used existing technology to the best of our ability. Perhaps rather than building huge expensive schools in every community, we could look at investing our money in telecommunication systems where one, two or even three high school programs could be delivered throughout the Territories from two or three central locations via the use of satellite. It is an approach that has worked in other rural areas, in Australia and Alaska. There is no reason why the plan could not work here. We have the technology but we are not availing ourselves of it.

A Younger Core Of Leadership

The other problem when it comes to education is that we do not appear to be bringing through the system that quota of leadership that we must have in the North. If you look around today at leaders, politicians in the communities and on the regional and territorial level, we see the same faces time and time again, and the same faces have been there for as long as I have been in the North. We do not appear to have that younger core of leadership coming up. Now, while that is somewhat of a generalization because I think there are some communities where there are some exceptions and a lot of work has been done with young people, we do have a problem. We do not seem to be developing a second generation of leaders or a second generation of people available to take the high positions in government and the other agencies that we have in the North. I know that I have talked to the Member for Frobisher Bay about the problem many times in his capacity as Minister of Education. I know that at times he feels very frustrated with the bureaucracy. I would remind the Member that there are many people within the bureaucracy and within the Education department who are responsible for putting in place a system which has failed us. I recognize the difficulty that he has in trying to get the same bureaucracy to change the system which they developed and supported.

Lack Of Standardization Of Educational Programs

I am continually amazed at the different levels and different types of education we are giving. In a region where you have only 50,000 people in 60 communities, you would think that education could be somewhat standardized. And as late as a month and a half ago, I am finding that this is not the case. I recently heard of a case where a family moved from Igloolik to Baker Lake. They were from Baker Lake originally and had moved to Igloolik a couple of years ago. They had a child in grade six and when they moved back to Baker Lake, the school had a tremendously difficult time trying to figure out where to put this child because the grade six in Igloolik was in no way comparable to the grade six in Baker Lake. It was a totally different program. I did a bit of homework on this because I always thought that we are attempting to standardize education so that people could move from one community to another, from one region to another and from one side of the Arctic to the other side of the Arctic, without causing themselves problems.

I found out that not only is that not true in terms of moving but it is not true even within the community. For example, my daughter is in grade six this year in Baker Lake, so I was hoping that when my son was moving into grade six -- my son is, shall we say, not as quick as my daughter, because girls are always smarter than boys, anyway -- I thought well this is good, my daughter will be able to help my son with his lessons when he goes into grade six next year, because she has done the work. I find to my amazement that this is not the case. If in fact his teacher leaves, which also happens far too often for my liking, then my son could end up and probably will end up doing a totally different grade six next year than my daughter did this year. I am not sure of the technicalities but the way I understand it is that each teacher is given a list of topics from which they can expand in the school year and develop their own classes and develop their own curriculum for that particular year. So if you change the teachers then you change the curriculum from year to year.

It quite honestly amazes me that we allow so much flexibility in the school system. It is no wonder that parents and children are confused when you do not know from one week to the next or from one year to the next what your child will be doing. It is also horrendously expensive for this government because it means that new teachers every year order new supplies and you could have a situation where new readers and new books have to be ordered time after time after time, depending on who the teacher is and if that teacher has just come into the system. I would hate to think of what the cost is to us for that kind of system.

Another thing that I found out quite frankly amazes me, again, and I really have to question the educators and the bureaucrats as to what they are up to. It was my understanding after the special committee on education and community hearings that there was a general desire on behalf of the population and certainly on behalf of the politicians and parents that we go back to the grade system. It was something that people understood, they knew what the grade system was, they could understand where their child was in the system. They were comfortable with it. But with the so-called liberalization of education in the mid-70s which brought us open areas among other things, which brought us a system of classes A, B, C, D, E, step one, step two, step three -- was totally out of line with what the communities need and want. It has been rejected by communities one after the other. It seems to be a pet of some educators though, but certainly not a pet of the parents because most of the parents that I know, including myself, now with the grade system, finally understand where that child is in school. Step A, level three tells you nothing.

No Regional Standardization

Yet I was amazed when I was in Baffin in January to find out that we do not even have regional standardization of education. In Baffin there are some communities in the north end that are on the grade system and in the south end they are still on this A, B, C, step one, step two. In inquiring into it, I found that every community is sort of told to do their own thing. I am quite frankly amazed about what is going on in that department. They seemed to have been given flexibility, not only at community levels but at regional levels, to do whatever they want. How are we ever going to build an education system, a college system, a university system, a high school system, and provide the ability for northern people to move from one community to another, from one region to another, from one side of the Arctic to another side of the Arctic, if there is no standardized education system? We are condemning people to live in and grow in and get their education in one community and we are saying if you go to another community, tough, maybe you will go back a way or maybe you will go forward a way, but we really do not know where you are going to go.

Unfortunately my comments appear to be more valid when I talk about the small communities than when I talk about larger centres because I do know that Sir John Franklin for one, has one of the highest standards not only within the Territories, but even compares very favourably in many circumstances to Alberta's schools.

The same drop-out rate does not seem to be prevailing in places like Inuvik, Fort Smith, Pine Point and Hay River and, therefore, I have to be very concerned. I suppose education is my one disappointment with this government. I find it increasingly frustrating now because essentially it would appear that there is no end in sight. It will take years to reverse its process and we are going to have to spend tens of millions of dollars throughout this government to cope with the failures of the system and with the people that are dropping out. In the Keewatin Region alone we have five or six times more drop-outs than we have high school students. It is, obviously, totally unacceptable and undesirable.

I encourage the Minister of Education that if changes have to be made then he make some, that he make them without regard for the sensibilities of some of the bureaucrats. I am looking at our communities and I see the drop-out rate. I see a horrendous picture around education. If bureaucrats have to be sacrificed to save the thousands of children that are not being educated then so be it, and that is just the way that it will have to be.

I will not say anything more about education because Mr. Patterson has heard me time and time again, ranting and raving as he calls it. I would like to impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, that the future of the North lies with our children and the education of our children which leads me into my next subject and that is young people.

Major Problems With Young People

Over the last two or three years, unfortunately, we have seen in the Keewatin and in my constituency a major -- and I mean major -- increase in the number of attempted suicides; the number of successful suicides combined with alcohol and drugs, combined with a major increase in crime, breaking and entering, and vandalism. I think I am not out of line in saying that among our younger people, particularly those in the 15 to 25 year old age group, we have a serious crisis on our hands, one that as yet I do not see this government equipped to deal with.

It saddens me to see a community like Baker Lake that I have lived in for 15 years begin to have problems that I thought I would never see. In the last circuit of the court there were between 40 and 50 charges that had to be dealt with by that court. In fact, there were so many that the court ran out of paper to work and is having to go back there next month to complete the circuit. For those of you who do not know Baker Lake, this is a major problem. We have never had these problems before. When I see communities like Baker Lake begin to falter and experience problems then I shudder at what is happening in some of the other communities that perhaps have a little bit more history than us.

Young people, I think, is an area that we have sadly neglected as a government, at least ever since I have been in the North. I think we have taken for granted their resourcefulness and leave them to figure things out for themselves. We have a very large young population caught between two cultures, caught there for the most part without education, and without our help and without the help of the politicians and the Legislature and with the social agencies, I do not think they are going to make it. That is why education, to me, is the single most important subject in the North today.

Day Care

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of other issues that I would like to touch on. As many Members have indicated, including those from Yellowknife, day care is becoming more and more of a need in our communities. More and more of the work force is comprised of young women with families and they seem to be the ones who are making it through the school instead of the young men. The lack of day care has hindered a lot of good people from getting jobs. It has caused us problems in the school system because we find that many people keep their younger sisters or brothers out of school to babysit for them. We find that even with federal government grants and trying to do it ourselves that it is just not possible. My wife had a job in Baker Lake last year and I think her wages in a month were about \$900 net but she was having to pay \$500 for day care. Essentially it was not worth her while working, as she made more money by going on unemployment insurance. I do not think that that is a very healthy thing to be encouraging either.

We are also extremely concerned about power rates and the possible increase in power rates. It would destroy, for the most part, the entire business community in the Keewatin and my constituency and probably most of the home-ownership clients that we have. We would hope and encourage that the federal government will bring in a subsidy system that will alleviate these problems.

I would like, also, to touch on the subject of highways. I think the time is starting to come and there is already some talk in the Keewatin that perhaps if our part of the world is to go anywhere then we have to develop an infrastructure to allow us to take advantage of resource and economic development. While a highway will cost a lot of money and while it will be obviously many, many years and there will be many environmental questions to be addressed, I think that perhaps the government and the federal government should seriously start considering extension of the highway from Gillam to Churchill, through the Keewatin, around the coast. I do not see any other way to develop the resource economy of the region or to develop the tourist potential of that region. Aircraft and airstrips are just far too expensive.

We are also faced with the problem of NTCL being sold, maybe. We know that the Keewatin is one of the areas that is heavily subsidized and if the private sector would take it over then there is a good possibility that the freight rates might double or triple. If that happens, there are many of us who just cannot afford to live there any more.

Two other small items that I have and one is the home boarding issue. As you know, the Keewatin has been one of the primary pushers of trying to get its children into Yellowknife and other areas for education. One of the problems is always a lack of facilities to house them and it was thought that home boarding was the answer. I now find that home boarding people are being given T4s because it is taxable income and I am very much afraid that this is just going to discourage people from boarding children. I think that it is something that the government is going to have to look at very fast.

The other matter that I will touch on is penal institutions. I, for the first time as an MLA, have several constituents housed in the Yellowknife "Hilton" here. In talking to some of them, one of them in particular was quite open about it. He tried 17 times before he finally got there but he is there now for a number of months and I asked him why. He basically said, "Well it is just a good place to be." "I get recreation", he said, "I get three meals a day and I get a room", which he is sharing with only two or three others, and he has something to do during the day. They structure his day for him and it is a lot better than what he has at home.

I am finding that particularly among some of the younger people that this attitude is starting to prevail because the correctional system will give them a structured life and I think that is what many of our young people are looking for. They are looking for someone to structure their lives for them, to assist them in what they are doing. But I do not think it is a good way to go about it by getting yourself put in jail. I would like to see some kind of system produced whereby we do not take these young people out of the region. Maybe rather than bring them here to Yellowknife that we have camps on the land, 80 or 100 miles from the community, staffed with three or four of our older people and we send them out there for two or three months. I can tell you that after three months on the land in Baker Lake you do not want to go back a second time, particularly if you are a young person who is not used to living on the land.

Committees In Communities

I have a number of other issues that I would like to touch on here. We have heard time and time again about consultation in this government and I must admit that this government is better than most about consulting with communities when they do things. However, I do think we are at the point now where in a desire to consult as a government we are badly overloading the capacity of the communities. I think we have created far too many bodies at the community level. If you know the communities, you will know that invariably you will see the same faces time after time on these various community groups. Then after a while they drop out and you talk to them and they say, "Well, we were going to meetings every night and it was just too much." I really think that as a government and as a Legislature we have to take a long hard look at the way we are doing things. I suggest that perhaps we should look at moving these community groups together and look at having one major community body in a community and roll a lot of these committees into -- for want of a better word -- that super council, if you want to call it that for lack of a better term. I really think that the communities themselves are getting fed up because it seems that whenever you want to do something, you form a committee. I know in my community of Baker Lake we have something like 23 or 24 committees. In the region as a whole, I think we are looking at 120 committees or so for 4000 people.

Responsibility In One Major Group

What is happening now, even at the community level is that the communities themselves are starting to get disorganized, one committee does not know what the other committee is doing. It is bound to confuse people at a local level. Of course obviously every time we set up a committee, we set up a budget for that committee, we set up people to work for it and then we set up bureaucrats to look after it. I think we have gone too far and we should look at reversing the whole process and look at going to one, maybe two major groups in each community who are responsible for all functions of government in that community -- housing, education, planning, health, social services, the whole works. Roll them into one large body and allow them to hire top administration, maybe expand the hamlet council from eight to 10 and then an individual on that council could be responsible for one specific item within the community and then he could have a little subcommittee of two or three people, however many he needs to help him out. I think we have to start looking at that. I know in Pond Inlet they have tried it; in some cases they have tried it very successfully. I think other Members feel the same way that I do and it is something that we have to look at and perhaps address.

The other topic I would like to talk about is regional centres. For a long time I have never understood why this government persistently insisted on creating regional administration centres. There are a number of reasons why we should not have them. Historically speaking if you look at other areas in the world and outside of Canada, where we have a ruralized type of living pattern, regional centres have been created to the detriment of most of the people who live in that region. You will find because you create a regional centre, you put all these civil servants in there and right away the government improves services to that particular community, improves services in travel, transportation, communications, recreational facilities, water and sewer, housing. So automatically you set that community apart from the others in the region.

I think for some reason we think that if we hire people from the South then we have to improve life for them, even though the rest of us live here and we can get by. I have also questioned that because there are those of us who live outside the regional centres who live here because we want to live here, not because we have easy access to Winnipeg or because we have running water in our house.

The other major problem is that in other communities, particularly in the smaller communities some of the younger people, again, those with the skills, look at these centres and not all of them, mind you -- it is only a trickle right now but I think it could turn into a flood in a few years -- end up looking at that community and seeing what they think to be a better quality of life and moving there. They have a detrimental effect on other communities in the region in terms of population. If you look at our population stats you will find that by and large only the regional centres are increasing in a major way and other communities are starting to decrease, because the other communities have a difficult and a very trying time to match the so-called standard of living that they have in a regional centre. I think this is a policy that could ultimately be disastrous to the North.

Program Departments Should Move Out Of Regional Centres

The North must allow communities like Coppermine, Eskimo Point, Baker Lake, Tuk, Pangnirtung, Pond Inlet, Arctic Bay, to live and to thrive. To me, those communities represent the real North. That is, the values that we have in the North, that is where the values we have reside. And I suggest Mr. Speaker, that the regional centres should be broken up. I think that quite frankly some of the program departments should be moved out of the regional centres and moved into some of the larger communities. I think for one thing, it brings the government a lot closer to the communities and to the people. It provides some form of long-term economic viability for those communities and in a major way it also provides employment opportunities. I know that there are many, many talented people living outside of a regional centre who will not work for this government because they do not want to move to these regional centres.

Most of the major centres were artificially created, Mr. Speaker, whereas people prefer to live in their home community. Northern people by and large are not a transient people. They have great difficulty relocating for any length of time and if we cannot bring people to the jobs then we should take jobs to the people. It is not something that would cost a lot of money. You will hear an argument from some people that "Oh, we have to be close to each other because we work together." Well, if you have been in any of the regional centres, you will not see our regional

superintendent putting his parka on and going outside and walking up the hill to another regional office. He will pick the phone up and call the other regional superintendent. You can call somebody in Rankin Inlet from Baker Lake just as easily.

We can also use it to enforce improved services for those communities, in the ways of transportation and communication. It just gives us better all-round communities. I agree that perhaps there is a necessity to have departments like Personnel, Finance, Government Services and Public Works together, because they are service departments and these departments do work very closely together but I can see no reason why program departments should have to be kept together. Mr. Pedersen alluded in his statistics in his reply, to our creation of two classes of people. You will find that money and incomes are much higher in regional centres than in other communities of comparable size within the same region. It also leads to enmity and bitterness within the region and that is something that we do not need either. All we have to do is look at areas in Newfoundland and rural areas in Scotland and Alaska to see what this centralization of administrative centres did to those areas -- it decimated the rural communities. Over a period of years we ended up with either very old people or very young people. As the older people were dying off the younger people were growing up and moving away. I can take you home and show you the communities, Mr. Speaker, that thrived 100 years, fishing communities that no longer exist. I think that is the long-term implication for us in the North. I think this is the process that we have now set in motion.

When I look at the regional centres I do not see any reason why some program departments cannot be moved out of the Fort Smith office to Hay River, Simpson and Edzo. I do not see why, in the Central Arctic, some functions could not be moved into Coppermine. In the Keewatin I do not see why some functions cannot be moved into Eskimo Point and Baker Lake. In Baffin, I do not see why some of the government programs in Frobisher Bay could not be moved into Pond Inlet, Nanisivik and Pangnirtung. We have the capacity to do that. It is not a very difficult job whatsoever. It could be done within a matter of a year.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Hear, hear!

HON. GORDON WRAY: I think and I detect that the political will is in this room and it is something that we should start moving on. We talk about affirmative action. Well, to me that would be one of the most positive affirmative action steps that we could take. I can guarantee you that if we move some of these departments into some of the larger communities, you are going to find that people will come to work for this government. And you are going to find that there are people with the ability to work for this government. And you are going to find that those departments that we do move out, within a very short time even more so than the departments or even the regional centres, will be staffed by people from the communities because the capacity is there. I know it is there.

Few Benefits To People Of The North From Federal Projects

Two other topics that I will briefly mention are with regard to the federal government, Mr. Speaker. I think this government has made major strides using its money for the people of the NWT, Mr. Speaker, particularly when we look at some of the policies that appear to be put in place now with regard to business and business incentives. But I have to say that when I look at the federal government, the reverse is true. That is a major concern to me because the federal government puts as much money into the Territories as the territorial government. I know of major instances within this last year where federal DPW have hired companies to work in communities on projects that were never tendered. They seem to have a list in their offices in Winnipeg and Edmonton that they use from time to time to pick consultants and to pick people to do the work. They come in, but they do not hire any local people. They do not stay in the hotels. In fact they put nothing into the communities.

The Ministry of Transport is almost as bad. In my own community of Baker Lake, right now we are in a major fight with the federal government. They want to bring a construction camp into our community because they are going to do some work at the airport, even though Baker Lake is one of the few communities in the Eastern Arctic which has two commercial facilities for accommodation. The argument, believe it or not, is that the airport is too far away and they need a construction camp at the airport for the workers to be on site. Well, Mr. Speaker, the nearest commercial facility to the airport in Baker Lake is less than two miles away. Now, can you tell me that if they were building a project or an airport in Winnipeg or Edmonton, that if they could not find accommodation within two miles from that airport, that they would build a construction camp? Not on your life.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this government, this Legislature, has to take the federal government on. They have poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the North in the last few years and we have seen very little benefit. We have seen very little in the way of development of an economic infrastructure. We have seen very little in the way of employment. If you look at their existing organizations -- organizations which have been in existence longer than this government, organizations such as Environment Canada water resources, Transport Canada air radio, these organizations have been in existence for 25, 30 years in some communities, and yet the northerners working in these agencies are few and far between. The federal government has not lived up, I believe, to what we expect it to do in the North. Perhaps with the new government in power we can rechannel or refocus some of their efforts. But it is a major concern to me and to my constituents and I would hope that at some point in time, this Legislature could indicate to the federal government our displeasure at the way they do business in the North.

Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps this is an area that I am going to get myself in trouble on, but with regard to the question of Nunavut, as you know, Mr. Speaker, talks on constitutional development and talks on the so-called tentative boundary agreement have stalled. There has been a lot of acrimony and bitterness in this whole debate. We have heard charges of hidden agendas, of negotiating in bad faith. But I want to put on record my position and the position that has been confirmed to me by my communities as late as two weeks ago.

Member's Position On Tentative Boundary Agreement

I do not support the tentative boundary agreement. I will admit to being one of the ones who actively worked to convince others that we should not support it. I think it was a bad agreement for a number of reasons, some of which transcend parochial reasons of constituency or geographic area. But just to clarify or just to make sure that people understand, when the Nunavut caucus took the position of opposing that tentative boundary agreement, after long meetings it was a unanimous position. It was not the position of three or four others that forced it upon the rest. It was a unanimous position. I have my own reasons for not supporting it and I am not afraid to make them public, Mr. Speaker. I have done so in my communities already in front of hundreds of people. So it is nothing new. Before I talk about those reasons, however, there are some areas that I would like to address, which caused me concern.

For the purpose of this exercise, I am an ordinary MLA. I was quite surprised to hear of the tentative boundary agreement. I was quite surprised by the fact that I was not given an opportunity to have input into that decision or to ratify that decision before it was made public. My communities are very upset over the fact that a major decision was made without at least going back to the communities to talk about it.

Right Of Self-Determination Taken Away

Mr. Speaker, among other things, this is what surprised me most. Given my knowledge of the people who were sitting around that table, since the day I came north, in all the jobs I have ever held, and the dealings I have had with native organizations in the communities, there was one thing that stood out time and time again. That was the principle of self-determination. It is something in the North that we are very aware of. It is something that I know the communities that I have lived in for years have fought for. That is, there is a right of the people to determine their own future. That has been an underlying principle of every native organization of every community in the NWT for the last 15 years. And above all, the tentative boundary agreement takes that right away. That makes me very fearful, Mr. Speaker, because when you take the right away once, then you can take it away a second time. I would say to the native people in the West, that to support that agreement they are going to have to be very, very careful, because if you take away the right of self-determination from the Inuvialuit, there is no reason why the right of self-determination cannot then be taken away from the Dene. Perhaps they could lose that right just by virtue of the fact that they support the tentative boundary agreement without really thinking about what it was going to do for them in the long-term process. Because while that was one process to be done, there was still another process to be completed and that was to figure out the type of government that the West was going to have.

I do not know about hidden agendas, Mr. Speaker. But I tend to try and think things through and see what consequences there may be not immediately, but two, three and five years down the road. I would say that the native people in the western part of the Territories are placing themselves in a very precarious position when it comes to negotiating their own future within a western territory.

Now, there may be some argument about whether that right was taken away. I must admit that there is confusion around the whole agreement and this leads me to the fact that when I went back to my communities, there was total confusion over what had happened here and what was happening in the past. I must take the blame for that. It was my responsibility to keep those communities informed. However, if I was not kept informed, it was very difficult for me to do that.

Confusion has reigned throughout this whole process. It has reigned in this House. It has reigned in the press. It has reigned among the federal government. The whole process has been utterly confusing to those of us who were on the outside of it, somewhat. It is not helped by the fact that statements made by Members of this House have conflicted with each other. They have contributed to the confusion. And I will give an example, Mr. Speaker, because I would certainly like some clarification at some point in time from the individuals involved.

The honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre, in his reply to the Commissioner's Address, made several statements which on the face of it are not bad statements. I might even agree with him actually but I will repeat them for you because I am looking for consistency and I have never been able to find consistency throughout this whole process. Mr. MacQuarrie said that the Inuvialuit would have the right to decide and if they determined that the discussions failed, then they were not to be forced into a western territory. In fact Mr. MacQuarrie went to great lengths to explain how the Inuvialuit would not be brought into a western territory kicking and screaming and how in fact it was a staff member of WCF who wrote in "subject to the above", because they were worried about forcing the Inuvialuit into a western territory. Further on in his speech he says that, "If in fact, this were a legal agreement and they", the Inuvialuit, "were forced into a western territory without a vote, then maybe...that would have been undemocratic. But that is not the case." They were not to be forced.

Conflicting Statements In WCF Transcripts

But all throughout the Member's reply, he quite correctly I believe, pointed out that the agreement did not call for the Inuvialuit to be sold out, as has been said. And in fact in the discussions, and I read the transcripts of the meetings that the two forums were having, the discussions did centre around that and that there was general feeling that that was not to happen. Yet, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the WCF, somebody that I suppose I have to listen to, because he is the chairman of the WCF, and I assume that he is a spokesman for the WCF, he says, contrary to the Member for Yellowknife Centre, something entirely different. Time after time he made the comments, "We are very glad that the Beaufort area will be in the West". That was January 14th. January 17th, "It was agreed in the alliance that the Inuvialuit community should not have a choice in order to have an agreement on part of the boundary." On January 23rd in the WCF newsletter, "The entire Inuvialuit settlement area will be in the western territory." So, I would be very pleased if the two gentlemen would at some point in time get together and get their stories straight because it would certainly avoid confusing me, for one.

The other thing that bothers me is that the statements being made do not sound like a negotiating position. They sound very much like an ultimatum. "To me, if the Inuvialuit are not in the West, then there is no division." That completely destroys the attempts to reach any meaningful solution between the two groups.

Mr. MacQuarrie also alluded to the fact that Mr. Curley may have a different agenda than the rest of the people. Well Mr. Curley's agenda, along with most of the rest of us who support Nunavut has always been that Nunavut meant more or less a tree line boundary. That should not come as any surprise to anybody because that was the original position put forward 10 years ago and it is a position that we have consistently stuck with. Now we have said that we would be flexible in the type of boundary that will be set up but generally speaking, for the purposes of discussions, we were looking at something along the lines of a tree line boundary -- 100 miles on either side of it, 50 miles on either side of it, but generally speaking that was the thrust that we, in the East, have always had.

Confusion And Disagreement Within Both Forums

Again, as I say, it was a position that we have always had and I assume was clearly understood by everybody. Again, confusing statements coming out of the WCF. Mr. Sibbeston on January 14th, "Regardless of where the boundary is, we will share the revenues to be derived for a number of years." Fine, but then 11 days later an employee of the WCF, "The organization has only agreed to

explore the concept and not share the resources." So once again the same organization, two different individuals giving us two different stories. So, obviously, we have conflict within the WCF as well and within the NCF. Some are saying that the Inuvialuit will decide. Others say, "No, it is a fait accompli, Inuvialuit in the West, forget about them ever going to the East." So, I would much prefer, rather than the self-righteous statements being made by everybody, that people be truthful with the rest of us who are not involved in this process and tell us exactly what was meant. It is one of the reasons that I voted not to support the boundary agreement because I felt that there were far too many gray areas and far too many possible areas of confusion, which has now proved to be true. In fact, not only do both sides disagree with each other now but even people within those forums are disagreeing with each other as to what actually happened.

It has upset me greatly because we are embarking on a major thrust of this government and of the Legislature. It was the desire of the people of the Northwest Territories and the people charged with that responsibility do not seem to know what they are doing. They do not seem to know what they want or if they do know what they want, then they do not know how to put it down on paper properly so as to avoid confusion for the rest of the population.

Mr. Patterson took the honourable way out, regardless of what Mr. Amagoalik says, and I really do not give very much credence to Mr. Amagoalik's comments about Mr. Patterson's resignation. It was not a particularly smart comment to make and if there is one way to destroy Nunavut it is continuing to make comments like that. He took the honourable way out. We would not support -- Mr. Patterson will admit, some of us literally raked him over the coals and I would do it again in a moment if I saw such a piece of paper coming out from a body that I had a lot more respect for.

Reasons For Non-Support

As I said, one of the reasons I did not support it is that it does remove the right of self-determination according to some members of the WCF and according to some of the things that I read. Among other reasons why I did not support it, it was not a good deal for those of us in the East. There is all this talk and these principles that they have about maintaining a viable territory and yet the proposed tentative agreement would have left us in the East with perhaps the possibility of as few as 14,000 people in 21 communities. Is that fair? Is that a viable territory? Is that an equitable process? It is not even close to it, Mr. Speaker. Maybe what members of the WCF mean when they say "viable", is that they have everything and we have nothing. They would confirm the status quo that has been in existence for the last 20 years and that was the reason why we wanted Nunavut in the first place.

I think that we can see that from this part of the Territories attitudes have not changed. In fact, a clear concept of fair and equitable appears to me to be one of keeping us 20 years behind them. On a population standpoint it was not a good deal for us. From an economic standpoint it was not a good deal for us. From a geographic standpoint it was not a good deal for us. In fact, all the major reasons for having Nunavut would have been destroyed by that very agreement. Members will make light of the fact that it was the NCF that brought this agreement to the table. I do not disagree with them. I do not dispute that but because NCF brought it to the table, does not mean that I have to support it. I think they made a mistake. The people I represent think they made a mistake, and I think they made a very bad mistake, Mr. Speaker.

I think there was an overanxiousness on people's part to reach an agreement but if it takes five years or if it takes 10 years or 20 years to reach an equitable solution then that is how long we are going to have to take. We cannot build a new government and build a new part of a country that one day may be a province on a desire to accommodate narrow interests. I tend to lay the blame, Mr. Speaker, not on the WCF alone nor the NCF alone, but on the alliance as a whole. I think they did a disservice to the people of the North by coming up with an agreement that was so full of holes, that was so open to interpretation that it was going to be the subject of so much controversy and I would question why it was allowed to happen. I think I know what happened on the NCF side. From the WCF I can certainly see why they would be in a hurry to get this agreement signed and approved. It gives them everything that they want or appears to give them everything that they want. Then again, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about hidden agendas and it was quite possible that there were hidden agendas on both sides, Mr. Speaker.

"Hidden Agendas" On Both Sides

None of us are so naive as to forget the fact that there is a major group in this part of the Northwest Territories that does not want division. We saw it in the plebiscite and we have seen it in statements by the people from over here. We know that the Dene Nation will not accept division

unless they can satisfy themselves that there is some means of protection for their people and I do not quarrel with that. I quarrel with the fact that they want to use the Inuvialuit to give them that protection. By the way, the Inuvialuit would not give them protection because if they think that by adding the Inuvialuit in, there would be enough native votes over here to combat the non-native votes then they are short by about 8000 or 9000 people. They seem to want to use the Inuvialuit to give them protection, whatever protection they need. I think they have to negotiate that by themselves and not piggyback on the backs of others to do it. I think that there are a lot of hidden agendas around, Mr. Speaker.

I think it was well-known and I would suspect in some quarters, it was well-known that this agreement would not be palatable to those of us from the East and that, in itself, was a good reason for trying to force the agreement through because it was known that the agreement itself would probably delay division or even have it put on the back burner for the next few years. So, there have been a lot of hidden agendas, Mr. Speaker. I do not think any one Member has exclusive rights to those hidden agendas. We have heard various speakers in the last few days say that we should maybe relook at division. I am willing and open to looking at division but I can tell you that my position on division has not changed because I do not think we can do any worse with it than we are doing without it.

Lack Of Infrastructure In The East

I look at the two sides of the Arctic and the East has not been served well by this government and by this Legislature. We have one high school, you have about five or six over here. We have one hospital, you have about three or four over here. I know the millions of dollars that have been poured into the highway system every year and into winter roads. There is \$100,000 that gets poured into the Eastern Arctic for the same transportation infrastructure. I look at medical facilities, I look at the economic development that has taken place, I look at the money that has been poured into that economic development infrastructure and nobody will ever convince me that the East was ever treated favourably in the past. Communications are probably ahead because we have Bell Canada and you got stuck with NorthwesTel. So that is one we won.

---Applause

We do not have the facilities in the East, we do not have the infrastructure and I would suspect that we for the most part will not be able to develop them under this present system of government. So we can do no worse with Nunavut than we have done without it.

But after saying that, I will not be placed in a position of accepting Nunavut at all costs. I have said before and I will say again publicly -- a Nunavut at all costs is no Nunavut at all and I would never support it. There are people who think that Nunavut is dead. They can forget about that too. Nunavut is something that we have been trying to get for 10 years and we are going to keep trying. It might take us two years or five or 10 or it might even take us 50 years. But one day we are going to get Nunavut, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that it is a Nunavut that will be arrived at in a fashion that dignifies the whole process and that an equitable agreement is arrived at.

I would caution the people involved, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere in the world in the history of man has a boundary which is imposed on people, been successful. Whether you talk about the Middle East, India or Pakistan, whether you talk about Northern and Southern Ireland, no boundary imposed has ever been successful. I do not think we have to repeat those kinds of mistakes, Mr. Speaker. I think we have the capacity and I think we have the good will and hopefully the good will will be there again to arrive at a decision which will be fair to both sides of the Arctic. The Inuvialuit must have a say in where they go. That say has to be respected by both sides. Whether or not one side likes it or not, it has to be respected. If the Inuvialuit going into one territory is going to cause problems to the other territory, then let us make sure that the other territory has enough protection built into it so that the Inuvialuit leaving does not cause it problems. We can do that.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, we must always remember that people have the right to decide their futures and the right to decide where they want to live and under what government they are going to live. I do not know where we are going from here, Mr. Speaker. I think that the process has been put off the rails temporarily. There is no agreement, there is no tentative agreement and even though it was ratified in pettiness by this House, it is clear to all that no agreement exists. At some point in time, I do not know how, because we have been unable to do it, there has to be discussion

in this House on constitutional development, on the future of constitutional development and on the future of the Constitutional Alliance and on the future of division. We owe it to the people who voted for us and we owe it to the people of the NWT to have that debate. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wray. Replies to the Commissioner's Address. This will probably be the last day for replies. Are there any further replies? Mr. Butters.

---Applause

Mr. Butters' Reply

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief reply. I had intended to contribute these remarks in the great non-debate on division, but before doing so, Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment you and your staff on the arrangements made on the occasion of the formal opening of this chamber. It was an opportunity and an occasion which will not occur again, to gather together in one place, and in this place, so many of the individuals who have contributed to the rise and the evolution of responsible government in the NWT. So you are to be commended on that initiative, sir.

Mr. Speaker, when the Hon. David Crombie addressed this House just a short seven weeks ago, he said in part and I quote from his remarks: "Your two constitutional forums are unique, bringing together your elected officials with leaders of the native peoples to explore and secure social and political consensus on constitutional development." Further on he said, "Less than just a month ago, the Western and Nunavut Constitutional Forums reached consensus on the most acceptable process for defining the boundaries of the two new territories." And further, "There has been elaborate consultation by the people with the people. There seems to be consensus that the boundary process which is being followed is both practical and sensible. I find...the logic of the decision compelling."

Now, it would appear that the consensus referred to by Mr. Crombie no longer exists. While individual members of the Nunavut Constitutional Forum have not yet responded to the chairman of the Western Constitutional Forum's request for formal confirmation that the joint agreement announced in Yellowknife on January 14th is dead, it is quite apparent that that is the case. Not only have we just finished hearing the remarks from the honourable Member for Kivallivik but when the former chairman of the Nunavut Constitutional Forum tendered his resignation on Monday, February 25th, he said in part, "The unanimous consensus which emerged yesterday, Mr. Speaker" -- and he is referring to the consensus of the Nunavut constitutional caucus -- "was that the conditions precedent to division insisted upon and demanded by the Western Constitutional Forum would likely result in a new Nunavut territory which would not be viable nor have the potential for provincehood for a long time, if ever."

This position is supported by the joint press release issued March 8th by the mayors of Tuktoyaktuk, Sachs Harbour, Paulatuk, Holman Island, Coppermine and Cambridge Bay, when they indicated -- and this is from the press release of that date -- "The mayors unanimously rejected the report and requested its immediate repeal by the Assembly. They wish to make it clear that this present position of the Beaufort Sea and Kitikmeot West communities is that they intend to be part of Nunavut." If the tree line boundary is the position being advanced by the Nunavut Forum, then I suggest that body is asking that the whole question of division be reopened and re-examined.

I represent a community that in the plebiscite, more than 75 per cent voted against division proceeding. When this Assembly agreed to support division -- it occurred in my constituency, a constituency that voted against division -- and on that occasion and in that place, I supported the initiative to move toward a division of the Territories. In my constituency I believe that the major reason for the opposition to division at that time was due to the possibility of a tree line boundary proposal being advanced. The tree line boundary, Mr. Speaker, slicing westward some 10 or 15 miles north of Inuvik is not acceptable to the majority of my constituents. I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that a tree line boundary would neither be acceptable to the rest of Canada and particularly the western provinces. If Nunavut Forum members are seriously advancing the proposition of a tree line boundary, they should be aware that they could also be inviting the provinces of Canada to our talks on division.

In responding to the recent outcry from Western Arctic communities and Kitikmeot communities, many people seemed to have overlooked the fact that a significant number of communities in the Western Arctic, Aklavik, Inuvik, Fort McPherson and Arctic Red River have not been consulted at all. That is consulted by the WCF. I remember the NCF visited Inuvik and I attended that meeting but we have not had a community consultation with the WCF. When that forum in the past has come into the Western Arctic, they have been on their way to Tuk, Sachs Harbour or Paulatuk. I suggest there is much consultation to the discussion that should be occurring among the 5000 people of the Mackenzie Delta, who to date have been ignored, and especially they should be consulted, involved and receive voting privileges if a tree line boundary is a serious consideration. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Butters. Replies to the Commissioner's Address. Mr. McCallum.

Mr. McCallum's Reply

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I cannot promise how long I would want to talk because I think that there are things that were in the Commissioner's Address that I would like to comment upon, however brief I could make them.

Just from the beginning I want to indicate to you, sir, that the opening of this session was something that I took a great deal of pride in. That is, having former Councillors, former Commissioners here to take a look at what has gone on since their time, I am sure was a source of pride to those people. It as well gave us an opportunity to indicate to them the appreciation that we have for what they have done in the past.

In making a reply, Mr. Speaker, it is normal for one to go through a litany as it were of concerns in one's constituency. As we have been here for a number of weeks and we have talked about concerns of our constituencies in relation to departmental review of the budget, I need not go to any great degree into concerns. Obviously what concerns my particular community, concerns almost everyone else's community: the housing needs and the concern for people to be able to acquire housing or accommodation; employment and the economic development opportunities, both in the sense of a community and regionally. There are concerns in my community about business people getting those economic opportunities. I hope that with the new initiatives of the government people will be able to take advantage of any kind of opportunity that would come along to get involved. This government is a big spender. It spends a lot in particular communities. I would want to ensure that people within my community have an opportunity to get involved with that kind of expenditure. It involves not just getting part of the money or part of the action but it involves as well, to a great degree I believe, the training of particular people even for short periods of time in new and different avenues.

In the discussion that we had on particular departments, I commend the government for affirmative action that has been put forward. I have some concerns in terms of it, that it will only be involved in one particular area and it will not deal with affirmative action throughout. I know the government is embarking upon a step-by-step approach to it. But I think affirmative action means looking at all minorities. I think that there are concerns that would have to be raised on this affirmative action as it is related to the opportunities for all people who are born, educated, raised in the Territories to avail themselves of opportunities to come into the government.

I obviously have a concern, Mr. Speaker, with the government's position on the appointment of justices of the peace. I know that the question has been settled in the minds of the government. That will not detract, for others of us who do not agree with it, from raising it.

The programs the Minister of Housing has embarked upon in relation to the concerns put forward by the special committee are to be applauded as well. I think those are the kinds of things that will give a better view of how government will react to concerns that are raised in this House by Members or by standing or special committees. A very quick reaction to those is to be commended, as I say, by the House because of the quickness of the action. I trust that these programs will be put into place as quickly as possible.

Sense Of Unity In The East And In The West

I have some concern, Mr. Speaker, about what is going on or what has taken place in this whole aspect of the division of the NWT. There is no need to go into more acrimony, more harsh words, other than to say obviously what has taken place is not acceptable to a great number of people. I think that one of the things that stands out, obviously to you, to me, and to others in the whole exercise is that it is parochial but it has indicated to me that there is a sense of unity, at least in the West. It has obviously shown a sense of unity in the East. And as people in the East believe in and want what they see as a final solution, so do people in the West.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible comment)

MR. McCALLUM: I am talking about all people. I am talking about all people in the East and in the West, but I know that there has been a greater coming together of people in the West for what they feel is their right. I would hope that there would be some kind of resolution to this particular problem, however it will come about. We must continue to do it because I think people have a right to get what they desire. We must work toward it. There is obviously going to be a great deal of compromise, not so much compromise on principles but compromise on how it will take place. Just as people have indicated that they are not prepared to change their minds on what they believe, so I am not prepared to change my mind on a particular principle.

The division problem is not to be on the back burner. I think the division problem will have to continue and the discussions among those in whom we have placed a great deal of faith in putting them on the particular forums and naming them to the alliance itself -- that faith has to be vindicated. I have every confidence in those people that I put or helped to put on to represent my particular viewpoint, be it from the West or be it from the non-native. The particular discussions that have gone on in the past may not have resulted in an agreed solution but the solution has to come about. People in the Territories are not satisfied with what we have now. There has to be a continued dialogue and whatever the end result will be, it will have to be for our better interests. We will have to be able to try to achieve what each of us wants to get and obviously we have all indicated that we are not happy with what we have now, we are not happy with the way things operate, we are not happy with the arrangements that we have. We want some change.

Division is only one particular step in this whole business of constitutional development. It may be a small step, but it is only one of them. There are other particular concerns. I think that with continued dialogue and at least some good will on both sides, that there may be a resolution to what we are trying to do. I think there is a demand then for each and every one of us to continue that kind of dialogue, not to let it die, not to pass it aside. If that is the only result there will be, indeed, a great deal more acrimony, even greater and harsher words.

Agreement On Principle Of Division

My particular purpose, Mr. Speaker, is to continue to see that that particular dialogue continues. I have my particular viewpoints on what should occur and I will express those to my representatives on the Western Constitutional Forum and therefore on to the alliance. We agreed with division, the question is how. Just as we have concerns, so do others from the East. We do not agree on where that division line should be but we do agree that there should be a division of the Territories and I think that if there were to be a plebiscite taken again, you would find a greater number of people agreeing to that division, to the principle of division. As to how it will be divided, that is the crux of it. That is where the discussions have to continue and it is not enough that one would take a particular stand and stay in there on one side and others take a different stand and stand on the other side. They have to come together as to where we are going to have this line.

What factors will make each of those new Territories viable, I think is immaterial. What will actually have to happen is to ensure that people expect and can attain a certain degree of autonomy in their own area. I think the particular arrangements can be worked out but it will require a great deal of down to earth negotiation on each side. The principle of division is there, it is where it is to be divided and once we reach that there are other avenues or other goals and other objectives that we have got to try and reach. For my part then, Mr. Speaker, I would ensure that I would want to be involved with the process, either directly or indirectly as a Member, or through being a Member through my representatives on the alliance, therefore, the Western Forum.

As I said, I am not too sure, Mr. Speaker, whether one should go back and relive what has gone on. A great number of things have been said by a number of people and time, I guess, has a way of maybe mellowing people to it. When the discussions and the harsh words were being thrown back and forth in the beginning, one felt tempted to get up and rebut them then. I do not think that it will serve a great deal of purpose to do that now. I think what we have to do is to set a renewed idea as to what or how we are going to go about it. For that, Mr. Speaker, I as a Member of the Legislature, will continue to work toward that kind of resolution.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have anything further to add other than to indicate to people of the eastern caucus that we in the western caucus are prepared to sit down and to work something out with you so long as we are both going to be aware that there are certain conditions, certain principles that we have as well and we would want to put those forth. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Replies to the Commissioner's Address. Mr. Pudluk.

Mr. Pudluk's Reply

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, I will make this brief. I will not tell you what my wife is like. I would like to thank my wife -- she has been helping me a lot since I have been a Member of the Legislative Assembly, for the last 10 years. I also would like to indicate that next election I will not be running again for re-election so that I can be with my family while I am still alive. Since I met my wife I have spent a great deal more time travelling than being with her. Before I became a Member of this House I used to travel to the hospitals quite a lot after I injured my foot and then it had to be amputated and this was the start of my travelling. Maybe then, perhaps, I was with my wife for two months. Since then, up to now, I have been travelling extensively.

Since I have been an MLA I have gone through a lot of good things and a lot of bad things. Losing some family members and some of my friends and there are my friends that travelled from my constituency, moving to their original community.

Medical Services Needed In Resolute Bay Area

Mr. Speaker, I will be talking in English once in a while and in Inuktitut once in a while. I would like to talk a bit on health. Grise Fiord has a concern. When there is a medical evacuation needed they have to travel seven hours before they can reach the nearest hospital. They had asked if they could use Thule, Greenland, for emergency cases instead. They were answered that after the US army left there they do not have facilities any more in Thule. I have been thinking about that and I will be a Member yet for the next two years unless we have a re-election before then. One of the things that I would like to achieve is that the Government of Canada and the Government of the NWT can work together to place a doctor or nurse in the Resolute area. There is an increase in emergency evacuations from my constituency. There are two mines in our area and there are a number of oil companies too, and as well there are some small communities or camps of the federal government, such places like Alert, Mould Bay, and there are others existing.

Resolute Bay is the centre for surrounding communities. It is serviced by jet air lines four times a week. The evacuations always have to go through Resolute Bay. There are always Twin Otters on stand-by all the time. For that reason I will be making a motion to see if the Government of Canada and the GNWT can work together to get a centre in Resolute Bay. We definitely need the facility. I would like this to be included in my reply and I hope it is understood.

Since I became an MLA in 1975, a number of times I have replied to the Commissioner's Address and I always have included the concerns and problems of my constituency in my reply but there has never been any action taken afterwards. Therefore I am asking or requesting to get a nurse or doctor and that you keep that in mind. (Translation ends)

Impact Of Non-Native Cultures

I would like to speak in English for a while. A long time ago those aboriginal people have been living in the NWT since they have been created. In the 1950s, the "others" started coming to the North, like Hudson's Bay people, RCMP and ministers. I know myself that we were living one day at

a time -- if I do not get a seal today we are going to be hungry tomorrow. In our culture -- I do not know about Dene -- but the Inuit never really planned for the future, for the next month, or a five year plan. We never had that because of the hardships of living in the North. So when they started coming around in the 1950s and even before I was born -- I was born in 1943 -- we were living by the furs mostly, to buy sugar, tea, coffee, and clothing. Once a year my father took the whole family to the camp where those "others" were living, the Hudson's Bay people, police and the ministers. Every time when I had to go to those buildings I had to knock on the door so they could let me in. But for native people, that is not their tradition. Everyone is welcome. If I knocked at the door at 11:00 o'clock at night and somebody said "I am sorry it is too late. Come back tomorrow", we do not do that. An Inuk does not do that. Those "others" should be proud to be happy and welcome in the North.

We are proud. One time when I was six years old, we went to that camp again. I walked in and I had no money and poor clothing, and they gave me a piece of gum. Before I grabbed it he said, "Could you dance for us before I give it to you?" I had to dance because I liked that gum. Even candy. "Here's a candy, dance for us." I had to dance because I liked that candy. Today I can buy my own gum and candy. I wish those guys were here today.

One time, not very long ago I started working for MOT and only single people were living at that base. One thing I cannot forget. There were "others" from Montreal. They said to me "Do you like your job?" Yes, I like it because I like money. As a matter of fact I wanted an increase. My boss said, "Okay, I will give you a deal. Never mind the increase in your salary. Bring me a woman or your job is finished." That is one thing I cannot forget.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think aboriginal people should be inferior or servants to the "others". They are living together for so long and the communication is good, the relationship is good. We have never had a war. We have been pushed from the South to the North to be relocated and we have been living there ever since. I think division was a good answer but we have been deserted. I think the Dene and Inuit have had good communications. So when we are dealing with the law, ordinances, we are still looking for a better living. The way the people treated me, as I said a few minutes ago, I do not know how the Dene have been treated.

(Translation) I will go on to another subject. First of all in my constituency the oil is going to start to be moved and it is the first time in the North. There were 45 gallons sent to Montreal and I was really happy about it. Panarctic have been working in the North for 14 years. I am very glad that they have allocated a great deal of money and they have been employing many Inuit people. When they wanted to start transporting oil there was no disagreement whatsoever from the people. My concern is that in the future other companies will want to start companies in the North for transporting oil. I think now that as the present oil company is operating, in the next 10 years if another company wants to start up in the North, it can be agreed upon then. I do not have much more to say, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Members' replies. Mr. Nerysoo.

Mr. Nerysoo's Reply

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to begin by dealing with the issue of constitutional development, however I will, without question, deal with that as a concluding remark. Mr. Speaker I have a number of concerns with regard to constituency matters and I would like to go on record as having raised them, so that my colleagues are aware of some of the issues and concerns that I now have from a constituency perspective.

Prior to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my personal appreciation to Members of the Executive Council who I believe have done extremely good work over the past year, and in fact have responded in many cases to the issues that have been identified as priorities as a government and those issues that have been raised by the Members of this Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, when I became the Government Leader I did not and have not since then, risen to express my personal appreciation to all Members of this House for the honour that they have bestowed upon me, and really that recognition, at least that acceptance that I was able to lead the Executive Council, but even more than that, again my appreciation to all Members of the Legislative

Assembly for being so supportive of me and I believe of the government and the direction that the government has taken. There have been days though, when we have not all agreed, and without any question, we will continue to disagree. I refer not only to Members in this House but also to Members on the Executive Council. That is the nature of running government. That is the nature and the reason why we were elected to this Legislature. We come from different areas, we represent different perspectives and therefore, without question, that is the reality of the people who are here.

Inadequacy Of Medical Services In Constituency

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of issues that I wish to raise and put on public record. The question of medical services in my particular constituency continues to be an extremely difficult issue and a problem area. The recent decision of the federal government to cut back on finances to the nursing stations has not improved matters and in fact it has caused problems for the communities that I represent. I do not believe that the federal government has taken into consideration the importance and the vital service that is carried out by nursing stations and the nurses that are placed in those stations. I would hope that the Minister of Health and Social Services would at some time discuss that particular item with the Minister of Health and Welfare Canada to see if there can be some solution to ensuring that the finances required to provide that vital service do continue or are maintained at the level that is presently offered, as opposed to reducing that particular service.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe that there is also a serious need to review the process by which nurses are being recruited for nursing stations throughout the NWT. There seems to be a severe lack of orientation on the part of those nurses and in some cases they are being hired through processes that are not normal. In many instances people have no idea of the stations or the atmosphere or the people that they are to serve. There is no orientation that is being offered by the federal government to those nurses and therefore I believe that it contributes to lowering the morale of the communities and the respect that a community gives to the nurses. It also contributes to the lack of morale within the nursing stations themselves. I refer to the nurses and this is not a very healthy sign. It does not create a very healthy relationship between the service that the nurses are providing and the community itself.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the services of doctors, particularly in my constituency, I really have to say that the service that is presently being offered is one that requires a very serious assessment. I do not think that anyone would be satisfied with the kind of services that are being provided to my communities. Certainly, I believe that there is a real need to review our participation in ensuring that there are proper medical professional services in the Inuvik Region. I know from my personal experience over the past few years there was a report done and a health committee that was established and recommended that the responsibility for the nursing stations and in fact the hospital, be turned over to the GNWT, or at least that they begin negotiations to take that over. I really believe that it is necessary to proceed, knowing of course that the communities would want some kind of representation to ensure that the interests of the communities were recognized in the negotiations.

I think that Members here are well aware of the criticisms that have been expressed on behalf of Members in this House, particularly by Ms Cournoyea and Mr. Butters, who represent that particular region. We are subject to a lot of criticism because we do not have the responsibility for that particular service. Really I believe that it is a service that is vital to the community.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Hear, hear!

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I must say that while we continue to receive opposition particularly, I believe, from the Dene Nation and the Metis Association, the reality is that the leadership of those organizations live in Yellowknife and with the services in this particular community, there is no problem. There is no problem with the kind of medical services where one can walk out of the office to a doctor's office here in the community, in Yellowknife, and there are a number of doctors. The unfortunate situation in the particular case of the Delta is that we have one regional hospital that supports two regions, the Beaufort-Mackenzie Delta and the Sahtu region. We all know about the complaints with regard to the professional services that have been offered to the people in those particular communities. In fact at one time, I believe, there was a request in this House by the previous Member to provide a doctor specifically for the Sahtu region.

I do and would recommend to the Minister that he really carry out what I believe is some direction that he has received on the part of the region, that you seriously begin the discussions even knowing that that particular support from the Dene executive may not be there. Certainly from a regional perspective, the chiefs have supported that particular turnover. They have supported improvement in the services and without any question unless there is certainty and stability in the services and consistency, then there is not going to be an improvement. I really feel that presently because of the uncertain relationship that people in Inuvik or that particular region have to the hospital, and the services that are being offered here in Yellowknife, and there is presently no real relationship in reporting or providing information on particular patients, then that service will not meet the needs of the people in that particular region. I think it is important that we recognize that and try to ensure that if any discussions are to occur that those are elements of those particular discussions. I need not speak on behalf of Mr. T'Seleie, who is the Member for Sahtu. He has raised that particular issue previously, the need to improve medical services, and without question, has spoken too on a number of occasions personally about that.

Mr. Speaker, I raise the point, of course, of the hospital and I do hope that the Minister of Health and Social Services begins the discussions on those particular items, and certainly, as I indicated, it involves the community.

Support For Home-Ownership Programs

With regard to housing, Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation again to the Executive Council, and in fact directly to the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation who has in fact responded in my opinion very well in trying to deal with the question of the lack of housing and the need for an improvement in programs that were required to enhance the housing situation and housing development in the NWT. I just wanted to say that, while there has been criticism in this House at times of the manner in which government has responded to housing, I think that we have to recognize some of the programs that we offer to the people of the NWT. In particular a recognition of what is really a first in this country and I say this particularly as it relates to the home-ownership assistance program. Nowhere else in the country does there exist a government program that provides up to \$50,000 to any individual who wishes to participate in the home-ownership program. Nowhere. Yet, the GNWT offers that program. I think we have to recognize and, of course, without any doubt as a Legislature approving the expenditures and approving that particular program, take credit for supporting that program.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that within my constituency a need continues without any question for public housing units. But my personal preference and suggestion is that we continue to improve those programs that encourage more and more people to own their own homes. And I certainly support any initiative that would recognize and incorporate such a direction. I believe that this Executive Council again has done that on a number of occasions and encouraged more expenditures of funds in those particular areas. I believe that that is in fact the route to go and if the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation could continue to discuss maybe with his federal colleague or negotiate with his federal colleague, more and more funds that would be tailored to home-ownership, I believe that that certainly would receive my full support.

All-Weather Roads, Aklavik

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to raise two items with roads and I know that my colleague, the Minister of Public Works and Highways, has received a letter on these two particular proposals. One is a road from the community of Aklavik to the foothills. He has written, I believe, a letter to the federal minister responsible, but I just want to put on record that there has been a request by the community of Aklavik to have that road to the foothills constructed as an all-weather road, which would have all year round access to a gravel source for the community, plus a possible tourist attraction and would allow the community to take advantage of tourist industry. I do hope that the future holds for the community of Aklavik the ability to connect with the Dempster highway, so that they can have an all-weather access both in the summer and in the winter to other communities and certainly to the Dempster highway, which is an all-weather road which leads to southern Canada.

Concerns Of Arctic Red River

With regard to Arctic Red River, there are a couple of outstanding issues I believe that the appropriate Ministers could probably deal with. Firstly, in the case of provision of social services and probation services and welfare, the responsibility is presently in the hands of

employees that work in the community of Fort McPherson. Arctic Red has requested that at some time, the Minister of Health and Social Services look at the possibility of developing an arrangement by which they could, as a band council, assume the responsibility for provision of that particular service, on behalf of the government. I believe that we have already in place a number of arrangements and probably we could work that out on an agreement basis and allow them to take on that particular responsibility.

In the case of senior citizens, there has been an ongoing request from the community that we look seriously at constructing a small senior citizens home in that particular community to allow those homes now occupied by senior citizens to be made available to other residents in the community. I believe that is one way of dealing with the shortage of housing in that particular community while, as well, providing a necessary service to the senior citizens that have requested that that service be provided.

Without question, there is presently a need, I believe, to improve the policing services to these areas. The detachment in Fort McPherson presently has the responsibility for two communities, Fort McPherson and Arctic Red River, but it also has the responsibility for patrolling the highway. They have the responsibility, in fact, from the border to halfway between Arctic Red River and Inuvik. So they have an additional responsibility which is not, in fact, even in the hands of the police force in Inuvik. So, I think that there is a need to review that particular situation.

Requests From Aklavik

With regard to senior citizens, I want to raise one particular issue here. That is the personal care unit that is in Aklavik. My impression with regard to that is that there seems to be, presently, a lack of money. Particularly since there was an intention on the part of the government to allow for that particular facility to provide personal services to patients and in fact senior citizens who were not even from Aklavik itself but they were bringing in people from outside communities and were to have staff available. In any case, I believe, there is a need for additional staff and certainly additional money to ensure that the services that are being provided now are at least up to standard.

Mr. Speaker, again in Aklavik, I would hope that we would be able to improve the capability of access to gravel or at least the ability of the community to provide the necessary requirements for the community. I believe at present because of the way in which we continue to vote our money, particularly with regard to capital, we do not have the ability at times because of a winter road access, in Aklavik particularly. Not any other community but Aklavik has to have a winter road of 17 miles or so to have access. The only gravel source that the community wishes to have access to is accessed only by winter road and they have to construct that winter road every year. My opinion is that the federal government should provide the necessary funding to build an all-weather road to the foothills then we will be able to deal with that on a daily and ongoing basis.

Mr. Speaker, I want to now deal with the whole question of constitutional development.

MR. SPEAKER: Excuse me, Mr. Nerysoo. Before you get into this, how long would you plan to be? I would not like to break into your speech in that section if it is going to be long. If it is going to be short, then we can continue. In view of the hour then, we will recess for lunch. We will reconvene at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I will not have the opportunity to give my reply this afternoon because I have other meetings that I have to attend to and I wish to give a very short reply, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are you requesting an opportunity to reply now because there is someone that has the floor? I cannot divide it. That would not be proper so I am afraid if that is a request then I will have to turn you down, Mr. Wah-Shee. We will recess until 1:30 p.m.

---SHORT RECESS

On Item 2, Members' replies, Mr. Nerysoo had the floor. Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had indicated that I would go on with constitutional development. But I have a couple of issues to raise prior to that.

Attitude Of Parents Toward Education

Firstly, with regard to the whole question of education. I really have to agree with comments that were made by my colleague, the Member representing Kitikmeot East, particularly as they relate to the understanding of many parents of the importance of education, particularly those that continue to participate in the traditional way of life. There has to be some way in which we create an understanding of the importance of education. There is a need I believe for the Department of Education to review what options might be available to us to create that particular understanding, really try to address what I consider to be some negative attitudes toward the system of education, toward the need and the importance. I really find that today, there does not seem to be any, what I consider, discipline and that really is a responsibility on the part of parents. And what is strange is it is not necessarily the people that have participated in the traditional lifestyle whose attitudes you have to address. It is the young people, the young parents and those people that have gone through, at least a significant part of their life, in the educational process. That is the strange part I believe of what is going on now. I think with the older people -- and I can speak from experience -- the older people really have a good idea and an understanding of the need for the children to become educated, particularly going to school and disciplining the children to continue to go to school.

That does not necessarily mean there is a need to develop an attitude that your particular culture or your language is not important. That too, is an important part of the responsibility of parents and really also a responsibility of the community. But I really find that it is sad to see that there is no discipline in communities and it is a very important reason why students leave school. Their own parents, and I refer to the younger parents, do not feel that it is important to go to school, they do not feel that it is necessary. I think that has to be dealt with and I am not sure right now who is going to deal with that. I would hope that we would at some time develop a program that would identify the importance of the educational process.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have to speak very long or expound on the important part that youth have to play in the North. But I think that the need for better educational programs, better programs that will address generally the youth of the NWT are all-important. Recognition of this year as Year of the Youth, does not, I think, end the responsibility of the Legislature or the government or of the general public to address the issues that are associated to youth. It is an ongoing responsibility that we have to continue to address. It is an ongoing responsibility that we have to develop the proper programs and support that is necessary to develop a pretty positive attitude about the future that is available to the young people of the NWT.

Competition For Economic Development Opportunities

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the whole question of economic development in the NWT. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the North is going to be in for a battle and it is a battle to create an attitude in southern Canada that we, as a northern people and as a northern jurisdiction, want to encourage development to occur in the NWT. I see this issue particularly in light of the recent First Ministers' Conference on the economy. What I found during the discussions in that particular conference and outside the conference, was the competition that is now beginning to occur between various provinces throughout southern Canada. Their statements clearly indicated that they want development to occur in the provinces. Saskatchewan said it. Alberta has said it. In Nova Scotia clearly one of the political platforms that they recently held an election on was the encouragement of industry to come in and develop the resources and provide employment and economic opportunities to the residents of their particular province. What I am saying is that we are now part of that competition because the other jurisdictions that I am talking about are developing incentives for those companies, those resource developers to come into their provinces so that their residents can be provided with employment opportunities and their businesses can be provided with business opportunities. I feel that we are going to have to at some time in this Legislature, deal very seriously with that particular issue.

As much as we can say, the pipeline is here. The reality is that very quickly, and it is already occurring, the job opportunities on that particular project are literally gone. They are gone and there is a certain expectation of us, of the government of the North to continue to provide employment opportunities for those people that are not now employed, and will not be employed within the next three or four months. I believe that that same atmosphere or positive encouragement has to take place in other areas as well. Unless it does, we could find ourselves in a situation where industry leaves the NWT and goes to other areas and spends the money in other

areas in this country where they can feel comfortable and where they have been encouraged to develop in those particular regions. We could find ourselves losing those particular opportunities and our youth, that we indicated were so important to us, would have no possible future in a sense of being employed, particularly those people who want to remain in the NWT.

I do not only have to speak of the youth in this particular issue, it is the people who are now employed at this time. I really feel that at some time we are going to have to make that an issue in this House and deal with some strategy as to how we want best to approach the issue of encouraging economic development, resource development, both renewable and non-renewable resource industry development, to encourage those sectors to develop. That is not to say without ensuring that it is conditional to ensuring the participation of the residents of the NWT. At some time I feel we are going to end up losing unless we address the particular issues. In fact it is my opinion that even now -- and we have to remember that the incentive program that was allocated or developed in conjunction with the national energy program, you will all remember that particular incentive program as it applied to the frontier regions, has only one year of existence and after that there is no incentive program at all, unless of course we continue to press the Government of Canada to continue to provide an incentive program. Whether it is an incentive program of the nature that now exists or an alternative incentive program, certainly there is a need, in my opinion, for that to be maintained.

Professional Approach To Tourism Industry

Mr. Speaker, with regard to economic development, one of the areas that of course has become very prominent over the past few years has been the tourist industry. However, I find that we still have a long way to go in trying to address the manner in which we create the interest throughout this country and really throughout the world, to attract people to the NWT. I hope that we could take more advantage of this particular industry, particularly since the communities themselves can provide many opportunities that we are really not taking advantage of. I speak from a constituency which had the potential, particularly the community potential, to take advantage of the industry when the Dempster highway was constructed. Yet there are still some very serious problems and I believe some necessary work to allow the community to take advantage of that particular industry and the benefits that might be accrued to the North and to communities and to individuals in the communities.

I think that we ought to develop a more professional basis to address the question and really we have to because again it is an industry that has a lot of competition, particularly in the case of the Yukon, our sister territory, which has really developed what I consider to be one of the best programs associated to the tourist industry. I really think we ought to deal with it as professionally as that particular territory is dealing with tourism at this moment.

Equality Of Status For Men And Women

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to raise one particular item that I consider important to me, because I am at the moment a member of a band in the NWT, the Fort McPherson Band. At the moment in the House of Commons there is an amendment that would allow for those people that have lost their status as Indians to again be renamed to the band list. I think that one of the things that disappoints me in the Territories is that, in a territory where even during my term as vice-president of the Dene Nation we continued to argue the case of equality between men and women, there are only two bands in the NWT that have agreed to allow for those women who have lost their status to remain on the band list. In fact they have removed the ability of those individuals to remove themselves from the band list and they continue to provide services to them as treaty Indians. Those two bands are Fort Liard and strangely enough Arctic Red River, two of the smaller communities of the Dene Nation. It is kind of sad that we could preach the idea of equality, yet we are not prepared as a community to try to address those particular issues.

I want to stress on record my support for the route that the Government of Canada is going in ensuring that those women who do marry non-status Indians can retain their status. Really this should apply also to their children, which is something that I hope can be addressed in a little more productive manner than the issue has been debated today. In fact I would hope that we would be a little more reasonable in the NWT and make the issue retroactive so that all those women that did lose their status previously could in fact be brought back onto the list of treaty and status Indians as it should have been but never was. So I just want to indicate my personal support for that direction in which the Government of Canada is going.

Personal Relationships As Important As Cultural

Mr. Speaker, on the question of constitutional development, I just want to say and place on record, that my constituency presently is constituted of the Inuvialuit, the Loucheux and the non-native community. I do understand the opinions of some people who suggest that there is a wide difference of opinion between...

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize, I pushed this button in error. Would you give Mr. Nerysoo back the floor, please?

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: We had a big debate in here about the freedom of speech, didn't we?

---Laughter

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I understand some of the opinions that some people have expressed with regard to what might be the divergence of the cultures -- the Dene and the Inuit -- but I must say that in my particular case, in the constituency I represent, those wide divergencies do not necessarily exist and it seems that the extremes of the positions in this House have been really taken by those people that have no idea of the relationships that have existed in the North or particularly in the Mackenzie Delta-Beaufort region, for a long number of years. The idea that there is this situation that exists where you can see the differences of culture, where you can point out who is Inuvialuit, who is Dene or Loucheux -- that is not the reality. The reality in this particular situation is that in many instances the relationship is a very personal one.

What I find going on in the debate on division, is the idea that all the Inuvialuit will have an opportunity to vote and all other people will not have an opportunity to vote. Particularly when you see communities that are so close, I say that there is a relationship between many people. I have relatives in Tuktoyaktuk, I have relatives in Aklavik, I have relatives in Inuvik, I have relatives even in Sachs Harbour so the reality is that there is not that large prominent difference that people tend to try to indicate. I really hope that whenever we talk about division, particularly the whole question of creating two new territories -- because that is exactly what you are working on, creating two new territories and, hopefully, two new provinces -- that as much as cultural relationships that people may have, I think that the personal relationships are as important to any kind of decision that might be made. You have to remember that families and the relationships that communities have with one another are important to those divisions.

Delta And Beaufort Sea Communities Have Close Relationships

I do say though, and I will put on record now, that I am not interested in dividing the Delta and the Beaufort Sea. I will put that on record. Mainly because I believe that we in that particular region have a very close relationship to one another and I think that whenever the discussions go on in future that those personal relationships have to be addressed properly and it should not be on the basis of suggesting that there is this divergence of cultures. I respect the Inuvialuit, I respect them because I think I have a fairly good understanding of the people that are involved. As well, I believe that the Inuvialuit have a lot of respect for the Loucheux in that particular region.

There have been historical relationships that have gone back many, many years. Some not so good but generally speaking there have been very close relationships and we have to understand that. I think that those people who take extreme positions on one side or the other should maybe try to understand the situation as it exists -- not what they perceive it to be. I would hope that we would ensure that any decisions on the division of the Territories would see that particular region, particularly the Delta and the Beaufort, remain together. But that is something that has to be, I believe, dealt with fairly and openly in the processes that we approve.

I just want to also state that one of the communities within my constituency knows too well that the idea of division, and I point this out particularly as it relates to Aklavik -- and I do not want to be overly critical of the decisions that were made on creating Inuvik which my good friend, Mr. Butters, represents at this moment, but there was an attempt many years ago to move Aklavik or the residents of Aklavik into the community of Inuvik. That failed and really failed badly mainly because the people from that particular community felt that the community that they were born in and had been brought up in was a community that should exist on an ongoing basis and not one that should try to create an ideal community which would not recognize some of the personal concerns

that the people from that particular community had. I think that they understand all too well the idea of trying to create new areas, new communities from within their region. I must also say that that had an effect on the other surrounding communities as well.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond to a comment that was raised by Mr. MacQuarrie and it is in Hansard, "It is and can be a democratic process, contrary to what the honourable Government Leader said on the radio recently." Mr. Speaker, the Member is referring to a comment that I made with regard to the Constitutional Alliance. At no time did I say that that was not a democratic process. However, I want to say here that I feel that the process has its deficiencies.

Role Of Constitutional Alliance

I support and will continue to support the public process, the way it has been developed, but that does not mean that I give my whole-hearted support to the terms of reference of the Constitutional Alliance. I feel that there are some deficiencies in the way in which the government can improve its ability to provide services and programs to the people of the NWT. What I consider really to be an attempt to undermine the responsibility of the Legislative Assembly because we were elected to do a certain job and play a certain role with regard to constitutional development. The people that elected us placed a certain confidence in us to carry out a job. That is not to suggest that there should not be a relationship between the Legislative Assembly as has been the case in past. But when -- and this is the point that I want to make -- when I find as a Member or as the Government Leader certain deficiencies in a process, then I should make Members aware of those deficiencies.

In the case, for instance, of negotiating for responsibilities that we were directed to negotiate as a government, the mandate of the Constitutional Alliance does not allow us to do that. In fact there is a section in the mandate that suggests that the only individuals that would be negotiating any constitutional change whatsoever, including changes to the responsibility of government is within the hands of the Constitutional Alliance. And in my opinion, that is not the responsibility that they have or should have. That is clearly the responsibility of this Legislature and the government that has been mandated to carry out that particular responsibility. However, that does not mean that we cannot work out a solution which allows the Constitutional Alliance to continue its development of a future constitution and the structures of government. That will negatively affect the process of negotiating on the part of the GNWT -- negotiating those authorities and responsibilities that we feel are essential to providing better programs, better services and a better government to the people of the NWT. If we are incapable of doing that, then I find that it would be of no value to the Dene Nation, the Metis Association, the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, and of no value to the Members who are elected to this Legislative Assembly. So, I just want to raise that particular point because I think there has been some misunderstanding about the reasons for my serious concerns.

I also have some concern about the process. I guess it comes from the Dene Nation's motion number three from the joint chiefs and Metis board meeting, Fort Providence, NWT, March 18 to 22, 1985. It says in the "therefore" clause in the resolution: "The Metis Association's board of directors and the Dene Nation's leadership continue to support the alliance as the only type of mechanism capable of legitimately and successfully addressing the issues of constitutional development, division and the selection of a boundary." Well, I do not believe that is the only mechanism. If it fails, then there is a need to readdress whatever mechanism would be possible to allow for continuing public input that will be successful. But I do support the process as it is now. Put that on record. At the moment, it is the mechanism and I support it. But it is not the only mechanism. I believe that what you will find in future is that you are going to have to change the mechanism in the sense of allowing for public input and therefore you will change the nature of that public mechanism. So, I just wanted to point that out.

Assembly's Ability To Respond To Concerns

Mr. Speaker, just one other point. Any attempt on the part of the GNWT or any other single party to assert primary responsibility for this process will be rejected. There is no attempt on our part to undermine the process but again we have certain concerns, and unless those concerns are addressed at some time, we are not doing justice to the constitutional evolution of the NWT. We are not doing any good as a Legislature if we are hamstrung in our ability to respond to the needs of the people of the NWT. And that has to be addressed. I know that all you have to do is go through the numbers of statements that have been made in this House on the deficiencies of the way in which this government responds to concerns of communities and you can see there is a need to improve the constitutional ability of this government to respond to those concerns.

Just on the question of forestry. This Legislature certainly mandated the Minister responsible to negotiate that issue. Yet, the alliance mandate literally restricts that. I am raising these issues to make people aware of some of the concerns we have or at least I, personally, have with regard to the mandate as it is outlined. It is not to challenge the public process or nature of constitutional development in the North but rather there has to be a better relationship between the Legislature, the government and the Constitutional Alliance so that we carry out the responsibilities as were outlined in the mandate in a manner that supports one another, and does not necessarily defeat the purpose of the public process itself.

Communities Not Consulted

I do want to say one other thing on division or on the question. I would rather not use the word "division" but rather constitutional development, particularly constitutional development in recognizing two separate territories. In any kind of agreements that are reached in the future I believe that there ought to be a process whereby those people that might be affected by those negotiations, and I am referring to all people, should have the ability to participate in the process. Mr. Butters stated earlier the lack of public input or role, particularly with regard to the Western Constitutional Forum, of those communities that had some legitimate concerns with the process itself -- communities which are clearly affected but nobody considered them to be affected. Those were the communities of Aklavik, Inuvik, Fort McPherson and Arctic Red River. At no time were there any public hearings or meetings to hear the opinions of those people. While we were addressing the question of Inuvialuit, there are Inuvialuit in those particular communities and those concerns have to be addressed as well. So, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. The Chair recognizes Mr. Wah-Shee.

Mr. Wah-Shee's Reply

MR. WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give my own views on a number of items. However, I will not get into and try to repeat the many concerns that have been raised by Members of this House. To start off I would like to express how I feel about the present make-up of our House and the GNWT. I would like to commend the Members of the Executive Council who have volunteered to serve the people of the North and I would like to say that we want to work with the Executive Members. I know that it is very demanding. It takes you away from your constituency. I know it is difficult to not only represent your constituency but also try to represent the concerns of all the Members. However, I believe that since the Ninth Assembly and now getting on in the 10th Assembly, I think we have established a working relationship among ourselves as Members of this House. I hope that we can continue to work in the interests of all the residents of the NWT.

Constituency Concerns

I do have some concerns in my constituency. I have already indicated previously that they are concerned about the lack of progress being made in regard to airports because transportation is very important and so is communication among the communities. We are concerned in the area of housing. I still feel that we are not getting our fair share of housing for the Dene communities. I still question whether the real needs of the Dene people have been taken into consideration. I would like to see a needs study done properly with facts and statistics. We have large families and we also have a great many young people who require housing. I will not agree that there is more need of housing in other regions in comparison to our areas. I think there is a real need all over the place but I do not accept the idea that we do not need it as much as elsewhere.

There is also the idea of traditional livelihood, that is, being supported by renewable resources and I think there has to be a wage economy effort in the way of life of the native people, Dene, Metis and the Inuit people. In the area of economic development, as the Members are aware there is a great deal of interest among the aboriginal people of the NWT to take advantage of the economic opportunities that our land has to offer. When I say "our land" I am speaking generally of the NWT. We are very rich and very fortunate to have a real variety of natural resources, gas and oil, minerals. We have an opportunity to participate in tourism and I believe in the area of tourism we still have a great deal of work to do to take advantage of the opportunities. This tourism benefits everyone from the Baffin Region to the Delta to the High Arctic to the Kitikmeot, Keewatin and the Mackenzie Valley.

Relationships Strained On Constitutional Issues

I would like to say that the present relationship has been somewhat strained as regards the whole question of constitutional development. I think all of us as individuals have our own ideas of the kind of objectives that we ought to go for. We may agree on the objective but it seems to me that there is a variety of opinions in regard to how to achieve those objectives. I would hope that the relationship between ourselves will come back to the stage where we can still work together because we have two more years to go. I would hate to see us get to a point where, in our differences, we confuse the people of the NWT, which is really happening right now. I appreciate and can understand the aspirations of the Inuit people, that they want to have their own type of government which will look after their interests, maintain and promote their own culture. They want to have better communications systems, better transportation systems. They want to take advantage of the economic opportunities in their area. They have hopes and dreams for their young people. I think that in all of these areas their aspirations are shared by the Dene people. I would say that the Dene want to work with all residents of the NWT whether they be non-native or Inuit people. We have lived together in the NWT for a long time. I think that the route that we take with regard to economic development will certainly place a great deal of strain among ourselves.

We have young people who are going to school today and are attending classes where all residents of the NWT are represented, particularly in the high school area and in the area of training. I would hope that whatever route that we take in terms of the whole question of economic development, in creating two separate territories, that the young people, the next generation, in looking back will feel that we have dealt with this situation with respect for one another. I do not want to see the Dene children coming out of schools in the future, having a feeling of animosity in regard to other people. When I say "other people" I mean everyone. Likewise, I would hope that the Inuit children will learn to appreciate the Dene people for what they are and I think that is really important.

I know that in the end we are all going to have to, more or less, decide and it is going to cause some difficulties. Maybe there is no other way of resolving this situation among ourselves but I would like to feel that the Northwest Territories -- there are only 48,000 people and the cost of running the Government of the Northwest Territories, on behalf of everyone, is in the neighbourhood of \$500 million. To date, in regard to trying to achieve a consensus among ourselves the federal government has contributed \$2.3 million and we still have not resolved the whole issue of constitutional development in terms of achieving consensus. I am not too sure whether the federal government is prepared to spend more millions on behalf of 48,000 people. I think the federal government has other priorities; they want to develop the natural resources of the Northwest Territories; they want to see us continue to run our own affairs.

I think the whole question of constitutional development is going to have to be resolved by the people of the North. If we cannot resolve the issue among ourselves, we cannot say we are going to take our bat and ball and go home and say, "We will go directly and deal with the federal government." I do not feel that the federal government will be as sensitive to the aspirations of the people of the North. I think that we as the leaders, as elected people, are more sensitive to the feelings of the people of the North. I think there is a better chance of resolving our differences among ourselves and I would like to see a situation where the people of the North will resolve them. I do not believe that as aboriginal people, just because we got the aboriginal rights, we have the right to go directly to the federal government and say, "We want you to resolve our situation in the North. I am an aboriginal person, I am entitled to aboriginal rights."

Aboriginal Rights And Constitutional Development Are Separate Issues

The question of constitutional development, as far as I am concerned, has nothing to do with the whole question of aboriginal rights. What we are talking about, and I heard this from a number of people, is that everybody wants public government. Well, you are not going to get public government as far as I am concerned in dealing with the whole question of aboriginal rights because you are talking about the interests of all the residents of the Northwest Territories. For better or for worse we are stuck together until we come to a consensus. I have heard, as a Member of this House, the differences of views as to what actually happened and I am not really interested in placing blame on anyone. I think NCF and WCF have to take the full responsibility for the confusion that has taken place. I think that if we are going to properly represent the interests of everyone then we are going to have to realize that, as far as I am concerned, you cannot achieve constitutional development at the expense of any other party that you are having discussions with and negotiating with. I think there is a need for a compromise.

I can understand that in certain areas they want regional government and I fully support the concept of regional areas running their own affairs on behalf of their own area. How we do it and to what extent we should allow authority, I think, is negotiable. As far as I am concerned no one area has the right to say, "This is what we want and it will not apply to other regions." It has to apply right across the board. There are communities, as far as I am concerned, that are excluded in some cases and I think they have to be involved. The type of institutions that we want in terms of government has to take into consideration the cultures of the aboriginal people.

Aboriginal people, as many Members are aware, have an opportunity in attending the First Ministers' Conference on the whole area of constitutional development. They have another avenue which is called the whole area of aboriginal government. I personally do not feel that that is the route to go and I do not think it is going to resolve the problem that we have right now. I think you can take certain elements out of that and incorporate that as part of the public institutions of government.

Dene Participation In Constitutional Evolution

As Members are aware, the Dene people, particularly the treaty Indians, have the right, under aboriginal claims, to claim land and create reservations. Now, the Dene people exclusively have that opportunity under the treaties that were made between our elders and the government of the day. There has been a great deal of discussion in the past 15 years where that option was considered and the chiefs in our area decided, "No, we do not want reservations; we have other people that also live up and down the Mackenzie Valley and we do not want to create barriers." In terms of whether the Dene people's interests will be protected depends on how they negotiate constitutional development. I do not feel the Dene people have indicated in the last 15 years preconditions for constitutional development. They had some difficulty in terms of recognizing the Government of the Northwest Territories and this Legislature but that has changed. We are participating and we want to continue to participate in the constitutional evolution.

Had we considered what we have now and how it can be improved, I think in the future we would have come out a lot better. I think we would have been stronger and this whole problem of communication could be dealt with. People say Yellowknife is so isolated or so far away but I think you are going to have that problem, it does not matter where you put the capital. Even if you create a separate territory you are still going to have to decide where the capital ought to go and you are still going to have some communities complaining of their interests not being considered, for whatever reason. The whole area of public government is that people are elected to represent those communities and we are all in there as equals in this House. Even though we are not sitting on the Executive, the Executive Members do not have the monopoly on brains, as far as I am concerned.

MR. MacQUARRIE: That's for sure.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. WAH-SHEE: And some of the proposals that have been coming forward have pretty well indicated that to me.

---Laughter

And I am sure they have the same feeling about us at times when we are overly critical.

AN HON. MEMBER: Very seldom.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I am not here to criticize the honourable Members who have volunteered to represent our interests.

MR. McCALLUM: Go for it.

MR. WAH-SHEE: But I would like to remind them every once in a while that they are working for us, for the people that we represent. And the policies and programs and the funds that are allocated are there for the good of the public, for everyone. It is a real privilege to be sitting on the Executive when you have the support of your colleagues. But at times, when we are critical it is

because we want to improve the recommendations that they are making to us as ordinary Members. When we are being critical we are doing it to improve and it is not to personally attack any one Member of the Executive. Sometimes I feel that when we are being critical that they take it personally. In public life, as far as I am concerned, you cannot be so overly sensitive as to take things personally because you are there to serve the public. Because we volunteered to work on behalf of the public, naturally people will be critical of us. I have heard a lot of things about the media, for instance, misquoting and not interpreting the situation correctly, but they also have a purpose. They have to inform the public as to what we are doing as elected Members. Whether those activities or events are interpreted properly is really a matter of interpretation. After all, everybody else is human. I assume that the Executive are, because we certainly are as ordinary Members.

Structure Includes All Groups

So I think in the area of what kind of role the constitutional development should take and WCF and NCF, it is important to keep in mind that the reason why that structure was set up in the first place is because you have other groups that want to participate. And I think in the area of constitutional development at this stage, because we are a consensus government and we do not have party politics here, that we find ourselves in a very unique situation. I think that is why the Dene Nation and the Metis Association want to plug in. So do all the other native groups. I do not really agree that the GNWT should take the lead role in the area of constitutional development. That is not to say that I am questioning their intentions as a government. Not at all. It is because I think that that mechanism was set up and we had a lot of support from the people of the North. I think the role of the GNWT in the whole area of constitutional development still has to be defined. It is not defined at the present time but I think it will be. But it requires the participation of all the groups that represent the NWT, including the non-native people.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Every once in a while I have to put in a plug for the Yellowknife Members. They feel isolated. Every time we talk about budgets and new programs, it seems that Yellowknife is being missed all the time.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, thank you. Dogrib blood brother.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Perhaps it is because there is a lack of representation on the Executive Council.

MR. McCALLUM: How come you passed right over Smith again?

MR. WAH-SHEE: I find that the views of my honourable colleagues from across the floor in regard to what actually took place on the whole question of constitutional involvement -- in a sense I find it rather amusing. I know it is a very serious matter. At times there seemed to be misinterpretation of what is taking place on both sides. I know because I come from the West and I also participate as to what takes place in the WCF. I know there have been some harsh words said in regard to what was our motive, anyway, from the West. And at times I think maybe we in the West feel the same way about the other side but I always want to sort of feel, as a Member of this House, that we all have honourable intentions and that we are here to serve our people whoever elected us. I will not question the motives of anyone in this House. I think that creates a problem among ourselves. There seemed to be a barrier being created in the whole area of division. And I am afraid if the darn thing gets out of hand we may end up with something like the city of Berlin, with this big wall that separates the people of the West, the Dene people and the Inuit people.

Maintaining Bonds Of Friendship

As the Leader of the Government indicated, the relationship between the Dene, Metis and the Inuit has existed long before we even got elected and we would like to see that relationship continue. And so when we are dealing with the whole question of constitutional development, it is important that we do not create animosity among ourselves because of who we are. I am a Dene because I was born a Dene. I think it applies to all of us, that it is important that we keep that bond together because even if we get division, we are still going to need each other...

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WAH-SHEE: ...because there are only 48,000 of us. There is no contest in regard to who is going to achieve provincial status first even if -- you know, it depends on if we want it. We would want not to do it at the expense of one another and I think that is very important.

I compliment the honourable Members from the Eastern Arctic for representing your people in trying to achieve the goals that they have indicated to you. You want your own type of government, your own territory. I think we respect that. However, how we do it is more important at this stage and I hope we can find a way. I have no difficulty with the idea that all the people of the North have to participate. After all, as far as I am concerned, division is not going to be rammed down my throat or anybody else's.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WAH-SHEE: I am going to be participating. Regarding the implications of what we are trying to do, I think we have to properly inform the people. Some people say the type of information we are feeding them is sort of biased. Well, I think there has to be a way in which we give the proper information out to everyone. The North being what it is -- as you know, before the Government of the Northwest Territories moved to Yellowknife and before we had elected Members of this Legislature, the federal government, in actual fact, was running the Northwest Territories. I am sure that the Members in the East will recall where we had area administrators. The people of the North had very little say and it has only been in the last few years that we actually are taking over and participating and having elected people running the government. Just when we are getting to this point we say, "Well, let's break the whole thing apart now and create something else." It seems to me that we are going through sort of a circle.

Mr. Speaker, my intention in speaking today is not to place blame on anyone, nor to be overly critical but I think that there has to be a feeling that we can still work together. I know, at times we have disagreed, we hear catcalls from this end anyway and from across.

MR. McCALLUM: They are always picking on us.

MR. WAH-SHEE: They are always continuously picking on us, of course, but I would like to remind the other side, if you are going to give medicine then you are also going to have to take some.

---Laughter

When we do it, you know, just have some understanding that we are trying to assist you.

---Laughter

It is really done for your own good.

---Laughter

MR. McCALLUM: Like taking cod liver oil.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Sometimes the pill is bitter but it is for your own good. With that, I look forward to the next two years working with the Members of the Executive and also all the honourable Members of this House. Let's keep the boat floating.

MR. McCALLUM: Rock it a little bit, but keep it floating.

MR. WAH-SHEE: You can rock it as much as you want but we have got to let it float for the interests of the people of the North. That is all I have to say.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. Replies to the Commissioner's Address. Mr. Pedersen.

Mr. Pedersen's Reply

MR. PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you will allow me to ramble a bit. I was going to do this tomorrow but I understand that we may not have a tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Everybody else has.

MR. PEDERSEN: Yes, but not for the purposes of replies, unless I am wrong. I want to thank Mr. Wah-Shee for his speech he just delivered and if I had my "me too" sign along I would wave it at him right now. I agree with a great many things he has said. It was a very fine speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start on a positive note. Since we started somewhat more than a year ago, some things have happened which have pleased me. I think we have had good progress in housing for instance; hopefully as a result of some of the work that has been done by the special committee on housing and most certainly on the part of the response to that from the Minister and I appreciate that. Also, in Economic Development, I think we have had some good responses to concerns raised which may not have borne fruit yet, but some of the policies are getting into place. I am pleased with the importance that we are giving more and more to the traditional pursuits of hunting and trapping. There have been some improvements, I think, within the Education department, too. Not nearly enough, but I am pleased to say I think the Minister is trying to respond to them and he has a rather unwieldy department to move.

Constituency Concerns

Some of the concerns that we have within my constituency, Mr. Speaker, concern the breakdown in traditional family structures, the violence within our communities, spousal assault, the suicide and the attempted suicide rate, the fact that the traditional values do not seem to be passed on from the older generation to the younger generation. I dealt with the violence issue at some length the other day when we discussed the spousal assault report and I will not go into it again.

The education of our youth is a concern to us; where education fits in to the overall government structure, where it leads to meaningful careers after the education is finished. I have talked about that too, during the budget debate, and I will not burden you with more of that. The apparent failure of a leadership group to emerge from among our youth has been mentioned both by Mr. Wray and by Mr. Nerysoo today and it is a great concern to many of us. The leadership group that, in my constituency is referred to as the "Old Inuvik Gang", includes such people as our honourable Leader, I believe every mayor in the Beaufort and Kitikmeot West area, and everyone who is connected in leadership positions in the native organizations up in that area. This group somehow does not seem to be backed up by a new group. There should be a new group coming but whether it is because we closed the Inuvik school system to students from our area and started sending them to Yellowknife, whether that is just coincidental I do not know, but I do know that we do not have a group behind and we need that. It is not that I would suggest that the "Old Inuvik Gang" I referred to is getting over the hill or should be replaced but when they started gaining prominence, which is four, five, six years ago, the age they were then, the ones of that age today are not showing any leadership desires or capabilities. That is a concern to us. We must encourage this.

Observations On Debate On Division

I am going to have to ramble as I have 20-odd pieces of paper with notes on them. I guess we have to mention the big issue of this sitting, the non-debate on division. It has, as we all know, been a debate through tabled documents, the press and replies to the Commissioner's Address. There have not been too many chances for rebuttals so I guess, at least, I should make some observations on it.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been pleased. It has been no pleasure to me to be part of the House during this session that we are in right now. I think our consensus government has deteriorated into confrontation. I think Mr. Wah-Shee was very right when he just stated that we should take each other for what we say. We should not imply motives to each other. We should not be suspicious. Surely, in a consensus government we should have the maturity, when someone makes a statement, to take that statement as being legitimate and valid unless proven otherwise, and not the other way around. We should not automatically go around doubting each other and say that you must be lying; unless you can prove that you are telling the truth, I will not believe you. I know that emotions have entered into this division and constitutional development question many times.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, throw a few thoughts into it which have not been voiced yet. One is the reason I see for many people wanting division. I do not think we are looking for a geographical boundary, Mr. Speaker. We talk about the distance between us and the improvement in transportation has been mentioned. For instance, the first time I went to Coppermine in 1953 from here, it took us five hours and 10 minutes, and it was a non-stop flight. Today I can leave Cambridge Bay or

Coppermine in my constituency every Wednesday or Friday, go through Yellowknife, through Winnipeg and end up in Toronto or Montreal that same evening. So I really do not think we are talking about distances in miles. I think we are talking about distances in philosophy and concept of how things should be. Many of us feel that there is a move in certain parts of the Territories and certainly among certain Members of the House here -- on both sides of this debate and I am not trying to single out any one side -- to bring the southern concept of how things should be done in the North.

Quality Of Members' Debates

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the other day that we had a court case in Coppermine which, I think I used the word "deteriorated" and I still feel that is a proper word for it, into a copy of what you can see on TV any day -- a copy of a southern courtroom drama. Many people who were present at that, including all the elders, got up and walked out. Mr. Speaker, I think sometimes in this House, we are guilty of trying to do the same thing. I think there are times that we ask questions, not so much for the purpose of getting an answer, but with the hope of embarrassing someone by asking that question. I think there are times when we are guilty of confusing the volume of words, the quantity of words, with the quality of words. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if we analyse the stack of Hansards that we have received so far from this session, that we would find that the majority of words in there could be attributed to a minority of Members. And again, on both sides, I am not looking at anyone or aiming at anyone in particular.

The fact that native Members of this House generally are not as vocal as non-native Members, and I am one of these non-natives, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, is not because their tongue muscles are any less strong than ours are. It is the difference in approach. I think that when we talk about a desire to divide, that this has contributed to it.

Mr. Speaker, it is many years ago now that I chose to come to the part of the world where I live today. In those days we did not refer to it as Nunavut. It was generally called Inuit Nunangat, which means the land of the Inuit people. I chose to go there because I wanted a different way of life from the one that I had in the South or in Europe where I came from. And I certainly found a different way of life, one which I have liked ever since. I have stayed up there. I married a very fine Inuk lady. I have had five children, I have 11 grandchildren -- I think. And they all live still in that territory.

Importance Of Boundary Based On Philosophy

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that I would not be serving them right if I blindly accept a boundary which does not at least assure them of an opportunity to retain the way of life, the philosophy of life, the belief in how things should be done. There have to be some guarantees for this point of view before I can agree to any boundary. And Mr. Speaker, the geographical line that this boundary may take is not nearly as important to me as the philosophical line. When we talk about Nunavut, we have been accused of trying to create an Inuit homeland. It was referred to in Mr. MacQuarrie's speech as a jurisdiction which encompasses all Inuit people. This is not a realistic statement, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that the vast majority of Inuit in the world do not live in the territory which we talk about as Nunavut. The vast majority live in Greenland and in Alaska, some in Siberia and even within Canada, Inuit people live in Newfoundland, in Quebec, Manitoba. If the Nunavut territory does encompass Inuit people, it is merely a small minority of the remaining Inuit people. And it is not so much a proposal for a territory which would unite that small little group, it is a territory for people who think like that small little group. I happen to think like that group, Mr. Speaker. Certainly I am not trying to create an Inuit homeland. I am not an Inuk, but I am trying to create a homeland for myself too, as are Mr. Wray and Mr. Patterson. I think the very fact that the three of us are representatives in this House is a strong indication that we are not looking -- when we are told that we are looking for an Inuit homeland, this is not a racial thing. There are no racial prejudices in the area which we have chosen to call Nunavut. Anyone suggesting that, Mr. Speaker, shows a distinct lack of knowledge and understanding of the situation. Mr. Speaker, I think also to say that if a Nunavut territory was created using, roughly, the tree line that this would leave the western territory too small and with not enough land mass, I cannot accept that statement as being correct. The western territory that would be left if Nunavut was created along the tree line, would be one and one half times bigger than the present Yukon Territory and it would be bigger than all the provinces, except Ontario and Quebec, approximately the same size as BC. It is not a small territory, so why are we wasting time arguing about the size of it? Wherever the boundary will be both territories will still be very large.

The tentative agreement that was reached on the 13th and 14th of January -- in Mr. MacQuarrie's speech it was mentioned that it was reached by the members of the alliance that were present and then only by them and by no one else and it is therefore their agreement. Mr. MacQuarrie stated that anyone outside that group should be perfectly at liberty to criticize the agreement. I do not really want to criticize it but I do want to point out some things from it that I disagree with. Mr. MacQuarrie, and I am sorry that I have to keep referring to him, but he presented us with some straightforward statements, on page 377 of the transcript of the debates, in his speech he mentioned that it was a good agreement, it was the best that could be possibly worked out, it was a very fine agreement. And he mentioned the possibility of general acceptance of that agreement among the vast majority of the people of the NWT. I agree with him 100 per cent but only because that vast majority of the population of the NWT lives in the urban centres in the West. For them it was certainly the best possible deal.

A Confirmed Disagreement

The co-chairman of the western forum, Mr. Sibbeston, has mentioned that on a number of occasions, that it was the best possible deal that could have been worked out. But that is not the case for the people in Nunavut. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that that is why the tentative agreement that was reached on the 13th and 14th of January very quickly became, not a tentative agreement but a confirmed disagreement. That in fact no agreement exists to this day, I think, is obvious. We, in this House and government or society as a whole, I think have accepted that when we want the opinion of any given community, we listen to the duly elected bodies within that community, such as hamlet councils, settlement councils, town councils, or whatever. They are the democratically elected people. When we do this, Mr. Speaker, I think we must do it consistently and not selectively.

Concerning the tentative agreement, the Nunavut caucus instructed its chairman that they found it to be unacceptable. Since that time, all the regional native organizations have condemned the tentative agreement: COPE; both KIAs; Baffin; national ITC; the mayors of the Beaufort and Kitikmeot Region have condemned it; and a great many other communities and hamlet councils throughout what we refer to as the Nunavut area have, by motion submitted to this House, condemned it. Surely we must accept their opinion in this if we solicit their opinions in any other things.

Mr. Speaker, there was a suggestion that certain powerful members of the Nunavut caucus were responsible for these motions coming in, and Mr. Speaker, I think that shows something of what I mean when I said we are trying to introduce southern concepts of political procedures into the North. First of all I think Mr. Curley in particular was referred to. I think anyone who would suggest that Mr. Curley directs the ideas, thoughts and expressions of not only the Nunavut caucus but communities in the Nunavut area generally, is attributing far more power to Mr. Curley than he indeed possesses. I think even more so it is an insult to the intelligence and independence of the rest of us. We do not take direction in what we say from anyone but our constituents.

Historically Boundary Agreements Difficult

As for the boundary itself, I do not think we should be overly disappointed with the fact that we have not at this session been able to endorse or agree on a boundary. Historically boundaries have always been very difficult. It was mentioned today that in places like Ireland or North and South Korea, Vietnam, and there was a little border between Denmark and Germany that was settled in 1864 and they are still arguing about that one -- so I do not think we should really be that disappointed. I think it is a bit presumptuous that we should think that our wisdom is so great that we should be able to achieve in one session what other people in the world have not been able to achieve in some cases for generations.

Mr. Speaker, I think I will leave the divisive issue for now and return to the issue of our youth. We must not forget them. Today on our desks appeared a copy of the Metis Newsletter and there is a comment by a student attending school in Yellowknife from my home community, Ruth Niptanatiak, and she says, "I think the present government should think of the future politicians. By this I mean, they should consider our point of view. After all, we will be running the government after they quit or retire." I do not think we should ever lose sight of that. We need them and whatever decisions we make are not made for us, they are made for our children and for our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go on much longer. I would just like in closing, to point out to the House that perhaps the answer to the whole thing has been right in front of us, or in my case behind us all this time. What we sometimes cannot find, politically, good reason for, we can look for the answers to the artistic community. I would like to refer you to the tapestry on the wall behind me. I think it was made in Pelly Bay and there is possibly one panel missing and it was done out of good taste and that is the one where we fight and bicker. But it illustrates perhaps what the process should be. The first panel on the outside shows to me what the public often think we do, we sit around and play games. The second panel shows what we would like to think we do and what we probably should be doing, sitting down and talking over issues and coming up with a solution. The last panel, Mr. Speaker, and it is my hope that we might achieve that someday, that we may come up with something that is so great that we will get up and dance for joy. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pedersen. Any further replies to the Commissioner's Address? That concludes Item 2. Item 3, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

ITEM 3: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Minister's Statement On Expo '86

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to announce at this time, several Expo '86 initiatives to complement those announced by my colleague, the honourable Mr. Curley, in this House the other day.

Last fall, Mr. Curley provided us with details concerning the types of messages that would be presented in the NWT pavilion at Expo '86 -- our rich cultural heritage, the development of our non-renewable resource sector, the significance of the harvest of our natural resources, and our future. Recently, Mr. Speaker, we have also been provided with details concerning the appearance and operations of the pavilion.

I am sure you will agree that Mr. Curley's staff have come up with an exciting design that does reflect the spirit of the North. However, without exceptional floor staff in 1986 the pavilion will not be a success. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Sharon Firth has been contracted by my department to help Mr. Curley's staff locate the best ambassadors from among our youth to work at the pavilion. She will travel across the Territories later this year, speaking in our schools and at other gatherings to inform our young people of these numerous job opportunities. Up to 100 people will be required as information guides, maintenance staff, salespersons in the pavilion boutique.

In the spring of 1986, Sharon will work with those who are selected to work in the pavilion, to improve their knowledge of the NWT and to help prepare them for living and working in the city of Vancouver. She will also live in the NWT staff residence and provide counselling services. The pre-employment training and the on-site counselling services will be especially important for the project staff who have been raised in our smaller communities and have not yet had the opportunity to travel outside of the Territories or work for an extended period of time away from family and friends. Ms Firth is well qualified for this assignment. She knows what it is like to leave home at an early age, travel, and meet with people from around the world. Her experience will prove invaluable in helping us to identify those best qualified, and in preparing them for their six month term of employment in Vancouver.

On a second point, Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has designated 1985 as the Year of the Youth. To assist in commemorating the Year of the Youth and to help Mr. Curley's staff in presenting the NWT at Expo '86 to the people of the world, the Department of Education will be organizing a poster competition. School classes across the NWT will be asked to design a poster which shows southerners interesting facts about their community -- the wildlife, the community itself, their history, or perhaps their love of the land. It will be their choice. The submitted posters will then be reviewed, and then the best of them will be made into postcards for our pavilion visitors. Who better to tell our story than our youth? The poster contest will help in showcasing the artistic talents of young northerners, and provide a personal invitation for pavilion visitors to travel to the Northwest Territories.

On a third point, PWA has recently announced that they will provide free air passes for numerous NWT students and their escorts to travel to Expo '86. A contest will be held to determine who should receive a free return ticket to Vancouver from PWA. As well, the Royal Bank has agreed to provide a three day entrance pass to the fair, for the winning students and their escorts. My staff will assist in informing students of the PWA/Royal Bank contest, will help in organizing the competition, and in making travel arrangements for the students. This will be a once in a lifetime opportunity for many of our youth to view and experience the world's fair.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to deal with Thebacha College and the pavilion project. As you know, the pavilion will contain a 170-seat restaurant which features our country foods. About 100,000 people are expected to eat in our restaurant. There has been much discussion in the Assembly concerning the potential significance of the harvest of our renewable resources, to the economy of our small communities. We have fish and meat products which we could export to the South and to other countries. I know that the Departments of Renewable Resources and Economic Development and Tourism will be utilizing our government's participation at Expo '86 to inform wholesalers and distributors of the availability and uniqueness of NWT food products. Thebacha cooking classes will also help through the development of menus which will show southerners the many delicious ways that our food products can be prepared and served. We will work with arctic char, musk-ox, reindeer, trout, whitefish and some of the less known but potentially commercially exploitable species such as burbot and black cod. In addition, Thebacha College will participate in the training of our restaurant staff.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will work with Mr. Curley to help him in achieving his target of hiring our best ambassadors from both our large and small communities right across the NWT, in presenting the North at Expo '86 to the people of the world, in advancing our renewable resource economy, and in assisting some of our young people in travelling to Vancouver. Our participation at Expo '86 will provide an excellent opportunity for many of our youth to view and experience first-hand many cultures from around the world, and also provide some with very useful and rewarding experience. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further Ministers' statements? Item 4, oral questions. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 4: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 199-85(1): Yellowknife Education District No. 1, Request For Additional Portables

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Education. The first question concerns a request for three additional portables for Yellowknife Education District No. 1. Mr. Patterson is aware that there was an unexpected increase in enrolment this year. The Minister has responded to the original request for additional portables and the school district received two at this point in time and they just made the request on March 5th, but they are looking for three more.

Question 200-85(1): Yellowknife Education District No. 1, Funds For Planning New School

In a letter to the Minister last fall from the school district, a request was made for some funds to start planning for the new school which has been planned for 1988. Now that there is some possibility of moving that school ahead one year earlier, there is a need for the education district to have some funds so that they can start the planning process and start setting up the necessary agreements for the city to ensure that there is adequate provision of sewer and water and other infrastructures. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a beautiful combination of questions. One for the loan of equipment and one to build a new school. Mr. Patterson, would you attempt to answer that?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be easier to send the Member's constituents' students to Eskimo Point than to move Eskimo Point portables to Yellowknife.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Sure, we can do that.

Return To Question 199-85(1): Yellowknife Education District No. 1, Request For Additional Portables

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Speaking more seriously, Mr. Speaker. We did get a letter from the Yellowknife School District No. 1 expressing a definite need for two portables, in letters of October and December of 1984. So I responded and the Financial Management Board approved those two portables and a further \$800,000 on top of the \$550,000 which had been committed to the coming fiscal year, which also provided classroom additions in both school districts.

Since then I am aware of the further request. Now, they want three more portables which would cost \$350,000 approximately. I note that in their letters they suggested these portables would avoid any increase in class sizes. To answer the Member's question, Mr. Speaker, the subsequent request did come in too late to be considered in the submission I made to the Executive Council. However, it may still be possible to do something. It is possible for example that existing portables may be available from other regions. Not the Keewatin Region but regions a little closer. And there may be some flexibility in our capital plan once tenders for current projects come in, in the next short while. I cannot make a commitment today but I will look into it and I should make a decision soon. I know it is necessary to make a decision soon, possibly by the end of this week.

Return to Question 200-85(1): Yellowknife Education District No. 1, Funds For Planning New School

Secondly, Mr. Speaker. On the question of early planning for the Frame Lake South school. I did tell the Member that I was looking into the possibility of moving the construction date ahead from 1988-89 where it is presently scheduled. No decision has yet been made on that change. However, I do understand that land assembly in such matters is complicated, more complicated in a city. Therefore, I will see if we can find a way to financially assist the school board in starting early planning although I am aware that they already actually have started doing some work. Perhaps we can find a way of giving them extra assistance. I should say, it is not going to be easy, Mr. Speaker, because the capital plan is very tight at the moment. But I recognize the needs and I will do my best. Thank you.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Right after we take care of the sewage problem.

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

Question 201-85(1): Rental Rates For Housing Association Employees

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Housing. Again it is with regard to the question I referred to the Leader yesterday. In my own area of Fort Providence, I discussed some topics with the manager of the Housing Corporation and he said that employees of the association are being charged \$150 a month for rent if they are living in public housing. I would like to ask the Minister if that is standard practice, in view of the fact that we do have rental scales that are used at the moment right across the Territories.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question 197-85(1): Housing Association Rental Rates For Staff, And Question 201-85(1): Rental Rates For Housing Association Employees

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a return to that question I gathered which was asked yesterday by the Member. It was a return to oral Question 197-85(1). Basically the answer that has been provided to me from my officials is that employees of housing associations are subject to the same income assessment as defined in the NWT rent scale as every other tenant. And as of yesterday, March 26th, all employees with the Fort Providence housing association are paying rent as determined by the rent scale. But if the Member has information to the contrary, then I would be pleased to receive it and I will undertake further to check into it on his behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Mr. T'Seleie.

Question 202-85(1): Terms Of Reference, Norman Wells Project Assessment Committee

MR. T'SELEIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for Mr. Nerysoo, the Government Leader. Yesterday in the reply to my question concerning Norman Wells, the Minister indicated that a small steering committee consisting of key government staff would be conducting an assessment of Norman Wells and the experiences of this government. I would like to ask the Minister if he could tell me what the terms of reference of this committee are and as well, which GNWT key government staff are on this committee. In view of the fact that this committee will be placing its report before the Executive by June, I would like to have that information provided to me as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 202-85(1): Terms Of Reference, Norman Wells Project Assessment Committee

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not have all the details with regard to the individuals that are involved, but I do know some of the departments: the Department of Renewable Resources; the Department of Economic Development and Tourism; Energy, Mines and Resources Secretariat; the Executive; Regional Operations Secretariat; and someone representing the Inuvik Region and Fort Smith Region. I would be prepared to provide the actual details of terms of reference. There are no specific terms of reference but each has had an opportunity over the past few years to do some work in those particular areas and to take on the responsibility that has been requested of us. So in that sense we have no particular terms of reference but are doing an overall assessment of the project itself, and all elements that were associated to the project. But I can certainly provide a written reply, Mr. Speaker, of further details that I do not have information on now. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Oral questions. Supplementary, Mr. T'Seleie.

Supplementary To Question 202-85(1): Terms Of Reference, Norman Wells Project Assessment Committee

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask Mr. Nerysoo if in his reply to me if he could provide any information that would constitute what you might call terms of reference for the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Nerysoo.

Further Return To Question 202-85(1): Terms Of Reference, Norman Wells Project Assessment Committee

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I would be providing the letter to the honourable Member with regard to the work that is going to be done. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Gargan.

Question 203-85(1): Employment Of Operators For Pipeline Substations

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Leader of the House. I believe it is in April that they are going to be officially opening the oil pipeline to the South. I believe it was in 1973 or 1974 that they had a program under NORTRAN, I think it was called, Arctic Gas, at that time, where people have been trained in the area of gas transmission operators. I would just like to ask the Minister whether any direction is being considered with regard to these individuals that did take the training, to be operators in these substations along the pipeline, if and when it does open.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 203-85(1): Employment Of Operators For Pipeline Substations

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any recruiting program of that nature. It is really not up to this government to recruit people for that particular project. If the Member is suggesting that we intervene and ensure that those individuals are recruited or that we get a list of individuals that could be qualified to do the job, then certainly we could do that. But we are not recruiting on behalf of the company itself. The actual responsibility is not my responsibility. It falls within the hands of the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Gargan.

Supplementary To Question 203-85(1): Employment Of Operators For Pipeline Substations

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe before the approval of the pipeline was to go ahead, there was something like \$10 million that was supposed to be used for training in the area of oil production or oil transportation. I am just wondering whether the Leader of the Government knows how that money was used and whether the training that did take place, did benefit, or are the oil companies taking advantage of the people that did take training in whatever field it is, toward the oil companies?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 203-85(1): Employment Of Operators For Pipeline Substations

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I indicated before to the Members of the House that with regard to the \$10 million that was allocated for training, some \$7.9 million was not spent. It was not spent because we were again trying to work with the Dene Nation on developing the appropriate programs and I can table in this House that information. That money was not spent. The reality is that we were not as a government responsible for the non-expenditure of those moneys but certain issues arose. I believe again the Member was also aware, at the time the discussions took place on the negotiation for the money, there was an ongoing debate about who would administer the money. Not who would be key in developing the programs but who would administer the money. We debated that issue some two years and there was a committee that was set up to recommend direction. Only up to a little over three million dollars I believe was spent on training of native people. And in fact, not only native people, but people in the NWT. I believe a lot of the money also went to community projects. So we lost as of right now, we do not have that seven million dollars that we had an opportunity to use. So it is gone. But I will table in this House, a document that shows where we did not spend that money. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 204-85(1): Yellowknife Separate School District Budget

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Education with respect to Yellowknife Education District No. 2, the separate school district in Yellowknife. It seems that a situation, Mr. Minister, may occur again which occurred a couple of years ago and that is with the amount of increase in the annual budget. Although the intention, it appears, is to try to match it to increases in the territorial government school system, the fact that the board is already locked into certain incremental payments would mean that an increase of, let's say three per cent, in their budget, would not really represent an increase in three per cent and it could represent a decrease. So, could I ask whether the Minister is aware of this difficulty? Whether he can indicate what percentage increase in budget will be in effect for next year for that school district? And finally, whether a figure has been set but it did not take into account the incremental increases that they are locked into? Whether he would reconsider it with that in mind?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 204-85(1): Yellowknife Separate School District Budget

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that alarm about precisely what will be given by way of per pupil grants in the separate school board, is a little bit premature. Maybe I can explain. The main estimates approved by this House did include a 5.5 per cent price and enrolment increase over last year. The school districts were advised that this included a three per cent price increase. However, I would like to stress and I believe the boards were told this, that these are only estimates, since the actual grants are based on an agreed-to formula. The formula, as the Member may know, depends on actual costs in the Hay River, Fort Smith area and projected school district enrolment. We are still awaiting definite figures for 1984-85, so we really cannot at this point give any clear indication of what the new per pupil grant will be. The formula automatically incorporates increases for both price and enrolment and as far as the increments with the salary increments are concerned, they will be based on similar increments granted to public servant teachers in the schools south of the lake.

We are, I am informed, about to sit down to discuss in detail the grants once this 1984-85 year end data is available. So I think the numbers that are in the budget should be seen as only tentative holding figures, and I would urge the boards to await the detailed discussions that will shortly occur. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question 205-85(1): NWT Ducks Unlimited Program

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Renewable Resources with regard to Ducks Unlimited. It is an independent group that are quite concerned about the duck population. I believe there was an agreement signed with the Yukon government with regard to this particular group. I would like to ask the Minister whether any initiative has been considered possibly with regard to implementing that type of program, similar to the Yukon with the Northwest Territories?

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Cournoyea.

Return To Question 205-85(1): NWT Ducks Unlimited Program

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, yesterday Ducks Unlimited was indeed in Yellowknife and have been spending some time in Yellowknife, had a fund raising activity within Yellowknife and did quite well. We have been speaking to Ducks Unlimited for about a year and they are quite interested in establishing an office in Yellowknife and doing some work with the Northwest Territories government. The Yukon has signed an agreement and Ducks Unlimited would provide \$2.2 million on wetlands in the next 10 years in the Yukon for the development of these. Ducks Unlimited is interested in signing an agreement at some point in time with the Northwest Territories. We do not have any agreement that exists between our government and Ducks Unlimited right now and up to this point Ducks Unlimited has agreed to co-sponsor a small wetlands project with Habitat Canada within the Northwest Territories. We were fully informed of that. The project will be managed by Habitat Canada management section.

The project is designed, right now, to examine the potential wetland classification system and to begin identifying wetlands important to wildlife in the Northwest Territories. The work is applicable to the land use planning and conservation task force initiatives. The one goal of the project is to involve the Government of the Northwest Territories in this program. In the past it has been the federal government that has been involved so we are quite encouraged with the tentative arrangements that are planned to be set up and we will be doing that in consultation with the various native organizations who would be possibly involved in identifying the areas that are important. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Ms Minister. Mr. Gargan.

Supplementary To Question 205-85(1): NWT Ducks Unlimited Program

MR. GARGAN: Again, my question is to the Minister of Renewable Resources. I believe that this group does revegetation in the waters for waterfowl to graze on. I would like to ask the Minister whether this group would jeopardize the aboriginal hunters or trappers in the North?

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Cournoyea.

Further Return To Question 205-85(1): NWT Ducks Unlimited Program

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that, the Northwest Territories government and the Department of Renewable Resources would not embark on any restoration or work without consulting the people that are immediately involved with the areas and the habitats that possibly could have some work done on them. We certainly intend to carry out that type of involvement and with the funding to hunters and trappers associations, we feel that they would be in a far better position to work with us closely. So we do not intend to arbitrarily go about making these initiatives without the involvement of them. Thank you.

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

Question 206-85(1): Meeting With Yellowknife Association Of Concerned Citizens For Seniors

MR. MacQUARRIE: A question for the Minister of Health and Social Services. We appreciate that the Minister was able to tentatively help the Yellowknife Association of Concerned Citizens for Seniors to find some property to build a senior citizens facility on, but I know that had to do partly with the hospital board giving approval to the land in question and I know the Minister was meeting last night with the board. Can I ask the Minister what are the results of the meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 206-85(1): Meeting With Yellowknife Association Of Concerned Citizens For Seniors

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I met with the hospital board last night with my deputy minister, assistant deputy minister, the president of Yellowknife Association of Concerned Citizens for Seniors and the board members of the Yellowknife Stanton Hospital. They were very favourable to the concept of having the new personal care facility built in the hospital area. They could see the wisdom of that as a long-term objective for delivering programs to the aged in Yellowknife. But, due to the fact that they do have jurisdiction over the hospital they have some concerns about the present existing patient services and proper delivery and operation of the hospital during the construction period and the two years after that while they will still be on that site. I do not believe that their concerns cannot be overcome by an agreement between the Yellowknife association and the hospital board. In fact, the president of YACCS, Mrs. Bromley, offered them a seat on the project committee for the construction of the personal care facility and the hospital board has accepted that as well. So I think all we have to do now is, since we have achieved the main objective at the meeting which was to get their approval to locate the personal care facility on the site, is just to accommodate everybody's hopes and aspirations in this project on that site and I am sure that we can do it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question 207-85(1): Gas Transmission Operators

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question again to the Leader of the Government and it is in regard to the transmission operation of the oil pipeline. There were quite a number of residents from the North that did take two to three years of training as gas transmission operators and that training would be wasted if they do not get positions in that particular area. I would like to ask the Minister, in negotiating or in discussions with the major corporations, that he would request possibly that these people be considered for positions.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 207-85(1): Gas Transmission Operators

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will take the Member's advice on any discussions that the government has with regard to employment of northern people on the stations. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further oral questions?

Item 5, written questions. Are there any written questions? Item 6, returns. Are there any returns today? Mr. McLaughlin.

ITEM 6: RETURNS

Return To Questions 65-85(1), 129-85(1) And 156-85(1): Vehicle For Grise Fiord

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to written Question 65-85(1), oral Question 129-85(1) and oral Question 156-85(1), asked by Mr. Pudluk on February 12th and 18th, 1985 and March 18th, 1985, concerning the vehicle to transport patients in Grise Fiord.

I have pursued the honourable Member's concern about the lack of an adequate vehicle to transport patients within the community of Grise Fiord. Health and Welfare Canada has advised that the extra vehicle they have in Resolute Bay is not adequate for operation in the Arctic and is being returned to the manufacturer. The Hon. Gordon Wray, Minister of Public Works, has advised me that his department is not able to tender for and purchase a vehicle in time for this year's sealift.

However, he has suggested that DPW could construct a box over one of the existing GNWT vehicles in order to transport stretcher cases when necessary. The Hon. Nick Sibbeston, Minister of Local Government, has advised that "The half ton pick-up scheduled for 1987-88 could be upgraded to a Suburban in that year." However, he has also advised that the present half ton fire pick-up could be modified by installing a fibreglass top unit.

I should also point out to Mr. Pudluk that a large heated MOT trailer which will adequately accommodate medivacs is scheduled for this year's summer sealift to Grise Fiord. The Department of Public Works and Highways will look at the suggested possible vehicle modification and in conjunction with the settlement council, recommend the most suitable solution to meet the needs for medical transportation in Grise Fiord.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further returns? Mr. Nerysoo.

Return To Question 176-85(1): Emergency Lights, Northern United Place

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a return to oral Question 176-85(1), asked by Mr. Pudluk on March 23rd, 1985, with regard to Northern United Place emergency lighting.

In response to the question raised by the honourable Member for the High Arctic with regard to emergency lighting for Northern United Place, I can assure the honourable Member that the building is equipped with an emergency lighting system. What happened on the occasion in question when portions of the building were blacked out is that both the fire alarm system and the emergency generator were activated by a power surge in NCPC power supply to Northern United Place. Normally when there is a power loss or a power surge of this kind to the building, an automatic transfer switch starts the emergency generator and bypasses the normal power supply. On the occasion in question, there was a malfunction in the transfer switch which caused the blackout to parts of the building. This problem has now been corrected and all systems are working properly.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further returns? Ms Cournoyea.

Return To Question 183-85(1): Travel Funding For Inuit Musicians

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I have a return that was given to me by Hon. Nick Sibbeston to present. It is a question asked by Mr. Arlooktoo on March 25, 1985, regarding Inuit musicians travel funding.

We are in the process of establishing the NWT Advisory Council for the Arts. This council will review applications for funds for the performing arts and will advise Mr. Sibbeston on which proposals to fund. The funds are in the 1985-86 budget. The council members will be appointed in early May and a call for nominations to the council has been put into the paper this week so that the community people may nominate people to the council. There is \$350,000 available this year for the performing, literary and visual arts and for the operation of the NWT Advisory Council for the Arts. The fund will be in the form of contributions and will help with the work of musicians, actors, painters, carvers, writers, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further returns? Ms Cournoyea.

Further Return To Question 159-85(1): PCBs At Pond Inlet Airstrip

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I have three returns. Return to oral Question 159-85(1), asked by Elijah Erkloo on March 18th, regarding the DEWline clean-up.

During the week of March 18th to 25th, meetings are being held at Broughton Island, Lake Harbour, Frobisher Bay, Hall Beach and Igloolik. These meetings are held not only to advise the people of the proposed clean-up and to answer their concerns, but also to seek their input as to known locations of abandoned electrical equipment. In addition, posters are sent to the communities asking residents to report sightings of such equipment to the local wildlife officer who will pass the information on to this office. The degree of success of this clean-up program will depend on information such as that passed on by Mr. Erkloo. I will see to it that his information is passed on to the agencies co-ordinating and carrying out the clean-up. Mr. Erkloo's information is much appreciated.

Return To Question 190-85(1): Replacement Of Hunting Equipment

A return to oral Question 190-85(1) asked by Moses Appaqaq on March 26th, regarding equipment replacement.

I would like to thank the honourable Member for bringing this matter to my attention. I have advised the deputy minister to ensure that the appropriate claim is made, under the disaster compensation policy, for this individual. We expect the claim to be presented to the regional superintendent for Renewable Resources in Frobisher Bay by the end of next week. I wish to assure the Member that this matter will be concluded quickly.

Return To Question 173-85(1): Sale Of Outpost Camp Housing, Pangnirtung

A return to oral Question 173-85(1), a question asked by Mr. Paniloo on March 22nd, regarding ownership of outpost camps.

The Department of Renewable Resources has a long-standing policy or agreement which gives the hunters and trappers associations authority to reassign the use of government funded outpost camps which have been or are being abandoned by the occupants. The hunters and trappers associations may assign these camps to families or groups interested in participating in the outpost camp program, or it can authorize the use of these camps as short-term hunting camps. Specific correspondence regarding this request was passed to the president of Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Association, Peterloosie Karpik, by our regional superintendent, Bob Wooley. The decision on your request rests with the Pangnirtung Hunters and Trappers Association and they should be contacting you soon. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further returns? Last call for returns for today.

Item 7, petitions. Item 8, reports of standing and special committees. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 8: REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Report Of Standing Committee On Finance On Bill 8-85(1), Bill 9-85(1) And Bill 10-85(1)

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The standing committee on finance has prepared a report on Bill 8-85(1), Bill 9-85(1) and Bill 10-85(1). What I would like to do is give a brief summary of each report and then move that these reports be received by the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed with your report.

Bill 8-85(1), Financial Agreement Act

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first report deals with Bill 8-85(1). Bill 8-85(1) authorizes the Commissioner and the Minister of Finance to enter into a financial agreement with the Government of Canada providing for the payment of a grant to the GNWT for the financial period from April 1, 1985 to March 31, 1988, and any further period as may be agreed upon by the Government of Canada and the GNWT. The legal agreement for formula financing consists of a three year memorandum of agreement which covers the period April 1, 1985 to March 31, 1988. A memorandum of understanding is negotiated annually in each of the three fiscal years pursuant to the memorandum of agreement. At the outset of our discussions with the Minister of Finance regarding Bill 8-85(1), the committee expressed a basic philosophical concern with authorizing the Commissioner and the Minister of Finance to enter into a three year financial agreement which could be extended, amended, varied or terminated without the necessity for ratification by the Legislative Assembly. In our opinion the original wording of the legislation conferred carte blanche on the Commissioner and the Minister of Finance with respect to financial arrangements with the federal government in the present and subsequent fiscal years. Formula financing is the most critical step to date in our progress toward financial autonomy and we felt that the ultimate authority to formally sanction these financial agreements should rest with the Legislative Assembly. In further negotiations with the Minister, the committee agreed to support the legislation on the basis that it provides for ratification of the memorandum of agreement and any variation, amendment, extension or termination of the memorandum of agreement. In our recent discussion with the Minister of Finance the committee and the Minister reached agreement in having reviewed this legislation and with the addition of subsection 5(3), we are satisfied that this bill accomplished the intent the committee has to ratification.

Bill 9-85(1), Loan Authorization Act, No. 1, 1985-86

Mr. Speaker, the next report deals with Bill 9-85(1). Bill 9-85(1) authorizes the Commissioner to borrow an aggregate of five million dollars in 1985-86 for the purpose of making loans to municipalities for capital purposes. Loans by the GNWT to the municipalities pursuant to this act are secured by means of municipal debentures. Mr. Speaker, this committee recommended a couple of minor amendments to the bill. We reached agreement with the Minister and the standing committee on finance is prepared to pass this bill as it was amended.

Bill 10-85(1), Supplementary Act, No. 3, 1984-85

My last report, Mr. Speaker, is on Bill 10-85(1), Supplementary Appropriation Act, No. 3, 1984-85. The purpose of this bill is to authorize additional expenditures of \$2,619,600, I apologize for a typo -- the actual report reads \$2,619,000 for the 1984-85 fiscal year -- and to authorize the deletion of \$10,807.95 on obsolete public property from the inventory of the Fort Smith public stores revolving fund. The committee questioned the Minister of Finance to consider the number of items in Bill 10-85(1) the government was seeking and on after the fact approval for expenditures. The main thrust of the committee's questioning related to the government's use of special warrants and an authority conferred by section 18 of the Financial Administration Ordinance which permits the Commissioner, on a report of the Financial Management Board, to authorize a disbursement of public money when the Legislature is not in session. Special warrants may only be issued where the expenditure is in the public interest and is urgently required. The Minister of Finance responded to the committee that the expenditures identified in supplementary appropriation No. 3 were all after the fact. The committee has a serious concern that in respect to this bill it is being asked to rubber-stamp expenditures which have been authorized by a political decision of the Financial Management Board. Our concern is particularly acute that in some cases the board may authorize expenditures for only the most tenuous reasons or urgencies. We intend to ensure through the exercise for examining the special warrants relating to each of the itemized expenditures that the authority for special warrants is not being abused.

The standing committee on finance further reports that it will undertake a comprehensive review of special warrants and other provisions of the Financial Agreement Ordinance and will report back to the Assembly on its findings and recommendations. On Saturday, February 23rd, 1985, the standing committee on finance agreed to defer consideration of Bill 10-85(1) and to question the departments on the respective supplementary appropriations as this bill is considered in committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Rule 92(2), I move, seconded by the honourable Member for the High Arctic, that the report of the standing committee on finance on Bill 8-85(1), Bill 9-85(1) and Bill 10-85(1) be received by this Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne. To the motion. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Reports of standing and special committees. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Report Of Standing Committee On Legislation

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a brief report from the standing committee on legislation. The standing committee has held four meetings thus far since the beginning of the year and these meetings have dealt primarily with a review of proposed legislation. Your committee has made several recommendations on several of these bills and the details of them will be addressed when we move into studies of the bill in committee of the whole.

The legislation that took the majority of the committee's time was the Young Offenders Act. Your committee had requested public input since the act's introduction a year ago. Your committee then reviewed the Young Offenders Act in August 1984 and again in October 1984 and the committee submitted a report to review of the Young Offenders Act during the November 1984 session. A good number of the committee's recommendations are incorporated in Bill 4-85(1), Young Offenders Act, which is before the House today. These will be noted as we go through the bill clause by clause.

Mr. Speaker, your committee has reviewed all of the legislation before the House which is not strictly of a financial nature. All financial bills as is the usual practice were referred to the standing committee on finance. Your committee in review of Bill 8-85(1), which had both financial and policy implications, passed a motion supporting the standing committee on finance's efforts in seeking further amendments to Bill 8-85(1) to ensure that there would be a strong role for the Assembly in reaching financial agreements with the Government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, your committee at the request of caucus, intends this year to do a thorough review of the Elections Act, 1978 of the Northwest Territories and to that end, some time ago, your committee sent out letters to all candidates and returning officers who were returning officers during the last NWT general election. We had requested comments and suggestions regarding the whole electoral process and to date your committee is pleased with a number of replies it has received. Based on these recommendations and those of the chief electoral officer, your committee will submit a report sometime during the life of the 10th Assembly and your committee, of course, hopes that this will result in better election administration and better legislation that will benefit those who intend to seek public office in the Northwest Territories. Your committee has decided that it will meet in the summer during the month of August to deal solely with the act and with the object of trying to have a report before this House at the fall session. Although the committee had put an earlier deadline on comments from Members and other interested parties with respect to possible revisions to the act and that deadline has passed, I must say in view of the fact that the committee has scheduled a summer meeting, Members and others are still invited to make submissions in that respect.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, your committee has continuously requested that the government have legislation for the committee's review six weeks prior to a session so that a thorough review of legislation can take place and while the Hon. Tom Butters is making sincere efforts to comply with the committee's request, this system is not yet as effective as it might be. To try to make it more effective I will announce the standing committee on legislation will meet May 14th, 15th and 16th in order to deal with any legislation that is proposed by the government to be introduced at the spring session and we trust that the government will have that legislation ready for us to deal with at that time.

That is the general part of my report, Mr. Speaker. I will add more detail as we deal with each bill and I will move, seconded by the honourable Member for Slave River, that this report be received by the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, to the motion. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

It is my intention to continue on to motions and I understand there may be some amendments to this motion. It is my intention, if there are, that I would like them typed out so we would have a 10 minute break at that time while they are being typed so that we make sure that we get things right. So if everybody will stay with me, I know there are some honourable Members looking for a few minutes break but we will have one when we get to that point. Reports of standing and special committees.

Item 9, tabling of documents.

Item 10, notices of motions. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have unanimous consent to go back to petitions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent being requested. Are there any nays? Go ahead, Mr. Wray.

ITEM 7: PETITIONS

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition from the community of Whale Cove, Petition 10-85(1), signed by approximately 42 people requesting a Hudson's Bay store be put into their community.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Are there any further petitions? Notices of motion. Item 11, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Item 12, motions.

ITEM 12: MOTIONS

Motion 19-85(1), Development of Nunavut and a Western Territory, Ms Cournoyea.

Motion 19-85(1): Development Of Nunavut And A Western Territory

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS this House has accepted Tabled Document 23-85(1), The Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Constitutional Alliance of the Northwest Territories, tabled February 22, 1985, and endorsed the principles of agreement attached as appendix A;

AND WHEREAS this House appreciates the important roles played by the Western Constitutional Forum, the Nunavut Constitutional Forum and the Constitutional Alliance in the process of constitutional development for Nunavut and a western territory;

AND WHEREAS this House realizes the need for discussions on constitutional development, the creation of new government structures, and the division of the Northwest Territories into Nunavut and the western territory to continue;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Kivallivik, that this House endorse the following:

- 1) That this House continue to encourage and support the discussions and negotiations between the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum through the auspices of the Constitutional Alliance toward the development of Nunavut and a western territory;
- 2) That this House continue to deliberate on the outcome of such discussions and negotiations and recommend to the Government of Canada a course of action that this House thinks appropriate for the creation of Nunavut and the western territory;
- 3) That this House suggests that any reports brought forward by the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum through the auspices of the Constitutional Alliance, be based upon recognized forms of public government, taking into account other proposals including the Nunavut proposal, Building Nunavut, and the Denendeh proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: Your motion is in order, Ms Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, in the discussions and the debate that have been held over the past few weeks and some of the confusion, there have been a number of questions by the general public whether, with the discussions and the impasses that have taken place, the Nunavut Constitutional Forum, the Western Constitutional Forum and the Constitutional Alliance are still in place. In particular, Mr. Speaker, this motion is put forward by myself as MLA from Nunakput because a lot of the questions that are being asked are from that area. It is felt that with all the discussions that have taken place that perhaps this House would feel that these alliances and these forums perhaps may have outlived their usefulness. The response that I have generally given is that even though there may have been debate, that there was no intention of this House to abandon either the forums or the alliance, and that this was a normal proceeding. So this motion is a motion to once again establish the fact that this House recognizes that these two forums continue to have a job done and the alliance will continue to move forward on its recommendations and in meeting together and trying to find a way where the divisional question could be answered most appropriately. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. The seconder, Mr. Wray? Mr. McCallum?

MR. MCCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the motion, amendment to clause three in the resolution of the motion. I am having it typed so that it will be put around to people but it is not ready at the moment, so could I then ask you to call a short recess?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I will call a recess. If there are any other persons with any amendments to this, would they please have them typed and ready for presentation and translated. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Member might read his amendment and then those of us who do have amendments in mind might not get off track attempting to put in something of the same nature.

MR. SPEAKER: That sounds like a reasonable request if you are prepared to co-operate, Mr. McCallum.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1)

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will move an amendment to clause three in the resolution clause where it says in the third last line, the last phrase, I will move an amendment to delete the words "taking into account other proposals including the Nunavut proposal Building Nunavut and the Denendeh proposal" and replace it with a phrase that I do not have at my disposal at the present time. I have given it to get it typed. It says though -- and I will replace the words that I suggested deleting, with the words "but also take into account the necessity of protecting the rights and interests of the North's aboriginal peoples".

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Then we will recess for 10 minutes to have these typed and translated.

---SHORT RECESS

Amendment Reworded

Mr. McCallum's motion reads: "That this House suggests that any constitutional proposals brought forward by the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum through the auspices of the Constitutional Alliance be based upon recognized forms of public government but also take into account the necessity of protecting the rights and interests of the North's aboriginal peoples."

MR. McCALLUM: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the third clause in the resolution part of the motion reads that this House suggests that any reports -- what I have brought to you is a further change. I just noted it, where it suggests that "any constitutional proposals". So, I guess, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with it I should indicate to you that I am now proposing two amendments to it. Mr. Speaker, just on a point of clarification it may be easier if I would indicate that I am amending that whole clause three to read as I have brought forward to you. I do not want to get into a debate on it as to which way it would go but if you think it is easier for me to simply replace the present clause three with this particular amendment I would be willing to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no trouble with the amendment. To the amendment. Who was your seconder, Mr. McCallum?

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, it is seconded by the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: To the amendment please.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I make to it using the terminology "constitutional proposals" is because I believe that there will be proposals being made by a number of different organizations or groups or individuals, not simply just reports, but there would be some constitutional proposals. Hence the change in the wording. It is my opinion that what we are trying to do here when we are getting these proposals and having them based upon recognized forms of public government that they would have to take into account the protection of the rights and interests of the North's aboriginal peoples, not just dealing with the two proposals, Building Nunavut and the Denendeh proposal. Using the report Building Nunavut, suggests as well that we are going to support something that contains a tree line and I do not think that that is the only proposal. There may be many of these proposals come to us, as well as with the Denendeh proposal although this proposal was tabled I think in the Eighth Assembly. I think that it has undergone

revision and we would be able to use anybody's proposals that would come into the alliance or the alliance should take those into consideration. It is my opinion in this instance that this would better bring about the desired results by using the terminology that is there. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The seconder, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking in support of the amendment I would say that in the first instance the change of the word "reports" to "constitutional proposals" is not in my opinion a really significant change. They will be alliance or forum reports and they will contain what they contain and presumably if they follow the mandate, some of what the reports contain will be constitutional proposals. So in my estimation it could read either way and be acceptable. With respect to the change in the last part from the wording of the motion that was originally introduced, I find this significant and would like to see the change made that was proposed by the honourable Member for Slave River. The initial motion mentions just two documents, the Building Nunavut proposal and the Denendeh discussion document, in the motion called the Denendeh proposal.

Many Documents Related To Matters Of Constitutional Development And Division

Now in the first place there are many documents that have been produced by both forums that are related to the matters of constitutional development and division. Many studies on behalf of the NCF, for example, a study on custom law on behalf of the WCF, a study on the boundary overlap and the problem of renewable resource management problems that might result from boundary overlaps. Those are just two examples. There are many, many more that could be included. Since there are, I think that you do not really contribute a great deal by mentioning only two. The second thing that I would like to point out is that they are not equivalent documents. The Building Nunavut proposal has more of a formal status with the Nunavut Constitutional Forum. They have brought it to a number of communities to have people discuss elements of that document, whereas the Denendeh paper is simply a paper that was put out by one party in the Western Constitutional Forum, namely the Dene Nation -- perhaps two parties I should say -- it was put out by the Dene Nation and the Metis Association, but put out as a discussion document by the executives of those two associations. It has never attained any more formal status than that with those associations. It has not received the endorsement of national assemblies or annual general meetings on the part of the Metis Association, and it does not have status with the full Western Constitutional Forum, and therefore is inappropriate to mention in this kind of motion.

In addition, there is a concern and I regret that the Hon. Nick Sibbeston is not here, because it is a concern that he has expressed elsewhere publicly, not only to me, that the discussion paper -- first of all a statement about it and then a concern -- the statement being that the discussion paper which was put out some years ago has certainly not been in the forefront of western discussions in recent months or years. Secondly, he wondered about the purpose of putting mention of this particular paper in such a motion because it is recognized by himself, by me and by others too, that there is a concern among some people who may be living in a western territory that they do not want constitutional development predetermined by one party's position. That concern would be registered on the part of non-native people and certainly registered on the part of Inuvialuit as well. And therefore, to have a motion like this with specific mention of that document may cause some alarm that that is the document that will form the basis of a western constitution when, in fact, that is not the case. The Dene in joining the WCF have, like all other parties in the forum, recognized that by joining it there will be a need for discussion and compromise. So it is clear that they cannot expect in that forum to attain everything that is in that document.

I would say as well that by substituting the wording which the honourable Member for Slave River has suggested, that it does not preclude the consideration of those two documents. They can absolutely be included in the discussions and considerations of the forums in the alliance but it also leaves the door open to an equivalent consideration of any other documents that might be appropriate to the study. So it does not prevent but it does enable something more and so I think that is a good reason why Members should support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: To the amendment. Mr. Patterson.

Basis For Nunavut Territorial Government

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to mention that in my view the document Building Nunavut is the document which will form the basis of the Nunavut territorial government. It is not merely another proposal. It has been discussed I think quite extensively amongst leaders in the Nunavut area and also at some 34 public meetings throughout the NWT. I very much look forward to seeing any constitutional proposal brought forward by the WCF. I think that, as was observed in this House early today by other honourable Members, the Western Forum has spent an awful lot of time travelling in the coastal parts of the NWT, particularly in the Kitikmeot and Inuvialuit communities. But I look forward to finding out how they are going to take into account the wishes of the Dene and Metis in the Mackenzie Valley and in communities in that region. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not vote on the amendment although I have a couple of concerns. First of all, the original motion only said to take into account other proposals including Building Nunavut and the Denendeh proposal and did not say that we would use them as a basis for anything. It just says that we have to take account of them. Any proposal which will come from the Nunavut Constitutional Forum will take into account the Building Nunavut document because it will form the basis of our new government. Now, perhaps some of the western Members would like to see the Denendeh proposal buried and dead and not even acknowledged, but my problem is that it is one of the very few substantive proposals that will be seen coming from the West. There has been very little come from the West and we have proposals for government. It is, I acknowledge a document that has been in existence for quite a long time. The fact is that it was drawn up and presented by the Dene Nation as what they saw as a basis for discussion on a new government and a new way of doing things in the West. So it cannot be ignored, it has to be acknowledged. It is there. It exists. Unless the Dene Nation come out and say publicly that no, the Denendeh proposal is dead and we do not even want to talk about it, then obviously there is going to be some problems in the WCF. Because you cannot ignore it, it is there. So I just wanted to make those two comments. I think there is perhaps a little bit of overreaction to the naming of those two documents, but it is certainly clear in the original motion that these two documents will only be taken into account along with other proposals. But they are the only two substantive documents in existence right now and that is why they were named, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wray. To the amendment. Mr. T'Seleie.

Objection Based On The Name

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to support this amendment. For a long time now we have been forced to live under a territory that is called the NWT, which was really not a name that we had chosen. As I understand it, to this point the objection of some people to naming this part of the territory is based mainly on the name. I would argue that we have been living in a country that we have no choice in naming and we have been able to put up with it pretty well. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but right now I am not prepared to address my objections to this amendment on other grounds.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Ms Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, there seemed to be some question on why we would want to include Building Nunavut and the Denendeh proposal. It appears to me that all the discussions on division and constitutional forms of government have stemmed from these two documents and these are significant documents, Building Nunavut for us and Denendeh for many aboriginal people in the Mackenzie Valley. Certainly in terms of Building Nunavut and eliminating that, we feel that this is a document that has had quite a bit of public consultation and discussion and it is really a document that takes into consideration not only the aboriginal people living in Nunavut but also the other people that would be involved. We feel that in not recognizing Building Nunavut it appears that we are putting aside work that has gone on for many years and a great deal of money has been spent to bring forth that document.

In terms of the Denendeh proposal, one of the positive things I find about it is that it does address a lot of questions that people do answer and I do not believe that we should put something like that aside because it does address a lot of the major concerns when it comes to aboriginal

people probably living in other than Nunavut in terms of numbers and how would you survive as aboriginal people in numbers in a society that would probably come out fairly strong in terms of "others" rather than the aboriginal people in the Mackenzie Valley.

Inuvialuit In Recognized Forms Of Public Government

I believe that a lot of discussions have centred around how, if the Inuvialuit and the people who are going to be in these recognized forms of public government, how would they be represented. It seems to me that the Denendeh proposal does come to a certain degree although we can talk about how we feel about those documents and say, "Well they are just one of many." But to me they are significant documents and they are things that people really know about. The other proposals that have come forward since are not really that well-known or well respected as documents. I sometimes do not feel it is too bad if someone hints a little bit about whether the document is full enough or not, but certainly there was a general feeling that, particularly in the last round of consultation, is that there was a feeling that for some reason it seemed that someone was trying to put the Denendeh proposal on the shelf and this caused some concern to people because if you go back to the actual vote this is one of the questions that was never really clear, is just how much we did know about this proposal and what it would look like.

Certainly, in terms of Dene people, I think they know much more than the Inuit know about trying to survive in a very highly populated area in terms of other people moving in. Perhaps we may be less aggressive in pursuing some of the areas of particular rights in a government and perhaps we have some kind of feeling that perhaps we are far enough in the Arctic and we do not have any trees and it is not considered the most appropriate place to live when there are more aesthetically serene wooded areas with large rivers and places people are more used to living in. I know we might sometimes appear not too sympathetic but yet at the same time we do respect those observations and those needs that generate from the Denendeh proposal. Although we talk about some of the points that come in that particular proposal, if you read some of the documents that are coming out of the Western Constitutional Forum, for some reason they appear to come a bit watered down but yet you could see from those newly developed documents that the essence and the questions and some of the answers and solutions proposed in the Denendeh proposal are put into various other papers. But I guess that is the way researchers do it. They read all the papers and they rewrite them and that is probably some of the very skilful tack they have taken putting forth new proposals.

I think there is really a great deal of merit in the Denendeh proposal when you are dealing with areas where you are going to face a significant voting population that is not aboriginal. I feel it is significant and I believe both Building Nunavut and Denendeh were two proposals that really came to grips, maybe a little too harshly, to try to develop how aboriginal people will survive. I think the Denendeh proposal also indicated how they felt that they could work with the non-native people population in the Northwest Territories. I, for one, am not feeling that there is a need to take away the identification of two significant proposals and certainly two that have been talked about and probably worked on a lot longer than anything else, other than the normal status quo.

So I believe that Our Land, Our Future is significant and it is a good paper and it is a Denendeh proposal as well, and I feel that we should not try to say well, let us just take it away and try not to mention any of these things. In terms of Building Nunavut one of the concerns we had and I have personally, as representing a group of people, although we are not against moving to another constitutional framework and forum or whatever, it is the lack of a recognition that in the coastal communities there is a type of living condition that we try to address and we feel that oftentimes people are made to feel a little bit uncomfortable because we are abandoning a group of people that live close to us, but I guess no matter what we do somebody is going to abandon someone else. So I feel, Mr. Speaker, that although the amendment has been proposed, I really feel that it takes something away from recognizing a lot of people's work on a couple of documents that have meant a lot to people, maybe in a time when a lot of people did not get the recognition and probably the amounts of money to put together their ideas of self-preservation and dignity and determination. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel concern that some Members are not able to support the identification of Building Nunavut and Denendeh. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. To the amendment, Mr. Pedersen.

Government Reflecting Northern Values

MR. PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In my reply earlier today I stressed that I was looking for a government which reflected northern values and objected to the southern concept of government being imposed upon us. To me the Nunavut proposal Building Nunavut and the Denendeh proposal

reflect these northern values that I am looking for. Mr. Speaker, I therefore cannot support the amendment as I would oppose the removal of the reference by name to the proposals which I agree with, leaving in only the southern concept. So for that reason I will be opposing the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pedersen. To the amendment. Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me we are getting a little bit off the subject when we are talking about the value of these two documents. I think we will agree that these two documents have value and obviously these documents, along with other information, with other papers and hopefully some new ideas, will form the basis of discussion. But I thought the intent of this motion was that this House could agree to renew a process. We have tried for two days to find some sort of a common ground and it seems to me that the best way to achieve that is really to start fresh. It is really nothing to do with the value of these proposals. The Denendeh proposal is a proposal that is taken seriously in the West as a discussion paper. It has generated a lot of discussion. The Dene Nation since the time that it was first proposed acknowledge for example that the 10 year residency requirement is not possible. They talk in terms of a three year residency requirement now. There have been modifications to the proposal. The proposal is a very valuable one. It does contain the feelings of northern people. But I thought what we were trying to achieve is that when we leave here today or tomorrow, we could renew the process and not preclude anything, any idea that comes up. Obviously we have started off with certain ideas. We have reached an impasse and now we should leave here saying we are open to any idea which might come up and not to just pick two documents. I mean we could pick two, we could pick 10, we could pick 100. I think new ideas which might come forward could be very uniquely northern ideas. There might be a way to break this impasse, so I do not think people should in any way look at this amendment as attempting to cast any sort of aspersion on these two documents. What it is an attempt to say, "Let's start fresh. Let's go away from here and let's all take a good, hard look at it. How can we come together and how can we solve this problem?" So I am supporting the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the amendment. Mr. McCallum do you wish to -- no, I am sorry, you do not have a right under amendments. I am sorry.

---Laughter

I was just corrected by the Clerk, he said, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1), Defeated

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed, if any? I did not get a tie vote so I will have to do it over again. I do not count very well. Would you please hold your hands up high so that I can see. Those in favour please, high. Against? Now I get a tie.

---Laughter

I will cast my vote as against the amendment. So, the amendment failed.

---Defeated

To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. To the motion? Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Member for bringing forward this motion and as she points out, she brought it forward as the Member for Nunakput. It is extremely unfortunate that the motion that purports to suggest co-operation in the future and a working relationship renewed cannot be brought forward by a joint expression of resolve by both sides of this House from the East and the West. I hope that does not suggest that the future of the two forums will continue to be one of opposition and argument.

With regard to the motion, I think we have had a number of motions that have been placed and either rejected or withdrawn over the last three weeks and one of the motions that was withdrawn had a "whereas" clause which I felt was extremely important and that was that -- this one by the way, Mr. Speaker, was put by Mr. Sibbeston and Mr. Patterson and later withdrawn by Mr. Sibbeston. The "whereas" clause in that motion said, "And whereas the 10th Assembly recognizes that the Government of the Northwest Territories has an important role to fulfil in the implementation of division and the establishment of two new governments". I would like to follow that up by making an amendment to the motion before us and adding after element three of the resolve, one which you describe as four and I will read it and circulate the material or have the material circulated.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1)

My seconder, sir, will be the honourable Member for Mackenzie Delta. The amendment, sir, is: 4) And finally, that the Government of the Northwest Territories begin to participate more fully in the constitutional development process by providing support to the Assembly's representatives on the alliance and forums on various issues as required, undertaking special tasks for which the alliance and forums are not equipped, playing a major role in discussions with the federal government regarding non-renewable resource management and revenue sharing as well as the transfer of other responsibilities to territorial governments, accepting primary responsibility for negotiations with the federal government regarding the implementation of division and co-ordinating that implementation.

MR. SPEAKER: I presume, Mr. Butters, that your statement, "Government of the Northwest Territories" is the Executive? Is that correct?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, and on occasions I guess it could be the Leader when he is representing the Executive.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1), Ruled Out Of Order

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Butters, I find your motion is out of order in that we are duplicating section two of Ms Cournoyea's motion which reads "2) That this House continue to deliberate on the outcome of such discussions and negotiations and recommend to the Government of Canada a course of action that this House thinks appropriate for the creation of Nunavut and the western territory". Your motion says "Accepting primary responsibility for negotiations with the federal government regarding the implementation of division by the Executive". It is in conflict with the original motion. To the motion. Mr. Butters, have you a point of order or something?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion, Mr. Butters. To the motion. Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This motion I am supporting it, for these reasons; all these letters that we brought here to this House from our constituencies and for the reason that we would like this to be discussed more toward Nunavut. These are my two concerns that I would like more discussions on toward with the Constitutional Alliance. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Paniloo. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1)

MR. MACQUARRIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to the third clause in the resolution section. I move that the word "and" in the second to the last line of that section be deleted and that the period at the end of the word "proposal" in the last line be replaced by a comma, and that the following words be added "the Carrothers Commission report on constitutional development in the NWT; the Drury Report on constitutional development in the NWT, the city of Yellowknife constitutional development paper; the south Mackenzie area council report on regional government, the NWT Association of Municipalities paper on constitutional development, and Our Land, Our Future, a publication of the Ministry of Aboriginal Rights and Constitutional Development of the GNWT."

AN HON. MEMBER: Check that over, did you miss anything?

MR. SPEAKER: Could we have a copy please, Mr. MacQuarrie? Mr. MacQuarrie, your amendment is in order, is there a seconder?

MR. McCALLUM: I will second it.

MR. SPEAKER: You have the floor, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Although a list like this may seem to have a frivolous intent, I can assure you that it does not, Mr. Speaker and Members. What we see in the motion as it stands is the mention of just two documents that relate to constitutional development and the impression is given that there is one for the East and one for the West and that is the end of the matter. But the truth is that in dealing with this very complex and difficult matter of constitutional development and division, that there really are many, many documents that have to be brought to bear on it and I have mentioned some of those in my proposed amendment. I would still say, I would underline the word "some" when I said "some of those". Because unquestionably there are still other documents as well and that is what I would intend by adding these, merely to show that there are many, they are varied and all of them ought to be considered by the forums when they discuss and negotiate in the area of constitutional development and later report to the Legislative Assembly. Until there are firm proposals to the Assembly from the forums and the alliance, we should not suppose that any particular of those documents have greater worth than any of the others.

It is unquestionable that in the minds of particular groups of people who have advanced particular proposals that those are the ones that are most important, and I respect their right to think that and to feel that way. But of course then they must recognize that other proposals that are advanced by other groups are considered by them to be very important in the whole process as well. Since I cannot possibly, and would not want to include a comprehensive list of all the documents that are in that category, I think I have at least added a list that is long enough that anyone reading the motion would see that there are many, many documents that need to be considered in this discussion. It does not take anything away from the original motion, so I hope that Members who voted against the previous amendment and support the motion, could still support my amendment because the two documents that are named are still included, they are not to be removed, the Building Nunavut proposal and the Denendeh discussion paper are both still included, so I hope that all Members can support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. McCallum, do you wish to speak as seconder?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. Mr. Appaqaq.

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to speak briefly on the amendment. I do not think I could support the amendment because it will be used in the newspaper. If I support the amendment it seems like we are going to listen to what the Ottawa people want us to do and I think we should make up our own minds. I think the motion as it is is okay. I think the people in Nunavut and the Denendeh should work together and negotiate together. With the amendment it seems like we are trying to get help from southern people.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Appaqaq. To the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1), Defeated

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All those in favour of the amendment? Hold your hands up high please. Opposed, if any? The amendment is defeated.

---Defeated

To the motion. And remember you can only speak to the motion once, if you have already spoken to the motion you cannot speak again. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I wonder if you would explain why my amendment was ruled out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: That too is out of order, Mr. Butters. You cannot question the Speaker on his rulings. Mr. Richard, to the motion.

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, on this motion I will abstain. I have difficulty with the third resolve, in other words the references are that the Constitutional Alliance suggested that they take into account the Building Nunavut document and the Denendeh discussion paper, but because the two amendments which were proposed were defeated, no other documents which have been considered by the alliance to date are to be included in this paragraph three. Because of that I have serious difficulty with that because there are some substantial concerns to myself and my constituents in the Building Nunavut document and also in the Denendeh discussion paper. For that reason I cannot agree to paragraph three but also in conscience cannot vote against the preamble clauses and paragraph one and two and I will abstain. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too will abstain on this motion. I had hoped that we would be able to come up with a motion that would mean that when we leave this House, we would actually give it an honest effort, to try to achieve some sort of consensus on this very, very difficult issue. I think that the two amendments that were proposed were an attempt on some of our parts anyhow, to find some compromise, to try to find a way to get out of this impasse. So I, like my colleague Mr. Richard, agree with some of the concepts put forward in the motion. It is because of the fact that certain Members would not accept either one of those amendments put forward, I, in good conscience, cannot support the motion as it stands. So I really hope that we find our way out of the impasse. I do not feel that motion is accomplishing that and I will abstain.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, to the motion. Mr. Nerysoo.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1)

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker; "4) And finally that this House recommends that the Executive Council begin to participate more fully in the constitutional development process by: (1) providing support to the Assembly's representatives on the alliance and forums and various issues as required; (2) undertake in special tasks for which the alliance and forums are not equipped; and (3) playing a major role in discussions with the federal government regarding non-renewable resource management and revenue sharing, as well as the transfer of other responsibilities to the territorial government."

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House wish to have this typed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: We will recess to have the motion typed.

HON. GORDON WRAY: It has already been typed.

MR. SPEAKER: The preamble has been changed, Mr. Wray.

---SHORT RECESS

Order please. During the recess, we were having an amendment typed. The amendment by Mr. Nerysoo. It reads, "4) And finally this House recommends that the Executive Council begin to participate more fully in the constitutional development process by: (1) providing support to the Assembly's representatives on the alliance and forums and various issues as required; (2) undertaking special tasks for which the alliance and forums are not equipped; (3) playing a major role in discussion with the federal government regarding non-renewable resource management and revenue sharing as well as the transfer of other responsibilities to the territorial government." The motion is in order. To the motion. Mr. Nerysoo. To the amendment rather. Who is the seconder to the amendment? Mr. Butters.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to indicate that firstly, I believe that presently we have a capacity in government to provide certain support that could be of great assistance to the discussions that lead to any constitutional agreements in the Northwest Territories, particularly seeing as we are going to begin developing strategies with regard to the devolution of responsibilities to this government. But always those strategies have to take into consideration the process that is now in existence, and I think it is important as well to recognize that during the negotiations of aboriginal rights that there can be arrangements and agreements that are reached that could influence the process. I think that particular experience that we have within government certainly can, I believe, play a significant and important role in political evolution and constitutional development as we have supported over the past three, four, five years.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the whole question and certainly direction already in statements from Members in this House have indicated that we should begin serious discussions regarding such issues as renewable resource management, non-renewable resource management, the whole question of revenue sharing. Certainly there are ongoing comments with regard to this government providing better services and at times we are handicapped in providing those particular responsibilities and services and programs because they presently are in the hands of the federal government. Often at times they are really in competition in the sense of the manner in which we operate the programs. So I really think that it is responding to a concern of Members in this House, so I would like to conclude with that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Butters. Mr. Butters, as seconder, do you wish to speak? To the amendment, Mr. MacQuarrie.

Problems With A Unilateral Motion

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have problems with the amendment and will probably abstain in the vote. The reason I have problems is because it is similar to the problems I have with the motion. In a matter that is so complex and so important, first of all a motion that tries to reconcile and to answer all of the things that have to be answered should not be a unilateral motion, it should be one that all Members and parties have had significant input into. Secondly, to attempt to address what is a very important question on the floor of the House in what is now, if I may be excused the expression, a half-assed manner because a half of an initial amendment has been dropped, I just find that not acceptable at all. I will say publicly as I said before, I do see a role for the Government of the Northwest Territories. That is not what is at issue to me. But the question is how do we clarify that role and how do we fit it into the role that has been given by this Assembly to the Constitutional Alliance? Those are complex matters and they should be addressed carefully and thoughtfully over a period of time by everybody who is going to be involved. This has been brought to the floor of the House now. It may well pass. It appears that it will pass. To me, then I have the question, does that limit the Executive Council to the things that are specifically listed in that amendment? Can they not go beyond that because nothing else is mentioned in the amendment?

Earlier from a motion that had the support of most Members, it was seen that there was an important role for the government for co-ordinating implementation of division and constitutional development provisions. There was going to be a role for the Government of the Northwest Territories in negotiating whatever principles the alliance had agreed to and had been endorsed by their various constituencies and by the people of the Territories. But does it mean because those are not included in the amendment now that that is outside their purview? I just do not know the answers. It is confusing to me and I do not think that we are doing this whole serious and complex problem justice by attaching an amendment to a motion like this that has been brought to the floor by two Members and not by a concerted effort of all parties to reach some agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. To the amendment. Mr. Ballantyne.

Government Should Play A Major Role

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have some problems with the process of being forced to amend and reamend the motion. I do not even know what we are trying to accomplish any more after this particular discussion. But for this particular amendment, my understanding was that whatever role or mandate was originally given to the alliance, the Executive Council would still have their normal role that they have under the NWT Act and by practice, to carry out these

negotiations. But the Government Leader feels that he needs this in the motion. I think one of the advantages of the parliamentary system is that we can support one part of a motion by supporting an amendment, but I still will abstain from the overall motion because I do not agree with the philosophy of the overall motion any more. If the Government Leader feels that this is important for the government, for the Executive Council, to carry out certain responsibilities, namely under number three -- now I very strongly believe the government should play a major role in discussions with the federal government regarding non-renewable resource management and revenue sharing, and transfer of other responsibilities, I do not think it can wait for the resolution of the whole area of constitutional development. So in that vein though I am not at all happy with this whole process, I do not think this is achieving what the Executive Council wanted to achieve but if the Government Leader and the Executive feel that they need this mandate, especially number three, I will support this amendment but I will still abstain from the overall motion. Thank you.

Amendment To Motion 19-85(1), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: To the amendment. Question being called. All those in favour of the amendment? Opposed, if any? The amendment is passed.

---Carried

The motion, as amended, all those in favour? Point of order, yes, Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I was wondering if I could speak to the motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: I am just looking at my score card here. It is very difficult to find out who has spoken and who has not, but my Clerk says that you have not spoken on this, so go ahead Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did speak on one of the amendments but I would like to address the motion. For the benefit of Members who do not understand what the motion is all about I think that it is very clear from the first "now therefore" clause that the motion endorses continued discussions and negotiations among the members of the Constitutional Alliance toward the development of Nunavut and the western territory.

I really find it quite amazing, Mr. Speaker, that some honourable Members feel that they cannot support renewed discussions and attempt a resolution of the issues that have caused us such anguish over the last couple of weeks. Whether amongst other public government proposals we mention the South Mackenzie area council's study on regional government, I think it is very clear that the reference to proposals includes any number of proposals including some of those that the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre could not think of this afternoon. It cites two documents that I think have been fairly useful in reflecting some of the northern issues. It mentions two that are modern, relatively recent, unlike the Carrothers report which was very important in its time and incidentally recommended that Yellowknife would be an appropriate capital for a western territory. I still think it is an appropriate capital for a western territory.

Endorsing Continued And Renewed Discussions

Mr. Speaker, the fundamental aspect of this motion is endorsing continued discussions, renewed discussions. I have heard Mr. MacQuarrie speak in favour of that in this House and I have also heard other honourable Members say that we have to try and resolve this issue. Personally, I believe that that is one thing that all people in the Northwest Territories can now agree, that we need to work together and try to resolve this issue one way or the other.

I also think that most people in the Northwest Territories agree that the status quo is not acceptable. Mr. Speaker, I personally feel that it would be a great tragedy if we stood by in the Northwest Territories with the opportunities for innovation and creative nation building that this moment in history provides us. And if we were to say everything is fine, then we would be missing an opportunity that many other people in this country, particularly aboriginal people, would love to have to create new forms of government that will reflect the kind of northern values that Mr. Pedersen is talking about rather than Anglo-Canadian models that were imposed without anyone's real participation or consent.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that the issue of division must be resolved. It will not go away. I do not think we can talk about constitutional development properly without addressing this fundamental issue. I think division is inevitable and to my mind the only question is will we have the courage to tackle the issue now when we have a receptive federal government, it seems, in both the Minister of Indian Affairs and the Minister of Justice; a process in place at the national level, defining aboriginal self-government; a structure set up, the Constitutional Alliance, which can allow for fairly representative discussions within the Northwest Territories? This is a golden opportunity, Mr. Speaker, which I think we all should embrace with courage. It will not be easy, Mr. Speaker, but worth-while things are not achieved easily. At least in this country we do not have to worry about the shedding of blood or the firing of guns over these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome renewed support from the Legislative Assembly for renewed discussions on division because I think, as Mr. Wray and Mr. Wah-Shee and others have said in this House, even today, that the Constitutional Alliance probably did become isolated from this Assembly, if not the people of the Northwest Territories, and I certainly feel duly chastened about those comments. But here is an opportunity to affirm that the Legislative Assembly supports that forum and perhaps will participate more actively than has been the case in the past. I think that is one very positive thing that has come out of recent events, that the Legislative Assembly and the people of the Northwest Territories are going to be taking a much greater degree of interest in what happens to date. I also think it is timely, in the closing days of this session that we make this motion, Mr. Speaker, because I think it would be useful if there were some discussions that could occur between now and the next session. I think they would form a basis for renewed discussions perhaps at our next session in another part of this great territory.

So I support the motion, Mr. Speaker, and I urge Members who have said they are going to abstain to not be too preoccupied with whether particular documents are mentioned or not, among other proposals. Rather, look at the fundamental, the first whereas clause, supporting renewed discussions. If we cannot support these renewed discussions, Mr. Speaker, I just really am concerned that we will not be making progress and I do not believe that any Member endorses the status quo that much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion as amended. Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too have some reservations with regard to the motion as amended. As far as the honourable Member mentioned with regard to renewed discussions -- I guess every time we do break or recess or go home to our constituencies, there is a renewed discussion every time we meet. So this is continuous and there is nothing new about a renewed discussion.

Aboriginal Groups Are Also Negotiating

I have some major problems with regard to this government playing a major role in the discussion regarding renewable resources and management of renewable resources and the transfer of other responsibilities to the territorial government. I realize this is dealing with the constitutional development of the Northwest Territories but I have to also consider the interests of the aboriginal groups who are now negotiating on some form of revenue sharing and also the transfer of responsibilities, devolution to these organizations too. I also have a major problem with regard to that motion because yesterday Mr. Curley was mentioning that his department is doing what this government is attempting to do and that is negotiating with the government with regard to revenue sharing. Is that just reinforcing it? He also mentioned the confidentiality of negotiations. Does this open a door so that this government could actually discuss what is being negotiated by the native organizations? I do not know. I have reservations about this whole -- it just reinforces that the government -- that we ignore the negotiations and do our own negotiations on behalf of the people of the North and disregarding other aboriginal groups that are actually negotiating with the government with regard to revenue sharing and devolution of responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be supporting the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker. I have some difficulty with the motion, this whole business of trying to reach an understanding as to where we go from here. It should really have been done with the involvement of all of us, because I would like to see a motion that is being put forward in the House, that would have the support of everyone instead of having some Members reluctant to even vote for it. And I do not think this is a very good reflection of how we are conducting ourselves to reach an understanding, with all due respect to the honourable Member that just spoke in favour of the motion. I will have to say that as far as I am concerned I think there is courage on our part to reach an understanding but to have two Members putting forward a motion of this nature without even holding discussions, I feel is really no way to reach an understanding at all. So I am not going to support the motion because I do not feel that they have gone through the process that would be acceptable. I think we all want to contribute to the motion and I am sure with some changes a motion of this type should be supported by all of us, and really it should be unanimous, in my point of view.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wah-Shee. To the motion as amended. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I would like to comment on a number of things with respect to the motion but I certainly agree, particularly with what the honourable Member for Rae-Lac la Martre just said. In a way it is kind of a tragedy when that kind of reconciliation is possible and it was obvious that we were so close to it and yet it is not given a chance because particular Members feel that there has to be a particular motion that comes in. And I would call that a kind of forced motion. If there are Members who wish to just have a broad and wide ranging discussion on constitutional development and who should have what role, that is possible without trying to bind anybody to anything so that we could get a really clear explanation from everybody where they stand. But that kind of discussion is not possible when a motion like this is brought into the House because it is seeking particular things. But even a motion like this is possible if there has been the chance beforehand for everybody to have some input and make the necessary compromises ahead of time and then bring in something that everybody can support.

Acceptance Of Tabled Document 23-85(1) Did Not Have Full Support

At any rate, with respect to certain specific things in the motion, I note the first "whereas" says this House has accepted Tabled Document 23-85(1), the Report of the Legislative Assembly from the Constitutional Alliance of the NWT, tabled February 22, 1985 and endorsed the principles of agreement attached as appendix A. Now, I would simply like to say that from my point of view, I did not consider that when the motion I made with respect to it had only western Members present, that it was ever in my opinion thereafter considered to be a motion that had the full support of the House. So I realize technically this statement is correct, but it overstates the real situation.

When I moved to the first clause in the resolutions section, I have to make some comments about it. It says, that this House continue to encourage and support the discussions and negotiations between these forums. Now, when it is phrased in that way, it supposes that the House has already done that. But I would have to say that in some of the comments that have been made by individual Members, and by actions taken by the eastern caucus at one point, that it would be incorrect to say that we have encouraged and supported the discussions and negotiations of the Constitutional Alliance. I have heard people say that in fact we did not do a good job, that we were out of touch with the people. And we have been criticized -- we were criticized in Mr. Wah-Shee's speech this morning and Mr. Wray's speech and we have been criticized by others as well. Now, if the honourable Member for Iqaluit feels chastened by those remarks, that is his entitlement. He seems to enjoy wearing sackcloth and ashes. But I do not. I do not feel chastened by what was said because I say that the alliance was given a mandate by this House and it carried out that mandate in good faith and I do not apologize one little bit for the part that I played in it because I played my role in good faith.

Our job was to make some recommendations in the area of constitutional development and division and we did that and came back to the House. I know that some people in the NWT including some Members, somehow feel that we put something over on the people of the NWT or on this Assembly. And that is patent nonsense. We came to a tentative agreement and it was the understanding from the beginning that that tentative agreement would be brought back to the various groups. And so it was brought back to this House. But it did not receive favour. It was not encouraged and supported by this House. And so I would have to wonder whether this phrase does not ring hollow in view of the fact that although encouraging statements are made, yet there is no specific direction as to how the

alliance should do things differently in the future. So if the same people are to go back with the same objective it is hard to see how they can come out with a different result. It is hard to see that even if they did have a different result that this House would encourage and support what they had done.

Role Of The Constitutional Alliance

So I merely have to make those comments and I do not make them as a challenge to the role of the Constitutional Alliance. I believe that that is the mechanism which will best serve us, if it is given a chance to work, if it is given reasonable support by people across the Territories because you cannot negotiate these difficult issues with 48,000 people sitting down and trying to do it. You need a representative group who, in the forum where they see the conflicting interests that have to be reconciled, do it in the most reasonable way. They will take account of the various interests as far as it is possible and come back for approval. I think that it is important that we support that kind of process. It is important because native associations are saying it is important and they speak for a significant number of people in the Territories. I do not know how many, but certainly a significant number of people. And so if they feel it is important that they have a full partnership then I think it is important that they have that partnership, otherwise we are not going to achieve a stable political situation in the NWT in the foreseeable future. I also think that that mechanism is valuable because we have seen the kind of difficulty that we can run into if we try to resolve all those issues in this House. We have the job of managing the governmental affairs of the NWT and that is an important job. While we have obviously a direct interest in the constitutional development in the Territories, we can delegate some of that responsibility to an organization like the alliance, and we did that. And I think that the process that is in place is one that respects the rights, and safeguards the interests of this Assembly and of the people of the NWT.

So I will just reiterate that in talking about the hollowness of the statement there, it does not mean that I disapprove of the alliance doing this work. I certainly think that it does. One other point that I wanted to make is yes, whether this motion is passed or not, it is clear to me that the two forums will in the coming weeks, attempt to sit down and begin discussions again. They do not need this kind of statement from the Assembly. If it were a sincerely supportive statement, that would help very much. But they do not need it. They are probably going to do it anyway, under the mandate they already have. In attempting to do it we must not think that the job will be easy. It is unquestionable that it is going to be a hard job for the alliance because of the attacks on its credibility that have been made in recent weeks. And it will also be a hard job if, in fact, and I alluded to this in my reply, the objectives of the two forums are clearly different. Not only will it be a difficult job then, rather it will be an impossible job to reconcile the interests of the two forums. But I think that they should sit down and get to work on it and I think they will, regardless of any motion that is passed or not passed in this House.

Work Of Constitutional Alliance Should Be Brought To House

With respect to the second resolution, I absolutely agree that as one of the parties of interest anything that the Constitutional Alliance does should be brought back to this House for affirmation or rejection, and that at some point the House will have to recommend to the Government of Canada a course of action that this House thinks appropriate. What I would like to say about that is just to clarify my own position. I believe indeed that the House has that role. I would say that if the alliance's mandate is going to mean anything, however, that the House should not recommend anything to the Government of Canada that is different from what the alliance is recommending as a whole, unless and until we reach a point where there seems to be an impasse in alliance discussions and negotiations. Then at that point the House quite properly would say, "Well, something has to be resolved in this area. So we will consider making some recommendations of our own." That would be within the right of this House to do it, but as long as the House says it is supporting the alliance and the mandate it has in that area, it would be improper for the House to make any pre-emptive recommendations.

I had already made comments with respect to the third clause so I will not speak to it again. The final thing that I would like to say is that in view of the confused section now with respect to the government role, particularly, which really does not clarify that role, and because of certain other difficulties that I alluded to earlier I find it very hard to support the motion. I think at some point all Members of this House have to decide clearly whether they support the alliance doing its work or not. If they do, then it is important, not in this forum, but in one where there is an

opportunity for more free discussion and reconciliation of interests, that we clarify the House's role, the alliance's role and the government's role and then that we come in with some motion that would get the whole thing rolling again. That is what should be done. I fear that this motion does not accomplish that at all.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. To the motion as amended. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a great deal of difficulty supporting the motion. I was unhappy that the motion to amend did not pass which would have included some other documents to be considered, including the south Mackenzie recommendation on regional councils. I imagine that precludes regional councils being considered as well as precludes talking about WARM and other regional councils as well. So for that reason I am against the motion. I will not vote against it because there are other things I like in it. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if we added three or four more clauses there would be enough people in the House against it, for at least one of the things, that everybody would abstain. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion as amended. Ready for the question? Ms Cournoyea, you have the right to close the debate.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I will try not to repeat what I said today but I would like to clarify once again that the reason this motion is on the floor is not that the forums would not keep on meeting, would not keep on spending money, would not keep on doing the things. It was to really clarify mainly to an area, my constituency, that we really are asking questions. Are they going to keep on going? Is this Legislative Assembly supporting them? Now it may be that the forums would have continued to work, but if it was not clarified how seriously would they be taken? I am sorry that this motion was on the floor all week but no one came to me and asked me if they could sit down with me. I noticed that some other people were asked but not myself, and Mr. Wray was not in town. This afternoon when we sat down we have to realize that this motion was written almost 20 times in order to get something that would not be thrown out of the House because of previous documents, and we drafted and redrafted until we thought it was something that was acceptable because we already have some other documents that we were dealing with. So Mr. Speaker, if there is any blame to be taken I do not believe that anyone else should take it but myself because perhaps it was selfishness on my side to bring a motion like this, but it was to clarify for my constituents and other Members that were asking, what does this House think about the Nunavut Constitutional Forum? What do they think about the Western Constitutional Forum? What rating do they put on the alliance continuing the job? This was the reason that this motion was put forward. I do not believe in an hour today we could have rewritten the motion to make sure that it passed the inspection of the Speaker who has been very difficult in making sure that we present the motion to be in order regarding this special issue. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel although I do not know whether the total government issues are totally resolved in the amendment. I believe also that the business of other reports are taken care of in the motion, that anything can be examined, but I would like to say that the two most important documents that started the whole process and came from the people are in -- Building Nunavut and the Denendeh proposal, which I believe no one should be ashamed of. Thank you.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege, Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, the mover of the motion indicated that nobody had approached her to talk to her about the motion. She gave notice of the motion Monday, March 25. It is today March 27. I know that people approached her yesterday and talked to her yesterday. I talked to her again today. For her to say that nobody approached her to try to do something is totally wrong. She should withdraw the remark.

MR. SPEAKER: Ms Cournoyea.

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, when I was spoken to it was the attempt to get Mr. Patterson, who is the chairman of the Nunavut caucus, and Mr. Arnold McCallum together to speak together about something that possibly could be written, but it was nothing in relationship to myself sitting down with someone else. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion as amended. Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I raised a question of privilege, in terms of it. I thought you would have indicated something to it. I just do not stand up and raise a point of privilege without having some substance to the privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. McCallum, I was not there. Ms Cournoyea said that yes she did speak to you relative to another matter and certainly I do not know which one is right and which one is wrong. I do not know what you expect me to do.

Motion 19-85(1), Carried As Amended

To the motion as amended. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried as amended.

---Carried

Now dealing with sitting hours for tomorrow. I am sorry. There are two different ways in which we can handle this situation we are in. There is a lot of work to be done and there are a lot of Members, I understand, who are required to leave here by tomorrow afternoon to go back East so it was my intention to sit at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning to finish this business of the House. Now we can do it one of two ways. If I have unanimous consent, I can recess and reform at 9:00 a.m. at this point on today's orders of the day. If I have unanimous consent I can do that. If I do not, I have to go back by way of orders of the day and start all over again tomorrow. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, just a correction. I believe that NWT Air is leaving for the East on Friday night. That is what I understand.

MR. SPEAKER: That changes the picture considerably. The information that I have is that Friday's plane was cancelled. So I trust that your information is correct. Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we do not take a chance. We do not take a chance because I have heard two things, one that the plane has been cancelled until Saturday morning and one that the plane is now at eight o'clock on Friday night and I am not sure which one is correct.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Both sound all right.

MR. McCALLUM: Either late Friday or early Saturday.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I will ask for unanimous consent to continue with today's orders tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Do I have unanimous consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any nays?

Then we will stand recessed until 9:00 a.m., tomorrow morning.

---Agreed

---RECESS

Available from the
Publications Clerk, Department of Information,
Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T.
\$1.00 per day; \$30.00 for 1st session, \$20.00 for 2nd and 3rd session; or \$50.00 per year
Published under the Authority of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
of the Northwest Territories