



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

9th Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report

DAY 10

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1987

Pages 303 to 345

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
Office (403) 360-6600
(Natilikmiot)

Appaqaq, Mr. Moses, M.L.A.
Sanikiluaq, N.W.T.
X0A 0W0
Home (819) 266-8808
(Hudson Bay)

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

Ballantyne, The Hon. Michael, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 1091
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2N8
Office (403) 873-7658
Home (403) 920-2968
(Yellowknife North)
Minister of Justice and Housing

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

Cournoyey, Ms Nellie J., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 156
Tuktoyaktuk, N.W.T.
X0E 1C0
Office (403) 979-2737 (Inuvik)
Home (403) 977-2405
(Nunakput)

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
& Tourism and Government Services

Erkloo, Mr. Elijah, M.L.A.
Pond Inlet, N.W.T.
X0A 0S0
Office (819) 899-8903
Home (819) 899-8845
(Amittuq)
Deputy Chairman, Committee of the
Whole

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)
Deputy Chairman, Committee of the
Whole

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
Office (403) 872-3224
Home (403) 872-2246
(Slave River)

McLaughlin, The Hon. Bruce, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2637
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2P9
Office (403) 873-7113
Home (403) 873-6200 (Yellowknife)
(403) 393-2939 (Pine Point)
(Pine Point)
Minister of Health and Social Services

Nerysoo, Mr. Richard W., M.L.A.
Fort McPherson, N.W.T.
X0E 0J0
Office (403) 979-7112 (Inuvik)
Home (403) 979-2668 (Inuvik)
(Mackenzie Delta)

Paniloo, Mr. Pauloosie, M.L.A.
Clyde River, N.W.T.
X0A 0E0
Office (819) 924-6336
Home (819) 924-6340
(Baffin Centrai)

Patterson, The Hon. Dennis G., M.L.A.
P.O. Box 310
Iqaluit, N.W.T.
X0A 0H0
Office (819) 979-5993 (Iqaluit)
(403) 873-7123
Home (819) 979-6618
(Iqaluit)
Minister of Education

Pedersen, The Hon. Red, M.L.A.
Coppermine, N.W.T.
X0E 0E0
Office (403) 873-7959
Home (403) 982-5221
(Kitikmeot West)
Minister of Renewable Resources and
Personnel

Pudluk, Mr. Ludy, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 240
Resolute, N.W.T.
X0A 0V0
Home (819) 252-3719
(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) 873-7112
Home (403) 695-2565
(Nahendeh)
Government Leader, Chairman of
Executive Council and Minister
of Culture & Communications

T'Seleie, Mr. John, M.L.A.
Fort Good Hope, N.W.T.
X0E 0H0
Home (403) 598-2325
(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 and Chairman,
Committee of the Whole

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

Officers

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

Clerk Assistant
Mr. Henry Zoe
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

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

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

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. Gordon Barnes
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1987

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	303
Ministers' Statements	
- 4-87(1) Federal/Provincial/Territorial Ministerial Meeting on Aboriginal Rights in the Canadian Constitution	303
- 5-87(1) Increase in Post-Secondary Students	304
Returns to Oral Questions	305
Oral Questions	305
Written Questions	311
Notices of Motion For First Reading of Bills	
- Bill 2-87(1) Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act	312
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 1-87(1) Boundary and Constitutional Agreement for the Implementation of Division of the Northwest Territories Between the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum	312
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 1-87(1) Boundary and Constitutional Agreement for the Implementation of Division of the Northwest Territories Between the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum	344
Orders of the Day	344

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1987

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Appaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Hon. Tom Butters, Hon. Michael Ballantyne, Ms Cournoyea, Hon. Tagak Curley, Mr. Erkloo, Mr. Gargan, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. McCallum, Hon. Bruce McLaughlin, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Paniloo, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Hon. Red 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 Tuesday, February 24th. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Minister's Statement 4-87(1): Federal/Provincial/Territorial Ministerial Meeting On Aboriginal Rights In The Canadian Constitution

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the 19th and 20th of this month a federal/provincial/territorial ministerial meeting was convened by the Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. The meeting was convened as part of the preparatory work for the upcoming First Ministers' Conference on Aboriginal Rights in the Constitution. As honourable Members are aware, since the patriation of the Constitution, the process of defining and elaborating aboriginal rights to be incorporated in the Constitution of Canada has been ongoing.

The ministerial meeting dealt primarily with one issue: the issue of self-government for aboriginal people of Canada. The position taken by the four national aboriginal organizations represented at the meeting is that aboriginal people had self-governing entities before the arrival of the settlers in Canada and the aboriginal people have never surrendered their right to self-government. As such they have an inherent right.

The right to self-government is the aboriginal right to be recognized by the Constitution. They take the position, Mr. Speaker, that section 35(1) of the Constitution Act, which recognizes and affirms aboriginal rights, includes the affirmation and recognition of the right to self-government.

Several of the provinces, however, take the position that there is no inherent right to self-government, and that such right can only be granted through delegation of powers presently enjoyed by the federal Parliament and the provincial legislatures. The governments are also reluctant to grant a right to self-government without such a right being clearly defined in advance of the inclusion of such a right in the Constitution. As such, for the present, they are not prepared to include what is known as a "stand alone" clause in the Constitution giving recognition to the right of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of the Northwest Territories has taken a position quite similar to that enunciated by the national aboriginal organizations. The Government of the Northwest Territories maintains that aboriginal rights include the right to self-government, and the process presently being undertaken by the federal government, the provinces and the territories is to seek the definition and elaboration of that right to self-government, as opposed to the granting of the right to self-government. It is our position that any "stand alone" provision is simply a recognition of the present state of affairs under which aboriginal people already have the right to self-government.

Compromise Proposed By Nova Scotia

In an attempt to seek a compromise to this situation and to bridge the gap between the two opposing points of view, Nova Scotia had proposed that a "stand alone" clause be devised giving the aboriginal people the right to self-government within the context of the Canadian federation, but requiring that such right to self-government would only be enforceable once an agreement has been entered into between the governments involved and the aboriginal people in a particular community or area of Canada. That proposal contemplates a process whereby an aboriginal group would request the Government of Canada and the government of the province or territory to enter into negotiations to define the right to self-government as it pertains to that community. Such an agreement, once concluded, would be endorsed by the federal Parliament and the legislature of the province involved. Once endorsed, the agreement would be deemed to be a treaty within the meaning of the Constitution of Canada and would thereby receive constitutional protection.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the Nova Scotia proposal perhaps has the best chance of success at the upcoming First Ministers' Conference, provided the various parties can agree to appropriate wording. It is proposed that a meeting of senior officials from the various delegations take place some time next week and, if necessary, a ministerial meeting be convened prior to the First Ministers' Conference, which is scheduled for the 26th and 27th of March, 1987.

As, no doubt, honourable Members appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the issues involved at this conference are very complex and touch on rights that are very fundamental to the aboriginal people of Canada. The Government of the Northwest Territories will continue to play a very active role in this matter and use its best efforts to persuade the parties involved to arrive at a fair and equitable agreement. Mr. Speaker, prior to the First Ministers' Conference, I shall be tabling before the House a document outlining the position of the Government of the Northwest Territories on the various issues being considered for inclusion into the Constitution of Canada, as they relate to aboriginal people of Canada.

Myself and Mr. Sibbeston and Mr. Ballantyne, who have been involved in these negotiations, will be prepared to discuss that paper with this Assembly should it be desired. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

Minister's Statement 5-87(1): Increase In Post-Secondary Students

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to announce that there has been a significant increase in the numbers of students attending post-secondary institutions in 1986-87, supported by the NWT student financial assistance fund. We have taken many steps to improve the delivery of student financial assistance programs over the last several years in an effort to increase the participation of northern students in post-secondary programs.

I am happy to say that our efforts have been effective for both native and non-native students. In 1986-87, 738 northern students are being sponsored compared to 587 in 1985-86, which represents an overall increase of 26 per cent. It is gratifying to note that the major reason for this increase is the number of sponsored native students. This year 201 native students are being sponsored compared with 110 in 1985-86, for an increase of 83 per cent. This trend of increased numbers of native students in post-secondary programs is expected to continue in future years and this will have a major impact on the labour market as graduates take on meaningful roles in industry and government.

While non-native participants in post-secondary studies increased over the last year by 13 per cent, the statistics for native students are truly impressive. Dene and Metis student enrolment increased by 60 per cent over 1985-86 figures. The enrolment of Inuit students also showed a dramatic change from 28 to 70 students for an increase of 150 per cent over the same period.

The establishment of the student financial assistance fund in 1982 has been a strong incentive to involve native students in higher education. In the year prior to the implementation of the new regulations only 75 native students were involved in post-secondary studies. The current enrolment of 201 native students represents an increase of 168 per cent over five years. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Item 2, Ministers' statements. That appears to conclude this item.

Item 3, Members' statements. That appears to conclude this item for today. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Return To Question 010-87(1): Further Assistance To Complete HAP Houses, Fort Providence

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to oral Question 10-87(1), asked by Mr. Gargan on February 12, 1987 concerning electrical installation in HAP houses in Fort Providence.

In 1985-86, four home-ownership assistance program units were allocated to Fort Providence. One house is complete and occupied. The Member is correct in that some financial difficulties were experienced with pad construction. A few months ago, extra funds were made available to ensure completion of electrical wiring. Two of the houses are now ready for installation of the wiring. The remaining house is not yet ready for electrical work. Bids for the work are presently being reviewed by the district office and the contract will be awarded shortly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question 046-87(1): Cancellation Of Business Management Course At Inuvik Campus

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if this is proper but I would like to make a supplementary return to the reply to Question 046-87(1) of Mr. Nerysoo yesterday. It is a little better answer than the one I gave yesterday, if I may. It is a question Mr. Nerysoo asked on February 20th. The president of the Arctic College attended a college board of directors meeting in Inuvik, last week, from February 16th to February 18th. During that meeting he stated that the first year of the public and business administration program would not be offered at the Inuvik campus in September because of lack of funds. Since then I have directed my staff to discontinue the introductory northern business management training course offered this year and allocate funding to the Inuvik campus to permit the first year of the public and business administration diploma program to be offered in Inuvik, beginning in the fall of 1987, and, Mr. Speaker, we hope to accommodate as well, any students who wish to take the introductory course. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Item 4, returns to oral questions. That appears to conclude this item for today. Item 5, oral questions. Mr. Pudluk.

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 058-87(1): Correspondence On Status Of Alcohol And Drug Committee, Resolute Bay

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question is directed to the Minister of Justice. The Resolute Bay alcohol and drug committee is trying to become a society. The correspondence has been sent to your department but they have not had an answer. They would like to know whether it has arrived at your department yet or not. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 058-87(1): Correspondence On Status Of Alcohol And Drug Committee, Resolute Bay

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, my department received the correspondence just before Christmas. There were some problems with the application for society status. On January 12th the department sent a letter back to the group. We have not heard back from them. I have instructed my officials to get in touch with the group and try to help them attain society status as soon as possible.

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

Question 059-87(1): Stationery Supplies For Game Guardian, Hall Beach

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Renewable Resources, Mr. Pedersen. The people in the communities that do not have wildlife officers are now starting to get game guardians. There is a game guardian in Hall Beach at the present time and he is being paid \$100 a month and at the end of the month he has to have a written report submitted to his supervisor in Iqaluit but he does not have any stationery supplies provided to him. My question is when will that person be able to get some stationery supplies provided by your department as he is employed by your department? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 059-87(1): Stationery Supplies For Game Guardian, Hall Beach

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Member for bringing this to my attention. I want to assure the Member that I will take immediate action to ensure that all our game guardians have sufficient material on hand to carry out the duties that we ask of them. Thank you.

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

Question 060-87(1): Request Re Social Problems, Broughton Island

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Social Services. There are some serious problems in Broughton Island for the elders. There are young people who are committing suicide and the elders are having serious problems about this one. I would like to know if you have received a letter from the hamlet council.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 060-87(1): Request Re Social Problems, Broughton Island

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have received the letter from the community. It is a long letter detailing the problems in the community and requesting an additional half year for a social worker. I have passed it on to my department to see what we can do in that area. Thank you.

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

Question 061-87(1): Instruction For Young Offenders By Southern Contractor

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a question to the Minister responsible for Social Services with regard to the provision of life skills and academic instruction for young offenders. I would like to ask why this particular service was given to a Vancouver-based business, rather than recognizing the speech that was made by the Commissioner to give these types of contracts to northern businesses or associations such as the Native Women's Association or the Learning Disabilities Association of the NWT?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 061-87(1): Instruction For Young Offenders By Southern Contractor

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The southern company that is referred to actually has two other contracts up here. For example, the one in Iqaluit to operate the young offenders facility there. Stipulations in the contract and agreement with them are that they were supposed to use their existing expertise, to train people in that community, in order that they could take over that contract. So that is the type of thing we are trying to do when we do not have the resources available. In this particular case, I checked into the bidders to see the exact details on how this contract was handed out.

The contract was given out in a normal fashion and judged on points in the normal fashion set out by Government Services as to the quality of proposals. Both people, in the departments which made the assessment, came to the same conclusion that that company should be awarded the contract. In addition to that, on complaints that it was not a northern company, I checked and found out that they were registered with the Department of Justice as a company legally able to operate in the North, but they were not listed on the northern preference policy list of companies in Government Services. But in addition, neither were most of the other companies that bid, including the Native Women's Association.

People in my department have followed all the proper procedures and have notified the successful company that they were successful and I am not in a position to reverse that decision. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Supplementary, Mr. Nerysoo. No debate please. Questions.

Supplementary To Question 061-87(1): Instruction For Young Offenders By Southern Contractor

MR. NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I will not debate this particular issue even though I support the concern expressed. A supplementary question, was the department aware of an appeal that was being filed prior to verbal commitment to this particular business based in Vancouver?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure. Myself, I was not aware of an appeal to me before the decision was given out. As far as I know, the decision was passed on to the successful applicant before I was approached in this matter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Will you take the question as notice then, Mr. Minister? The question is being taken as notice. Are there any further supplementary questions, Mr. Nerysoo? Oral questions. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Question 062-87(1): Inclusion Of Paraplegia In Extended Medical Benefits Program

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Health. Mr. Minister, certain chronic health conditions are eligible for the extended medical benefits program and paraplegia is not presently one of those covered under that program. Fortunately there are relatively few people afflicted, yet the additional costs are very great for those persons. The Minister has a request from the NWT Council for Disabled Persons to include paraplegia in that program. Could I ask the Minister what his intention is, in dealing with that particular request?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 062-87(1): Inclusion Of Paraplegia In Extended Medical Benefits Program

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member is right. Paraplegics are not covered under the extended medical benefits program under the chronic disease listing unless the paraplegic condition is caused by one of the other diseases on the list. I have been informed that there are less than a dozen cases in the Northwest Territories. I have asked officials in my department to confirm the actual figure and once I have that I will be able to come up with some figures as to what the cost would be to cover these residents in the Northwest Territories. Once I have those figures I will take something to the Executive to see if they can consider changing the policy to include those people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. MacQuarrie.

Supplementary To Question 062-87(1): Inclusion Of Paraplegia In Extended Medical Benefits Program

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Minister for a time frame on what he is proposing? Is it likely to be done within a month or two months or what?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 062-87(1): Inclusion Of Paraplegia In Extended Medical Benefits Program

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have asked my department officials to have this matter concluded so that I can take it to the Executive and hopefully be able to have a resolution to it before Members leave Yellowknife for the session break. Thank you.

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

Question 063-87(1): Training For Positions In North Warning System

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Education. I think it was about a year ago when we were talking about training positions, in the review of the Minister's budget in Education, and the announcement of the north warning system coming into play. I asked at that time if the department had undertaken any kind of discussions with the Department of National Defence about setting up training programs. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to me now if there has been communication back and forth with the Department of National Defence to set up training programs for northerners and what would be the status of this question of training northerners to take positions in the north warning system?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 063-87(1): Training For Positions In North Warning System

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the honourable Member's question, I have been working diligently on getting northern residents trained in the North as technicians for operation of the north warning system. Already the first group of nine trainees will be taking a three month pre-training program at the Arctic College Thebacha campus in Fort Smith. I have also been actively exploring with the consortium which won the contract to install and maintain the system, Canac/Microtel, about transferring the training to be done, to prepare for these new job opportunities, from Coquitlam, British Columbia to Fort Smith campus. And I have been led to believe that the consortium fully supports the transfer of this training to the North. The only obstacle that is still outstanding then, Mr. Speaker, is getting approval from the Department of National Defence since they are the training program proprietor. I have recently written the Hon. Perrin Beatty on this matter and sought his direction to see that the training is located in the North and I expect to meet with Mr. Beatty later on in March to find out precisely what his direction is on this matter.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, we have been working hard on locating this training in the North so northern residents can have first opportunity to get trained for these new jobs. I will continue to work diligently on that matter and I will keep the House informed as to progress. Thank you.

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

Supplementary To Question 063-87(1): Training For Positions In North Warning System

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding, Mr. Minister and perhaps the Government Leader, could respond as well -- it is my understanding that the honourable Mr. Beatty, the Minister of National Defence, will be coming north. Has the government arranged any kind of meeting with him to discuss certain particular subjects? Can I ask the Government Leader or the Minister if this is one of the topics on the agenda for that meeting?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Further Return To Question 063-87(1): Training For Positions In North Warning System

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Arrangements are still being finalized for that visit, Mr. Speaker, but the Executive Council has suggested that a meeting be held on March 11th with Mr. Beatty. I have informed them that the issue of the location of north warning system training, in the North, should definitely be an item on that agenda. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Oral questions. Mrs. Lawrence.

Question 064-87(1): Registration Of Native Organizations Under Business Incentive Policy

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Economic Development or Government Services. It was brought to my attention that northern people or northern businesses have to be registered. I was not aware of this and I doubt very much if the communities are aware of it either. I just assumed that all northern groups such as the Native Women's Association qualified under the northern preference policy when they submitted proposals. My question is, why should the native organizations have to be registered? They are northern and I am just having problems with the fact that they have to be registered. Mahsi.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 064-87(1): Registration Of Native Organizations Under Business Incentive Policy

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Member is referring to is the business incentive policy which our government established a while ago and about three years ago that policy was revised in order to provide more opportunities for northern companies to be able to take advantage of the public works and other varieties of government contracts. The criteria are quite simple; if you have lived in the Northwest Territories for at least three years and have a business operating and have an established office within the Northwest Territories you qualify as a northern company. That is strictly a guideline for those who are bidding on government contracts. But as far as the notion about whether native organizations or groups within the Northwest Territories are eligible, I would say they have no problem at all because they do have a permanent establishment in the North and the fact that they have resided in the Northwest Territories for more than three years. It is just a matter of registering or making known to the government you have a business establishment or organization and that you wish to have your organization listed in the government registry. There are no real requirements other than that. I will at least make sure that the organization she is referring to is properly informed. Thank you.

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

Question 065-87(1): Request For Return To Question 01-87(1)

MR. MCCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Personnel. On Thursday, February 12th, I asked a question of the Minister regarding the employees' day off work on January 2nd, 1987 and the Minister took the question as notice. That has been 12 days ago. I wonder if the Minister can indicate to me when he proposes to respond to that question?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I took the question as notice and assured the Member that I would give it careful consideration. I am doing so and it will be very shortly that a reply will be forthcoming.

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

Question 066-87(1): Disposition Of Recommendation For Community Hall, Clyde River

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. I made a motion two years ago in this House, to recommend to the government that a community centre be built at my community of Clyde River. This motion was passed and I have not heard anything more. What happened to this recommendation that was passed in this House? I talked to the regional director for Baffin regarding five year capital plan and I did not see this capital item in that plan. We need a community centre very badly, especially for our young people throughout the Baffin Region. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to know what happened to that motion that was passed two years ago. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will take the question under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister, you are taking the question as notice. Oral questions. Mr. McCallum.

Question 067-87(1): Administrative Positions In Yellowknife For Arctic College

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Education in regard to Arctic College. In the past the Minister has indicated in response to questions that I asked about Arctic College positions in Yellowknife that there would be very little build-up of the administration. In fact back as far as October 17, 1985, the Minister indicated that they would be only establishing the positions of president and secretary of the Arctic College in Yellowknife. It is my understanding that that has now changed. In point of fact there have been as many as five, six, or more, within the Arctic College headquarters. I am not talking about program positions, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about administration.

In light of the fact that in response to Question 11-85(3), asked by me in October 1985, the Minister indicated the position of public affairs officer, and I quote, "has just been filled and I can assure the honourable Member that there is no intention of moving that position anywhere". In light of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that that position now is in headquarters in Yellowknife, would the Minister comment on the possibility of his having misled this House or misled me?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 067-87(1): Administrative Positions In Yellowknife For Arctic College

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is appropriate for me to comment on a possibility, but I can tell the honourable Member that there certainly was no intention at that time when that position was staffed to move it. However, since that time the Arctic College plan has developed, the office of the president has been established and it has been deemed advisable that the public affairs officer position should be attached to the office of the president. I am informed that candidates who were recruited for that public affairs officer position in Fort Smith were told from the beginning that the position could and would move. But I would like to assure the honourable Member that we have plans to utilize existing resources within the Thebacha campus to ensure that the public affairs function for Thebacha campus is continued.

I would also like to inform the honourable Member that according to my calculations, although the office of the president has been established in Yellowknife and will be supported by certain officers in finance and policy and planning, according to my calculations there has been a total of 15 new positions installed in Thebacha campus over the last three years: extension co-ordinator; assistant extension co-ordinator; executive secretary; instructor; life skills coach; instructor of public and business administration...

MR. McCALLUM: Point of order.

---Applause

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

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I was not asking the Minister how many went down there, my point is that he told me something that in point of fact was not carried out. I asked the question about a particular position. He can go into a litany about how many have come and gone. All I am asking him is if, as he indicated to me back there that there was no intention of moving it anywhere, perhaps that road that is paved with intentions has changed a little bit. I do not believe the question I asked him was to enumerate or list for me the number of positions that have come to Thebacha campus. That was not the question I raised in the first place, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Your point of order, Mr. McCallum, is well taken but also, as far as the Minister is concerned, the point that you created was that you were being short-changed a position. You indicated by the nature of your question that you were being short-changed by one position and the Minister is answering the question relative to the positions in the same organization. Now, if he were speaking of the Department of Health or some other place I would say that your point of order would be well taken but we are still on Thebacha campus and I think that the Minister is within his prerogative to give you a list of what is happening in that particular department. You have the floor, Mr. Minister.

Continuation Of Return To Question 067-87(1): Administrative Positions In Yellowknife For Arctic College

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I had gone down to the fifth new position we have put into the Thebacha campus over the last three years. We also added an instructor in the public and business administration program; an instructor in the social services program; another instructor in the social services program; an instructor in welding; an instructor in cook training; a secretary; a student counsellor; an assistant librarian; a plumbing instructor and a comptroller. Mr. Speaker, if the 1987-88 budget is approved without reductions I also propose to add a further 1.5 person years to establish a new child care worker program at Thebacha campus. Thank you.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister could also indicate the number of positions he is deleting from the Thebacha campus in 1986 or 1987 or 1988.

If he had been at the standing committee on finance when we talked about it, we listed them. Mr. Speaker, my point was, the Minister in answering the question in this House, indicated to me, in a reply to a question on one specific position. He could very well have indicated as well, the number of positions that changed from contract to indeterminate, which I appreciate as well.

The question is, Mr. Speaker, that in a reply to a question I asked directly of the Minister regarding one particular position, not the build-up or anything else, he assured me that there was no intention -- and he did not say "at that time" -- of moving the position anywhere. The position has moved and whether or not in fact, Mr. Speaker, his people, in recruiting it, indicated that it was only there for a short period of time, maybe his officials should have told him, since he has the responsibility in this ministerial government, responsibility for the department. Obviously, his people are doing something he knows nothing about.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, has anybody got an oral question?

---Laughter

Oral questions. That appears to conclude oral questions for today. Item 6, written questions. Item 7, returns to written questions. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I had my hand up with regard to written questions and I was not noticed. Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: My apologies, you have the floor under Item 6, written questions.

ITEM 6: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Question W13-87(1): Musk-Ox Program Developments Limited

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a written question directed to the Minister of Social Services. Would the Minister of Social Services provide the following information:

- 1) Does Musk-ox Consulting have an established office in the NWT which offers employment to northern residents?
- 2) a) Could the Minister review the present services which are now being offered by Musk-ox Consulting?
 - b) Further, could the Minister indicate what training is going on for northern residents in each of these contracts?
 - c) Are all positions filled by qualified individuals? If not, where are there deficiencies in fulfilling these contracts?
- 3) Further, is Musk-ox Consulting registered in Yellowknife to conduct business in the city of Yellowknife, NWT?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Item 6, written questions. That appears to conclude written questions.

Item 7, returns to written questions.

Item 8, replies to Opening Address.

Item 9, petitions.

Item 10, reports of standing and special committees.

Item 11, tabling of documents. Tabling of documents.

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

ITEM 13: NOTICES OF MOTION FOR FIRST READING OF BILLS

Notice Of Motion For First Reading Of Bill 2-87(1): Advisory Council On The Status Of Women Act

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Thursday, February the 26th, 1987, I shall move that Bill 2-87(1), An Act to Amend the Advisory Council on the Status of Women Act, be read for the first time. Thank you.

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

Item 14, motions. Item 14, motions.

Item 15, first reading of bills. First reading of bills.

Item 16, second reading of bills. Second reading of bills. Item 17, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Tabled Document 1-87(1), Boundary and Constitutional Agreement of the Implementation of Division of the Northwest Territories between the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum; Bill 1-87(1), Appropriation Act, 1987-88, and Bill 7-87(1), Education Act.

Before I place the House into committee of the whole, I would like to acknowledge that we have many distinguished guests in the galleries today. However, inasmuch as I am afraid I might miss someone, I am not going to name them but welcome them to Yellowknife and welcome to this Assembly.

---Applause

We will resolve into committee of the whole with Mr. Wah-Shee in the chair.

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

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER TABLED DOCUMENT 1-87(1), BOUNDARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL AGREEMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DIVISION OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES BETWEEN THE WESTERN CONSTITUTIONAL FORUM AND THE NUNAVUT CONSTITUTIONAL FORUM

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Tabled Document 1-87(1), dealing with the boundary and constitutional agreement. There was a motion adopted inviting witnesses from the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum. Is the committee prepared to hear from these witnesses now? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Sergeant-at-Arms, would you invite the two witnesses into the committee, please? For the record, I would like to ask the witnesses to identify themselves for the committee, please.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is John Amagoalik. I am chairman of the Nunavut Constitutional Forum.

MR. KAKFWI: Steve Kakfwi, chairman of the Western Constitutional Forum.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. I would like to ask the witnesses which one would like to give their presentation first.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Mr. Chairman, first of all before we begin, I would like to ask the Chair approximately how much time we have and also what the procedure will be and if there will be questions and answers afterwards?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): It is my understanding that there has been no time limit set for your presentation. However, I would anticipate that after you have had the opportunity to make your presentations that the Members of the committee may wish to ask you questions on your presentation. So if we could perhaps proceed with John, maybe you could do your presentation first and then Steve can follow. Is that okay?

Presentation By Chairman Of The Nunavut Constitutional Forum

MR. AMAGOALIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (Translation) I would like to speak in Inuktitut first. If I were asked to talk in my own home -- I am the guest in this House and I would like to make myself understood so I will be speaking in English. (Translation ends)

I would like to say that if I were in my own house, I would be speaking my language. But I am a humble visitor to this House and as a visitor to this House I want my hosts to understand what I have to say and, therefore, I will speak in English.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the NWT territorial Council and visitors. Today's presentation of a boundary agreement and constitutional outline for the future of the North is a great moment in the history of northern peoples. This agreement, arrived at January 15, 1987, builds on the land use and occupancy work which Dene, Metis, Inuvialuit and Inuit carried on for many years. The proposed boundary between eastern and western territories truly reflects the history of the historical peoples of the Arctic. Far from being an arbitrary line on the map, a practice which has caused hardship and tragedy on other continents when carried out by colonial powers, this boundary reflects the northern history and a balance of northern needs. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that northerners note and take pride in this achievement.

Developing the purposes and needs of new constitutions has always been unique. Canadians in the past have had a few politicians and lawyers trading in back rooms, but the Nunavut and Western Constitutional Forums have begun with background studies which have been distributed and discussed throughout our areas. We have shaped our ideas through successive drafts and in countless community meetings open to press and public, social and political consensus has gradually been achieved.

For those people and southern politicians who doubt that native Canadians can achieve self-government, at the very moment when we are trying to achieve a national constitutional guarantee of that right, they would do well to reflect that the several races and cultures of the North have been the first in Canada to do so by open public process. That is not the end of our work, of course. As long as the real arbitrators, the government and Parliament of Canada, have not expressed themselves, doubt lingers. Until Ottawa has acted there will be individual communities and special interest groups and politicians trying to adjust these agreements to favour themselves. This is human nature. This is politics. But such uncertainties do not take away from the achievement of agreement. A number of concerns have been voiced about dividing the NWT to create new territories. It is too bad that those voiced by some leaders were not heard and dealt with during the five years in which we have done our work in the constitutional forums.

Economic Development And Public Revenue

The most serious concern raised is that of economic development and public revenue. It has been charged that divided territories will not be viable. The North today and a majority of the provinces are in a definite deficit position, receiving federal transfer funds for their operating budgets. In this scheme of things, the North is a petty cash item. I do not mean to take lightly our financial needs. But let us not forget that the way the national books on the North are kept

and the way the resources are managed, one can prove almost anything. One can prove almost anything with statistics. If Canada is willing to send troops and ships to the Arctic to fight for sovereignty, as the Baffin manoeuvres have just illustrated, clearly the North is worth much to Canada. Can the value of our territory, of our resources, of our people and their well-being, and their hopes, and their culture be added up and presented in a neat list? We think not.

But one thing is very clear. Uncertainty has plagued the small businessman in Yellowknife or Inuvik as much as the multinational business in New York and Toronto. A political settlement which accommodates the aspirations of the people of Nunavut will open the way to much easier business conditions. Any fantasies that Nunavut can be kept in a united Northwest Territories against the will of the Eastern Arctic people is a recipe for continued confusion and conflict. Any compromise about regional power or consociation is just a trick to let native people care for libraries and language courses while the real power, development, plans and funds, are decided by a predominantly white man's government in Yellowknife.

Nunavut is a different kind of proposal. We are looking for a very decentralized government so that Cambridge Bay and Rankin Inlet and Baker Lake and Coppermine all have part of the benefit of jobs and new facilities which come with a growing Nunavut self-government. We are not proposing to build up Iqaluit as a single capital and forget the other communities. We want all parts of Nunavut to be strong and to provide worth-while and rewarding jobs for young people with new skills and older people with mature outlooks. We want a government of local people who, with the help of the expert and dedicated public service servants required, are dealing with the problems of our communities. We do not want social engineers in Yellowknife or Ottawa deciding what is good for Inuit. We must continue the present public services so that there will be no neglect, nothing lost, but we will also begin to improve these to tackle the persistent problems of our people.

Unity Of Inuit People And Culture

A final concern I would address is that of the unity of Inuit people and culture. The boundary agreement provides for Inuit in two territories, Nunavut and a western territory. Labrador, Quebec and the NWT already divide the Inuit as do Greenland, Alaska and Canada. We have national and international organizations like the Inuit Circumpolar Conference and the Inuit Tapirisat and ICNI which look after shared Inuit interests. But just as COPE and Makivik have different regional claims settlements and different regional institutions, so does Nunavut have a sense of its regional destiny. Inuit values and families will be no less united for administrative and political boundaries.

Mr. Chairman, today we are taking a big step in making the North really part of Canada. Instead of a socially and regionally divided territory, scattered across the top of the map, bartering local benefits but unable to agree on overall policies in the face of massive pressure from outside, we have a clear idea about our futures. The world will see us completing Canada, Canadian nationhood in the North, with our own political institutions freely chosen and designed by ourselves, since the Constitution Act for all people and for Canada should lay to rest any doubts about the integrity and fullness of national sovereignty.

As I have already said, division will define the rules of the game. It will improve the economic development atmosphere. Developers will know who to deal with and know what to expect. Division creates a clear path for all to see. The alternative is the status quo. And what is the status quo? Does anyone really know the rules of the game? Does anyone really know who is in charge? Division will clear away the fog to create a positive atmosphere for the social, economic and political evolution of our people. Nunavut and Denendeh will provide the tools with which our people can face the 21st century. Division will allow devolution. Division will allow Denendeh and Nunavut to pursue full provincial status at their own pace.

We must demonstrate our willingness and courage to make important decisions. We, who signed this document must live up to our word. We must honour our agreements. What we do as individuals during this campaign will reveal the quality of our signature. Many of us have, in the past, accused others of breaking agreements and not living up to their promises. We must not make the same mistakes. We must demonstrate that our word is our bond.

Agreement Contains No New Lines

As we have already indicated, this agreement has not created any new lines. What we have done is that we recognized and accepted lines that have been negotiated and agreed to over the past years.

One line is the overlap agreement between TFN and the Dene/Metis land claims negotiators. Another line is a line that was agreed to in the overlap agreement between TFN and COPE. There have been some issues which have been identified when the agreement was first made public. I think what has happened is that some people have pushed the panic button and some people have the jitters. I think what is happening now is that the truth is coming out and people are starting to come to their senses.

Now one very emotional issue that we have heard over the past couple of weeks is the fear about the break-up of families. This is a whole lot of crap. And we have heard about the break-up of Inuit unity. This is also unfounded. This is manufactured. Inuit unity exists between Labrador, Quebec and what is now the Northwest Territories. Inuit unity also exists in Greenland, Canada and Alaska. Whatever political boundaries we draw within Canada will not destroy this unity. As a matter of fact we know that by the creation of two new territories it will give more strength to the Inuit, to the Dene and the Metis.

By doing this we will also demonstrate that we have confidence in ourselves and our people. This demonstration of confidence is very important. This decision to divide was made in 1982 and this decision is an indication of the maturing of our people. I am sure all of you when it came time to leave your home, to leave your parents, you felt very uneasy. You were afraid of leaving the security and love of your family. But in the end, you knew that you had to leave sometime. Even though you were afraid, you had to take this step. And we all have. We have built our own families, we have our own children and they too, when they grow, will leave your house. The time has come to leave home and seek our fortune in the world.

We must also recognize the historical importance of what we do. We must see this historical process in the context of what is happening in Canada as a nation -- the constitutional aboriginal process. We must see the overall picture of aboriginal political evolution in Canada and around the world. It is something we cannot fight. It is something we must nurture and use to our advantage. I call on all of you to find courage in your hearts to make this decision. Thank you.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Kakfwi.

Presentation By Chairman Of The Western Constitutional Forum

MR. KAKFWI: I wanted to start off by pointing out to the Members of the Legislative Assembly that division itself is not a new idea. The Inuit did not dream this one up. In fact, it has been happening since the governments started being established in what is now Canada. At one time what was the North Western Territory included the entire Northwest Territories, the Yukon, Alberta, Saskatchewan, most of Manitoba and most of the northern part of Quebec and Ontario. Over the years, parts of the territory have been carved out by the federal government, boundaries have been drawn and provinces have been created. As populations of the regions increased, settlers petitioned Ottawa for provincial status and Ottawa in its wisdom carved out certain sections and called them Saskatchewan, Alberta, Yukon. And it is our turn to be carved up. But in our case we are trying to engineer a different type of surgery; that is, it will be much more pleasant than having somebody do it to you; we are giving you an opportunity to do it to yourself. That is the only difference in this process.

Division Viewed As Inevitable

We view division as inevitable -- if we do not do it, somebody else will do it. As you know, the federal government under Diefenbaker, I think, in 1963, had it on the order paper and as the government died so did the order paper and the initiative for division. I think over the years discussions for division have come and gone and always it has stopped midway. The last attempt was, I think, in the winter of 1984, I believe, January of 1985, at which time the Legislature just barely squeaked in the vote on it but that was cast aside as well, so we are once more on the threshold of making a decision and, as I say, simply put, I think if you do not decide it, if you put it off, then somebody else will decide it.

It is our hope that you will grapple with this issue in a manner that would reflect a legislature that has some vision of the interests of all the NWT for political, responsible government; that you will see in your vision how it fits into satisfying the land claims aspirations of the Inuit

and Dene and Metis and that as long as division is not answered, as long as the request for some political change in government is not answered, the likelihood of a claims settlement being reached, at least with the Dene and Metis, and I understand with the Inuit as well, will not be realized, and also that until division is resolved, further responsibility being transferred from the feds to this Legislature will be frustrated.

Not Everyone Will Be Satisfied

So, in the argument, the one thing that I think is important for us is that we have an opportunity here to make the decision ourselves and, as with any large project, we are not going to be able to satisfy everyone -- that is, not 100 per cent of the Dene and the Metis are going to be in support; not 100 per cent of the Inuvialuit, I understand, are going to be in support; nor are the Inuit or the non-native people. But when you debate this issue I think you have to take all the small parts and based on that, make your political assessment. I think it boils down to your own political judgment as to whether you think it is in the interests of everybody that this goes through or not. It is our argument and the argument of some of you, I hope, in the vision of some of you, that it is in the interest of all of us to have this Legislature adopt the agreement that was signed in Iqaluit and to encourage the Dene, Metis and the Inuit to reach a quick agreement on a final claims boundary and, upon the Dene and Metis reaching agreement with the Inuit on the final claims boundary, to set a date for a plebiscite and that the plebiscite will then reflect the political will of the people that we all represent. That will give us the direction that we need.

I know that some of you have not read the agreement yet. If you have, then I think you may need to reread it again because, for me, it is very clear. A lot of the questions that come up, a lot of the concerns that come up, are taken care of in the agreement. It specifies a very clear process for locating the boundary and how to ratify that boundary. It outlines fundamental principles which must be addressed in the development of constitutions for each territory, including provisions for regional government and aboriginal self-government. It also affirms a structure and a process for the development of constitutions of each territory.

Residents Of Both Territories Must Be Satisfied With Constitutions Before Division

The agreement also ensures that the majority of residents of both territories must be satisfied with their new constitution before division can take place. One of the greater, outstanding characteristics of this political process that sets it apart from the conventional political process that set up governments in the South is that in this case the native people are being counted in the, you might want to call it, the body count, or the census. As you know, previous to 1957, I believe, Inuit and particularly treaty Indian people were not allowed to vote nor take part in public government. So, you were never counted when the populations of regions were being added up to see if you were ready for responsible government.

In a way, this is the first time we are being included as part of the general political body. We are also being included in a process that would have us, as native people, outline what we would like to see as special provisions for ourselves in a public government. It is the only process in the history of Canada that sets this out and I know some of you have said in an offhand manner that you want to stand on your own two feet and fight for your recognition on a one man, one vote basis with no special provisions. I must ask you to recognize that if the Indians of BC or the Indians of Saskatchewan today were given an opportunity to seek special provisions for themselves in their provincial government, they would not cast it off so lightly, as some of you do.

There are some very real reasons why we ask for involvement in the development of new governments and for special protections and provisions to be outlined in these constitutions for ourselves as aboriginal people. While those negotiations have not been embarked on in a serious manner, there are a number of suggestions and concepts that will be carried into these discussions should division be agreed on by this House. The conventional landing place of aboriginal people in the South, as you know, is reserves and that is not something that we suggest for one moment. The extreme, for some of you, may be to have too many special provisions and guarantees made for aboriginal people in the public government, but that is all part of the negotiations that would occur.

Credibility At Stake

In the process, I think for years, as native people we have said, "We want division. We support division. We voted on it. We have asked Ottawa. We have asked you for support." I think the credibility of this Legislature, the credibility of the nation, of the native leaders is going to be severely undermined if for some reason we find once again an occasion to delay this decision. I think we are expected to make a very decisive decision fairly soon and we must do everything that we can to make sure that it happens.

In my view, if the plebiscite does not take place or the plebiscite reflects a "no" vote, then it is in many ways the end of the line for many of you because maybe many of you will not run for re-election; I do not know. But the thing is that, the political process, the constitutional process that is supported by this Legislature and by the federal government in terms of giving it a credibility and giving it financial and moral support, I do not think is going to be there. I do not think it is going to be there if we botch it one more time in that, in a way, it will set back even the claims negotiations. The reason I keep bringing that up is because whenever we talk about claims negotiations, we always say, "Well, we are different from the South."

The one fundamental reason why we are different from the South is that here in the North there is no provincial government and it is our view that, when we settle the claim, a part of the claim package is going to be the kinds of political guarantees and special provisions, constitutional provisions that we will negotiate ourselves in this public government and that is what is going to make it different. We are not going to get any different deal from people in the South except for that particular element in our package.

When I was walking in here, there was a gentleman outside who pointed out that there was a quote in The Globe and Mail today credited to me. I want you to know that I did not say it the way it is written there but I am not going to correct it. So I would just say that if I did not say it that way, I should have. Thank you.

---Laughter

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): The procedure that we would like to follow is that after the presentations by the two witnesses, the Members of the committee will have an opportunity to ask questions. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make a couple more points before we get into questions and answers. In the process, it was a well-known fact that some members of the Western Constitutional Forum and myself used to trade a lot of political missiles between each other. I think those incidents did have their purpose, but I think in the end we came to respect each other and I want to commend members of the Western Constitutional Forum for their farsightedness in signing this agreement.

Also, Mr. Kakfwi was too modest to read out what was the quote of the day in the Toronto Globe and Mail, so I will read it for him.

---Laughter

"Whenever the Creator tells us to do something in a big way, our minds are too small to see it. That is what may be happening here." Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): I have Mr. Nick Sibbeston first.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the government I want to welcome both Mr. Kakfwi and Mr. Amagoalik to the session and say that I very much respect the work that they have done over the course of the last few years. I would like to, though, in saying that, ask them a basic question about the political climate in which they are seeking the Assembly's support and, hopefully, the support of the population of the North.

When I came on the scene for the second time in 1979 as an MLA, I came with a mandate to challenge the government that was in place. I saw from my constituents, who are primarily Dene and Metis people, that there was great dissatisfaction with the government of the day. The Dene clearly

stated then that this government was not our government, and on arriving here and sitting with other MLAs, particularly those of the Eastern Arctic, I did sense that there was alienation and the Eastern Arctic Inuit people saw this government as one very far from them. There was an underlying feeling that there was dissatisfaction with the government, so we consequently set up a unity committee composed of a number of MLAs to examine this underlying feeling. In our work and travels throughout the North meeting with leaders, we came to the conclusion that, yes, indeed, the people of the North were dissatisfied with the government. People saw this government as an interim government and people said that there must be change. So, slowly we began working and eventually a plebiscite was held, in 1982.

Change In Political Climate Since 1979

In looking back, I see the political climate in which this plebiscite took place and on which the results were 56 per cent in favour of division. Now, five or six years later, I see a change since 1979. I think the government has been slowly improving programs, and policies have changed to be much more in tune with the peoples of the North. There is much more native involvement in this government. Civil servants are generally much more committed to the peoples of the North. There is an affirmative action in place, so generally I sense and feel that the peoples of the North are generally much more enamoured and much more in favour and supportive of the government that is in place now.

With this political climate, I would like to ask both Mr. Amagoalik and Mr. Kakfwi whether they, too, see that the political climate that they are entering into now, seeking to get support for the agreement and support in the plebiscite, whether they see that there have been changes and whether they see their task to get support for division as being much more difficult than it was a number of years ago.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik, do you wish to answer first, or Mr. Kakfwi?

MR. KAKFWI: Thank you. I think there may be some feeling that government has gotten better. I see it is getting bigger.

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: Way to go, Steve!

MR. KAKFWI: No criticism, but I see you are dealing with a deficit as well.

---Laughter

I think that we have hit, perhaps, a certain level where government has gotten as good as it will get, but it is not going to get any better until we resolve the question of division, simply because the territory is still the same size. You still have a territory that spans -- it is a million and a half square miles; it has two time zones; it is an incredibly huge country and I think that the process of devolution, the process of trying to get more responsible government is going to be held up until the quest for division is fulfilled. I think that by dividing you will deliver better government, faster in the long run to everyone in each part of the territory. It is my view that you are right, things have improved since the early 1970s in many ways and I think people should be given credit for the work in improving government but I do think that as a Legislative Assembly, at the present level, we are not going to get any further dramatic improvements until division occurs and that once that happens, then everything will start to fall into place.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

GNWT Too Far Away For Nunavut

MR. AMAGOALIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We, from this side, still cannot accept the Government of the NWT as our government. Very simply, they are just too far away and just have too many different priorities. Also, I think over time, although there is no question that services have improved, the attitudes of people have changed, I do not deny that, but I think over time we will

see that gradually, perhaps without people realizing it, much of the power and authority will always flow toward Yellowknife and as a result, we in Nunavut will continue to be in a political no man's land and it is not something we are prepared to accept.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Are there any comments from Members? Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the witnesses and welcome them to the Legislative Assembly of the NWT. It is obvious that John Amagoalik and Steve Kakfwi came over to make their presentation.

Legislative Assembly Not Responsible For Land Claims

We are not responsible for the Inuit land claims and Dene land claims and aboriginal rights. That is not our mandate to look after in the NWT. We are not looking after land claims within the Legislative Assembly. We are not answering this question. I would like to say that for the first part, if these events are going to happen, if the aboriginal people are going to have their wish in the NWT, there will be dissension from the non-natives. I think we should not ask the non-natives. If I have aboriginal rights, I should not ask my colleague to answer for me as an aboriginal person. That should be clarified. Ottawa can answer to that question as my aboriginal right. In regard to my political rights, I have lived in the NWT as an aboriginal and my rights in regard to the land and the animals, because I have lived here in the land, should be answered by the federal government, not by the Legislative Assembly. That has always been supported by the NWT government. We have no responsibility in that regard. It is only answerable by the federal government, by the Inuit. We are dealing with the division of the NWT. That is in regard to everybody in the NWT, people who live in the NWT -- Inuit, Indians, Metis, as well as the Kabloona. This is in question today. We will be answering that question today. Because we are the aboriginals of the NWT those will be -- if they agree with that.

In regard to the political development in NWT, I think this is in question today. In regard to the political development, I am sure the whole population of NWT, Kabloona, Inuit and anyone that lives in NWT should be involved in it. We cannot say that either side is not acceptable.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MACQUARRIE: When the guests had made their presentations there would be an opportunity for Members to ask questions of the guests and, at some time after the questions were done, Members would have an opportunity to make comments about the agreement. Am I wrong in that? If not, could I ask the honourable Member what his question is?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. In regard to your point of order, you are correct.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): After the presentation by the witnesses, I had indicated that we would have an opportunity as Members of the committee to ask the witnesses questions. Once that is concluded, once the witnesses leave the chamber, then we would have an opportunity or the Members of the committee would have an opportunity to discuss the tabled document. So that is the...Mr. Curley, your point of order.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I was responding to your statement. You asked for general comments and that is what I was literally taking as such and if I made a mistake, then I apologize. I will abide by your ruling.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Do other Members have any questions they would like to ask of the witnesses? Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Yes, even though there was no question, I would like to respond to it.

---Laughter

Land Claims And Political Development Go Hand In Hand

I think what Mr. Curley is referring to is land claims versus political development, whether or not they should be considered together or whether or not they should be developed hand in hand. To my understanding, a constitution is a means by which people decide on how they will live together. Now, if we are going to do that, I think everyone has to recognize that the aboriginal peoples of the North have special rights. And when we are developing these constitutions, these special rights have to be taken into consideration. They cannot be ignored. Land claims and political development go hand in hand. And we will not allow them to be separated. Because what we are doing by creating Denendeh, we are recognizing the Dene/Metis homeland. By creating Nunavut, we are recognizing an Inuit homeland. But at the same time, we have to respect the people who have come to live with us. And we must respect their rights. So on the one hand, we have to try to protect rights of people as Canadians but we must also protect and respect the rights, the ancient rights of the aboriginal peoples. So we cannot separate the two.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question for our two visitors. My understanding is that the proposed boundary agreement is negotiable. If people do not agree with it, my understanding is that the group goes back to the table to negotiate on the boundary agreement. My question is, I guess, what process are you taking to ratify the boundary agreement at the community level? Mahsi.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Kakfwi, do you wish to reply to that?

Process For Ratifying Boundary Agreement

MR. KAKFWI: The process that was followed between the Inuit and the Dene/Metis in reaching an agreement on where a claims boundary is going to go was set out two years ago. The communities most affected were party to the negotiations that took two years and included people from Great Bear Lake, the entire Dogrib region, the community of Snowdrift, and I think Resolution was involved as well. That process was acknowledged at all times by the Dene leadership and the Metis, and an agreement was reached, which included the signatures of a number of well-respected leaders of places like Snowdrift. What has happened upon reviewing it with the communities -- I think the Inuit have done the same and we have done the same -- is that there is a request being made presently to suggest some, I think, minor changes to that claims boundary. There is a meeting, as I understand, as early as tomorrow between the representatives, or the Dene/Metis secretariat, and members of the TFN to outline the areas where changes are being called for and to see how quickly they can be resolved, if they can be resolved at all. The process for community consultation has been there all along. I mean, the chiefs have been involved and so have the members of the Metis locals.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope we are talking about the same Snowdrift that I am representing. When are you coming into the community, then, to consult with the people, or do you just assume that they have been consulted without your coming in there yourself?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Kakfwi.

MR. KAKFWI: I think as soon as I am invited. I do not go to communities unless I am invited. The practice is that the chiefs invite the leaders in and we do it. The boundary -- as I say, we ratified a boundary once already. The Dene/Metis leadership have ratified the January boundary in Fort Providence a couple years ago. As well, there have been workshops in Snowdrift last winter, I think at least on two occasions. I have made at least four trips in there talking about things like the proposed park. The entire Dene National Assembly gathered there this summer. So I think we are talking about the same Snowdrift, Eliza. If you are suggesting that we need more consultation, that is fine, let's do it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Wray.

Possibility Of Two Boundaries To Plebiscite

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The difficulties that have ensued with the attempts to reach a boundary agreement are well known for everything and well documented, and I think that when this process started, both sides were fairly hard-lined in their positions. On the NCF side it was that Nunavut meant a tree line boundary or a variation of a tree line boundary and WCF took the position of a north/south boundary. I am wondering, given that there was extreme difficulty in arriving at an agreement between the two parties, if at any time there was ever consideration given to the fact that ultimately, no matter what boundary leaders or appointed representatives of organizations arrive at, the people must be the ultimate judges. I wonder if there was ever any consideration given to two proposed boundaries going to a plebiscite so that when people went to vote they clearly voted either on a north/south boundary or on a tree line boundary. Was that consideration ever given, or was it ever presented by one side and rejected by the other, or was it ever discussed? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: It was never considered because it would not work.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Any questions? Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Mr. Kakwi and Mr. Amagoalik for their presentation and also I would like to thank the Members of this House who participated in the NCF and WCF work that the Constitutional Alliance has done over the last couple of years. I think we should also acknowledge Mr. Tourangeau of the NWT Metis Association and Mr. Billy Day of COPE for their work in the arduous process that took place over the years to come to this point.

As a Member from the West, I would like to just put my following question into context, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I have been a Member that initially was against division of the Territories because I was involved in recreation activities involving different sports and travels around the Territories, and I was also on the NWT Association of Municipalities and some other organizations and had a feeling for the whole Territories and what it could be and I actually opposed the original division. And when the plebiscite took place, I voted against division.

Subsequently, having realized that an overwhelming majority of the people from the East voted in favour of division and wanted their own territory, I realized that history shows through the centuries that in different countries that had situations like this within their political jurisdictions, division occurred or separation occurred eventually. So I have taken the position now that I want to concur with division and I see that in the West there will be opportunities for us to mind our business on this side.

Assembly Should Know Positions Of Aboriginal Organizations Prior To Division Decision

Now that we have reached this situation, Mr. Chairman, my question is that because this Assembly is made up of Members from all the different regions and we all have constituents and organizations we represent as individuals and as a body, I feel that Members have difficulty in making a decision in this Assembly before we see what your positions are going to be officially as native organizations and other participants in the process. I would like to have both of your comments on what you see as the timing for your organizations to make official decisions, because I do not think most Members of this Assembly can make our decisions until we have seen what you have formally done. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: If I understand you correctly, you are asking about what is the timetable for creating a constitution for the consideration of the people. Is that your question?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. McLaughlin, clarification please.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry if I was unclear there, Mr. Amagoalik. What I am asking is this. The different Members in this Assembly represent different constituents and organizations in the whole Territories that are involved in this process, and each one of

these organizations -- in order for this process to go through which is before us right now, all of the groups must agree before we reach the plebiscite position. Some Members in here, I think, are reluctant to make their position known until they are assured that the other organizations like yours have made their approvals public before some of our Members can move on the issue. So I was wondering what the time frame is within the next couple of weeks or so, or months, that you are intending to make these decisions. I think a lot of Members here will have difficulty making a decision on this issue, not knowing what their constituents and your organizations come to as a conclusion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

Setting Date For Plebiscite

MR. AMAGOALIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As has been indicated, the Dene/Metis and TFN negotiators are scheduled to meet tomorrow or the next day and, hopefully, they will deal with that overlap issue. Once that is done we believe -- that is really the only obstacle that they can really see which would create difficulties for setting the date for the plebiscite. We hope that the plebiscite will be sometime this spring, sometime in April or May. Once that has been dealt with and a positive result has come from this, we will immediately begin the development of our constitutions.

On the Nunavut side, I expect that the writing of it, the consultation, the research, much of which has been done, will take approximately two years. By that time we hope to bring a proposed constitution to a constitutional conference. And as you know, as is indicated, we hope that all these things will be dealt with by the year 1991, October 1st. As far as member organizations involved in our constitutional forum are concerned, we have the concurrence of all of them from the NCF side. So as I see it, the only obstacle that we can see from this side, from the NCF perspective, is the overlap issue with the Dene/Metis and TFN.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Just a supplementary then, Mr. Chairman. This Assembly is dealing with our budget right now and we are expecting it to be concluded sometime in the middle of March and then adjourn until we come back to deal with some legislation. There will be some considerable period of time after we adjourn before we come back again. In the matter of process, my concern is that in order to have a spring plebiscite, this Assembly would have to consider the question before we leave in the middle of March. My concern is, to both gentlemen, again, as to whether they feel that they can have their process completed while this House is still in session before we adjourn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, a question on the ratification process. I compliment both chairmen of the Constitutional Alliance for their excellent presentation delivered extemporaneously and very colourfully. I believe that the Members of this House have read the document and I think we know that it consists of a statement with regard to a boundary, statements with regard to principles for constitution building and a ratification process. I suggest, sir, that the ratification process will give us the greatest opportunity for discussion. I would just like to follow up on a response that Mr. Amagoalik made with regard to concurrence of other organizations.

I note that the document is signed by individuals who give their title in organizations; Rhoda Innuksuk, president of ITC and Donat Milortuk, chairman of the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut. Did the boards of these organizations examine the agreement? Have they agreed to this agreement at the present time, or will that be done in the ensuing weeks as well, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Yes, that will be done in the coming weeks. The answer is, yes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Curley.

Effect Of Decision By Kitikmeot Region

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to get into the position of arguing with Mr. Amagoalik but I think it is important to clarify the situation with respect to Inuvialuit communities because they were part of the original proposal for an Inuit homeland in 1975. There are Members in that area who continue to at least support the concept, the symbolic presence of the unified Inuit homeland. I know that there are complex issues when negotiating a deal and it is expedient, sometimes, to make a quick political agreement for the purpose of, let us say, an impending constitutional conference, at the expense of alienating people further than they were before. But my question is, now that you have decided to leave them out of the Nunavut proposal, what will happen if the Kitikmeot Region decides not to support the proposal? What are you going to say to them?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to make it clear to people like Ms Cournoyea that if I, as a person, hurt them in any way, I apologize; but as a politician, I make no apologies. You know, when tough decisions have to be made, somebody has to make them and we made them. Now, as far as excluding the Inuvialuit is concerned, as I indicated earlier, we did not create a new line and also we never kicked anybody out, we did not try to exclude anyone.

I think people have to understand what happened back in 1975-76 when the Inuit of Nunavut decided to reconsider their proposal. The Inuvialuit of the Beaufort Sea decided that they could not wait; they went ahead and pursued their own claim. I remember talking on the phone with Nellie and Sam Raddi, with Vince Steen from our office in Ottawa, trying very hard to convince them not to do this but it was done. Also, as you will all remember, the Inuvialuit had a seat in the Nunavut Constitutional Forum and we tried very hard to keep them in the fold, so to speak, but they left -- twice. So, that is the story. Also, I think that when touchy decisions have to be made the buck has to stop somewhere and it has stopped here. In the same way during the national constitutional debates, back in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the whole country had debated this for 52 years and no agreement could be reached. So, what happened? Three people started talking in a kitchen somewhere in Ottawa and they worked out the national constitutional agreement which has since then been accepted by the whole country.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Paniloo.

Discussion Of Location Of Capital

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is to the witnesses. I am not against your ideas, but my constituents are quite a way from the boundary line and they do not really mind that because they are away from the boundary line but before their vote on the proposed boundary line, the plebiscite, they would like to be consulted. I told them about the proposed boundary line, where it is located, and then the communities were told that they were going to be visited by the two forums and consulted. That is my understanding at the present time. My question is, why have they informed the communities too soon about where the capital is going to be? I felt that the people, the forums, should not have mentioned where the capital is going to be -- only after the plebiscite has been held. I wonder why they proposed two places as capitals. I felt that this is going to be confusing for the Baffin Region residents when they hear about two capital proposals. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) Why did I say that? Because I was asked. That is why I told them. But I just want to make it very clear that I said this because the Kitikmeot people have had this concern that if there was to be a Nunavut capital it was going to go to Iqaluit. That is what they had heard. That is why they believed it and I just wanted to make it clear to them, to the Inuit leaders and to the public. If they were not asked where the capital is going to be, they were not supposed to say where the capital was going to be, so I just mentioned that it would be better if it was not in Iqaluit, because they wanted to have a capital in a central area. That was my response when I was asked a question. That was to be discussed by the community as to where the capital is going to be. I am just happy for people to be asking that question and what I have mentioned before. If it is going to destroy the minds of the people, confuse the people -- I wonder how their minds are.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Questions. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to welcome the witnesses. I think the success of the Ninth and 10th Assemblies, if there has been a success, is that they did permit leaders of major aboriginal organizations to feel free to come here and discuss their concerns and know that they would be well received in this Assembly. So I am pleased to see you both here. I would also like to say that I do appreciate that you are in a very difficult position, which I understand very well, because it seems to happen that people who have not been involved in negotiations find it very easy to criticize the results; perhaps in part because they have not been, themselves, involved. I found this out once myself. The hard way. So I appreciate the difficult position that you are in. I do appreciate as well the clarification on the issue of the capital, just provided by Mr. Amagoalik, because it has caused some concerns in my constituency.

Economic Prospects For Nunavut

But one question I would like to ask Mr. Amagoalik and I think it needs to be asked here, is a question that I am surprised has not been asked today. There is a concern that I have heard expressed that there will be a rich and a poor territory emerging from this boundary agreement, if the plebiscite is approved. There is a concern that Nunavut, although it contains clearly the largest body of land, will be a poor cousin and will be dependent for a long time or for a longer period of time on the federal government for survival. Not that we are not already dependent on the federal government with the Government of the Northwest Territories. I wonder if, for the benefit of people who have those concerns, Mr. Amagoalik would comment on this concern about the economic prospects for Nunavut. Is this a matter that people of Nunavut should be worried about?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Of course it is something that the people of Nunavut should be worried about. But the suggestion that Nunavut will always be a poor cousin is something I do not buy. We all know that there is no complete inventory of what is in the Arctic. We know there are a lot of minerals. No one really knows how much, but I suspect there is quite a bit. Also, as I indicated earlier, division will define the rules and developers will find the economic development atmosphere much better. Also as you know, there are some very interesting prospects for fisheries in Davis Strait, in the Hudson Strait and even in Hudson Bay. Nobody really knows what is in Hudson Bay. Also, we have not even begun to touch tourism. I think tourism will be a gold mine in the Arctic in the coming years. So I am not worried. Although I acknowledge that it is something that we have to worry about, I am confident that in the future Nunavut will be prosperous. After all, the Canadian Arctic is the sleeping giant of Canada.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Erkloo.

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to welcome the witnesses. They have had a huge ordeal to go through. I have a question to the witnesses; it is twofold. The Members of the Legislative Assembly do not really know what is going to be done. It will be clear after we go through the process. We all have different ideas because nobody is made exactly the same. Some of us like the proposed boundary and some of us do not like it. If we were to go within the Assembly about whether we liked the proposed boundary or not, if we were to vote on it, it may or may not be defeated within the House. My question is: If this were a motion to approve the boundary and the motion was defeated, what would happen? Would that mean there would not be a plebiscite any more? And what alternative action can you, as the NCF, take about it?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: (Translation) If you were to have a vote on it today, if we were defeated, and if the Inuit people did not have a plebiscite within the NWT, maybe we could fix up a plebiscite because we have to understand what the public wants. Also, the Inuit people in the Baffin Region or Kitikmeot and Central Baffin, if they were to vote on this and we were defeated, we would have to go through different channels. We are looking at two directions. Let us try to get Nunavut; if we cannot get Nunavut, let us go through the constitutional negotiations. Let us try it that way. If this was stopped by the Assembly, we would look for other channels to go through.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Ms Cournoyea.

Continuing Responsibility For Constitutional Well-Being

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity over a number of years to work for Nunavut. I believe that, in that it has taken a great deal of time and dedication to help that particular objective to be realized, as John said, there was a struggle and decisions have to be made. Of all people in our region, I think John will agree that we, in the Beaufort region, have had to face difficult decisions. We will have the opportunity to speak to that and I realize that these are questions. The only question I put to both Mr. Amagoalik and Mr. Kakfwi is, can they respect this one suggestion that I have, which is: Yes, constitutional development is important and it is a struggle and in the ensuing months, it is my responsibility, representing Inuit who realized that it would be a struggle to stay in Nunavut, that we are not going to abandon our responsibility in looking after the constitutional well-being of those people for whatever reason, whatever way we have to do it. And I believe that I can comfortably get from Mr. Amagoalik, particularly, that he realizes that we must do that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Yes, just for the record, I want to tell Nellie that we will respect that right.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. MacQuarrie, no. Are there any further questions? Mr. Ballantyne.

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to welcome the two forum chairmen to our meeting. As a former labour negotiator, I think I am well able to understand the magnitude of difficulty that both forums have overcome in order to achieve this agreement. Later on in the debate I will clarify my position on the discussions. But what I would like to do is just pose a couple of questions of a technical nature to the two chairmen for some clarification.

Timetable Flexible To Maintain Quality Of Services

On page two of the agreement, under matters of general concern, government services, I read: "A major objective of division is to improve the quality of government and the delivery of services to citizens. Both forums recognize that adequate funds must be provided by the Government of Canada to ensure that in the process of division, the level and quality of services presently available to NWT residents, and the rate at which capital needs are met, are at least maintained. Both forums commit themselves to pursuing a guarantee of adequate funding for division from the Government of Canada." It is my understanding it has just been fairly recently that the central agencies of the federal government have been seriously considering this division proposal. My concern would be, and my question is that if, for whatever reason, adequate funds at least in the immediate future or within the four year timetable are not forthcoming, I would like the comment of both chairmen. Is there some flexibility in the timetable whereby it might take six years or eight years to accomplish in order that the level of government services would not have to decrease? I wonder if each of the chairmen could answer that question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Kakfwi.

MR. KAKFWI: That provision was, I think, put in there on the insistence from both sides, that none of the people, particularly in the smaller communities, should suffer as a result of the push for division. The process should evolve in such a way that the level of funding, particularly the quality and the level of service that we are all accustomed to -- even though apparently, it is by far the highest in Canada, per capita -- that we should not suffer and that is open to interpretation, I guess. But that was the insistence on both sides that, you know, the cost of setting up two territories, two capitals, two governments should not cut back, for instance, on the amount of capital money available to the communities. The way that it would unfold, I suppose, is that if there is agreement by the House to adopt the agreement, that if the Dene/Metis and the Inuit reach agreement before the middle of March and ratify the claims boundary, they will go to the respective native organizations for ratification. The plebiscite date will be sometime in late April, I hope. We will all turn out to vote in favour and shortly after, I guess, the forums will begin their work to draft out the constitutions for each respective territory and one of the provisions in there that would guide us would be to ensure that the level of service be improved. That is the whole objective of the exercise -- to make for better government, closer government, government that is more responsive to its own jurisdictions and territory.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Yes, I think the quality of life and services to our people will always be of paramount importance. If it means waiting a couple more years for actual division to take place until we can find some money to build a capital, I do not see any problem with that, but just as long as it does not become unreasonable. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Are there any further questions? Mr. Ballantyne.

Implementation Of Certain Aspects Before Division

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you. Thank you for that answer; I think that clarifies that question somewhat. The other one, again, is a small technical problem. On page three, "Division of the Northwest Territories may follow immediately upon the completion of this ratification process and the two forums are committed to achieving division by October 1, 1991. However, this ratification process notwithstanding, certain aspects of division may be implemented prior to division with the mutual agreement of the two forums." Again, this is just a question of process. Just so that if we get to that point, we do not end up with some misunderstanding, do both chairmen envision that the two forums, for instance, would make a recommendation to the government that, for instance, the Housing Corporation perhaps, might be divided and the government would undertake that? Is that how the process is seen by the two chairmen?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: That is how I see it. I think there are certain things that we do not need to wait for until final division takes place, so we should not tie ourselves down to not doing anything until 1991. I think it also means that once the boundary agreement has been ratified, we can then finally start talking about devolution.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My understanding is then that the group is gathering tomorrow. I just want to say that I will have the letter forwarded on our position for my constituency and I would like that to be considered, to negotiate the boundary line, and if it is not considered, we might be losing a lot of support. Mahsi cho.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Kakfwi.

MR. KAKFWI: I was just going to say, Eliza, that I see from the questions that everybody has read the agreement so I retract the earlier statement that I made. As for your letter that you are going to draft, it is my own personal position that for the process of reaching agreement on the claims boundary it is a matter primarily between the Chipewyan people and the Dogribs to reach agreement with the Inuit. My part has been simply to bring the process to a head and the more involved people like yourself come, not as an MLA but as an individual Chipewyan leader, it will help expedite that process. So I hope that you will involve yourself in that process.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Any further questions? Mr. T'Seleie.

Concerns Of Sahtu On Boundary Agreement

MR. T'SELEIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The agreement that we have here today has some conditions in it. One of the conditions is that there must be agreement among aboriginal organizations on the boundary agreement. Since the signing of the agreement on the 15th of January, I know that, at least in my constituency, some of the people were concerned about the proposed boundary. I would like to ask Mr. Kakfwi, for the record, to tell me at least whether the fears of those people in my constituency have been addressed as far as the boundary is concerned.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Kakfwi.

MR. KAKFWI: The boundary for our part, that is, in the area that is in proximity to the Sahtu region, is pretty well the same as what was proposed and adopted by the leadership two and one half years ago. But for the record, the former chief of Fort Franklin, plus the present chief, were party to the agreement. They signed the tentative agreement on the claims boundary last spring. I think the big concern in Franklin in January was that one of the supposedly more informed, transient members of the community, announced at a public meeting that the boundary line ran right

across Great Bear Lake. That was the big uproar there. Since then we have talked to the council and the chief and various members of that community and there is not great concern. They know exactly where the line is. There is a minor concern with the area overlap between the two and they have a very realistic suggestion to make to the Inuit in that regard. In Good Hope the land use there is unaffected. For Colville Lake as well and Fort Norman. Norman Wells is also unaffected.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Any further questions? Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, just a clarification. In the discussions that have taken place in the last few minutes, there seems to be an indication that there might be some changes. But it is my understanding that what is being put on the table right at this time, is it. There are no changes. That is it. I would like to know whether that is a fact and are the members sticking to that or are we, in one week's time, going to get a document with some changes to it?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Kakfwi.

MR. KAKFWI: What we are talking about here is that most of the political boundary being proposed is based on the tentative agreement reached between the Dene, Metis and the TFN. Our agreement suggests that the political boundary will be whatever that final claims boundary is that is ratified between the TFN and the Dene/Metis secretariat. By no means are we saying that there are major revisions going to be made to that line. It is generally along a corridor. We know where the claims boundary is going to fall, more or less, and that is what the last minute negotiations are going to focus on. That is what is being talked about here.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: My reply to that would be, as far as I am concerned, because I signed the document this is it for me. But if the House, in its wisdom, finds a way to make it even more acceptable, then I would not stand in your way.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Angottitauruq.

Agreement Before Devolution Of Federal Powers

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I will try to ask a question. The boundary and constitutional agreement, I believe, is to try to bring the government closer to the people and also, as Mr. Amagoalik said, it will have something to do with economic development and Inuit culture and so on. As one of the residents of the NWT, I think I have a question. In his remarks he said it is to bring the government closer to the people. Right now the Northwest Territories is in a process of devolution of power coming in from the federal government. I believe that after that, when those powers are given to the NWT Legislative Assembly, it might have been a better government and closer to the people. Why is it that this agreement is going ahead before devolution of powers are given to the NWT government?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: I guess it was done in this method because -- let us imagine that we have a pail of water that the Government of Canada is holding and we want to make sure that each side gets the right amount of water that they need. If we are going to pour it from the Ottawa pail to the Yellowknife pail and then have to do it all over again after division, we are creating a lot of unnecessary work for ourselves. We might as well take the short cut.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Curley.

Revenue Sharing Provision Omitted From Agreement

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to both speakers. When reviewing the agreements a very important provision, for those of us interested in the revenue base for both levels of government, was left out. That has to do with a revenue sharing arrangement between the two territories. I would like to ask both of you, given the fact that this very important provision was left out, would you people be agreeable to support any support that this House gives to share revenues for a period of time in the event that the division were to take place? As well, the tax-base revenues from this region so that we have time to build up the infrastructure as well

as perhaps building of roads -- I know the Baffin is not interested in roads but we in the Keewatin are definitely interested in transportation improvements, because without that the cost of living and everything else is just not going to develop and improve. As well, in my view public funding alone is not going to spread the wealth to the people of Nunavut. On that basis, would you be prepared to support a motion introduced in the House for this to be included in the agreement?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Amagoalik.

MR. AMAGOALIK: Yes, I think we would be. The answer is yes, but we must not forget that the person holding that authority sits in Ottawa. So we certainly would support your efforts if you want to make them in that area, yes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Kakfwi.

MR. KAKFWI: In one of the earlier drafts that was discarded, both forums agreed that resource revenue sharing would be included and it was included, I think, in an earlier document. It basically said that both territories will share in the revenue that is generated from its resources on a formula that would be worked out. In this document, it is not included because we are trying to leave out things that we have not spent adequate time on. It is not, Tagak, to say we did not want it included but if we wanted to include it, I mean we are not at a stage where we had anything to suggest. At least on our side, from the Western Constitutional Forum, we know that there may be a suggestion to put it back on the agenda, that if division is agreed on and we continue our discussions, that the idea of sharing revenue from resource development will be on the agenda and we are open to that. That is all the members of the western forum had agreed -- we just did not want to make a contentious issue of something that we really did not understand or had not worked out ourselves yet.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Any further questions? If there are no further questions, I would like to thank the witnesses and we will continue with the matter after a 15 minute coffee break. Thank you.

---SHORT RECESS

Call the committee back to order. We are dealing with Tabled Document 1-87(1), the boundary and constitutional agreement. I would like to call on Mr. MacQuarrie to open general comments at this time. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Legislative Assembly's Involvement In Process

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The committee has had placed before it, a very important document for its consideration and as one of those who signed the agreement that is contained in that document, I would like to make some comments with respect to it. I appreciate very much the comments of the chairman of the two forums. I note that they talked about the terms of the agreement and some of the larger issues that arise as a result of the agreement. I will deal with some of those issues too but first I would like to start with the Assembly's involvement in the process that resulted in this agreement being brought to the House. In the years 1979, 1980, 1981 and early 1982, there were Members of this House who strongly urged on all of us, the need to divide the Northwest Territories.

MR. McCALLUM: Right on. Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: There were various committees struck to consider it and various discussions in this House. In the fall of 1981 and through into early 1982, we saw that the House, this Assembly, decided that it should associate itself formally with the Constitutional Alliance of the Northwest Territories which was divided into two forums. It decided as well that it should name Members of this House to sit on those forums and to participate in the discussions that were conducted by those forums. And at around the same time the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories decided that there should be a plebiscite conducted across the Northwest Territories asking people everywhere, a very simple and direct question. That question was "Do you think that the Northwest Territories should be divided?", yes or no.

When that plebiscite was first scheduled -- perhaps I should clarify one thing because this was raised to me in Iqaluit on January 15th, almost immediately after I had signed the agreement. A reporter from the Eastern Arctic recalled to my mind and the attention of other people that at that

time I had abstained from the vote and the question was, what was my position now? And for clarification in this House, I do not mind relating at all what the circumstances were. At the time that first plebiscite was scheduled, I indicated publicly that my own personal preference was not to divide the Northwest Territories and therefore in the plebiscite I could not in good conscience go and vote "Yes" because that is not the way I felt inside. Yet at the same time as I said that it seemed to me very important to see what was the opinion of the vast majority of people in the Eastern Arctic because if they wanted the Northwest Territories to be divided, then even though I personally was not an ardent supporter of that position, if I saw it clear that they wanted the Northwest Territories to be divided, I for one did not wish to stand in their way. Therefore, I would not vote "No" in the plebiscite and thereby cancel someone else's aspirations by doing that. But, following the plebiscite in April of 1982, it became clear that, in fact, a great many people in the Eastern Arctic did want the Northwest Territories to be divided and just for purposes of speaking in the House today, I thought I would briefly look over the results of the plebiscite and I report them for you now.

Review Of Plebiscite On Division

We know, of course, that approximately 56 per cent of all the people who voted in that plebiscite said, "Yes, we want the Northwest Territories to be divided." I see, for example, a community like Arctic Bay had a 68 per cent turnout on that plebiscite day and 86.6 per cent of all those who voted said, "Yes, we want the Northwest Territories to be divided." In Baker Lake, 61 per cent turnout, 86.3 per cent said "Yes, we want the Northwest Territories to be divided." That is one from Baffin, one from Keewatin and in one from Kitikmeot East, Spence Bay, 87.8 per cent turnout on that day and of those who voted, 85 per cent said "Yes, we would like the Northwest Territories to be divided." Those results from the Eastern Arctic are generally consistent with the results in other communities. So what I am saying is that it became clear as a result of that plebiscite that a great many people in the Eastern Arctic believed that it was desirable and/or necessary to divide the Northwest Territories.

Seeing that, I then said that if that is the wish, I believe that the rest of us ought to co-operate to try to make that wish become a reality if it is at all possible. When the Assembly met in Inuvik in May of 1982 the question was put at that time to the Assembly, "Shall we support division in principle?" and if I recollect, the vote was 19 for, zero against, and one abstention. I believe that was the vote in Inuvik in May of 1982. So seeing those two things; the people, in the majority, saying in the plebiscite "We want division," and the very strong vote in the Assembly saying "Yes, we support the principle of division," having the Assembly associate itself formally with the Constitutional Alliance, the two forums, and naming Members to those two forums, it became clear that the Assembly intended to co-operate in bringing about a division of the Northwest Territories. And on that basis I, as one of the Members named to the Western Constitutional Forum, worked sincerely and I think quite hard over the ensuing years to bring back an agreement that would outline a boundary for dividing the Territories and some constitutional principles that would perhaps guide political and constitutional development in the Territories following division.

The task that was given to us on those two forums was not an easy task at all. As many have observed, in trying to divide territory in other places, at other times, there have been battles fought over that kind of thing because it means so very much to so many people. So I can assure every Member of the House that it was not an easy job to try to reach an agreement. As difficult as that task was and contrary to the sceptical predictions of some people, I think with perseverance and with a necessary spirit of compromise on the part of all members in both forums and against many odds, the two forums have reached an agreement and that agreement is on the table before you. It is an agreement that I endorsed as a member of the Western Constitutional Forum. I put my name to it.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. MacQuarrie, your 10 minutes is up. Does the committee agree that he continue? Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Carry on, Mr. MacQuarrie.

Agreement Presents Best Possible Line

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Members, Mr. Chairman. It is an agreement that I endorsed as a member of the Western Constitutional Forum. I put my name to the agreement. It is an agreement that I continue to support. It is an agreement that I recommend to the Members of this Assembly who asked us to undertake that work on your behalf and it is an agreement that I recommend to the people of the Northwest Territories. In other words, the people of the Territories have said that the Territories must be divided and if it is to be divided it must be divided somewhere. And given all of the complex circumstances involved, I say with confidence that if it is to be divided, this is the best possible line -- the one that is presented in this agreement.

Now, in saying that I do not say that it is perfect. It is clear that it leaves some people dissatisfied but having been in the thick of negotiations trying to reach that agreement, having heard the concerns that were raised by many parties, the concerns of Metis, the concerns of Inuvialuit, the concerns of non-natives, the concerns of Inuit and people from different regions, having heard all of those concerns and recognizing, for example, that in any given community you will find an individual who thinks it should go this way and another individual who thinks it should go that way, in view of all of those difficulties I am persuaded that no one could draw a line that would leave everyone completely happy. If that were possible, we would have done it, because we do not wish to leave people unhappy. It is simply clear that division cannot be carried out painlessly. If it is to occur some will be unhappy and I do not say that callously. I am sympathetic but if the people wish the Territories to be divided, that is the circumstance that has to prevail. I think in the final analysis that Members here who are considering the agreement should not necessarily say that it is a bad agreement because they can identify someone who is unhappy, but rather assess it in this regard: Is it a reasonable agreement? Is it a fair agreement? And is it an agreement that is capable of satisfying the large majority of the people in the Northwest Territories? On all of those counts I answer unequivocally, yes, it is all of those things.

As to whether it is a fair and reasonable agreement, I say that I believe it is because at one point in the deliberation of the two forums, in the months March through July, 1984, the members of the Constitutional Alliance tried to clarify for themselves and for other people in the Territories, precisely what is it that we are trying to do? The alliance set down an objective and listed certain principles that would guide it toward making what it felt would be a fair and reasonable boundary agreement that could satisfy the large majority of people. That objective and those principles have been on the table for the past nearly three years and I have never heard them specifically challenged by anyone as being unsuitable, an unsuitable framework to carry on these discussions and these negotiations.

Objective And Principles Guiding Negotiations

The objective that was agreed to -- I will read the whole of it. It is not very long, one short paragraph. "Objective. It is agreed that northern residents represented by the Constitutional Alliance of the NWT, and guided by the following principles agreed upon by the Constitutional Alliance, shall determine a boundary for dividing the Northwest Territories into two viable public government jurisdictions that have the political and economic potential to evolve toward provincial status, and it is agreed that the fair resolution of this issue shall be a priority of the Constitutional Alliance." The alliance, of course, has made it a priority since that time.

In those same discussions, as I said, there were principles outlined that the alliance indicated it would be guided by, in trying to reach this fair and reasonable resolution. I will not go through all of those but a sampling would be that new territories will have substantial numbers of aboriginal peoples; that new territories should have reasonable prospects for eventual economic viability over the short and long term, considering land mass and renewable and non-renewable resources; that historic, linguistic and cultural communities of interest should be taken into account in determining a boundary; that traditional and continuing land use and occupancy should be taken into account in determining a boundary; that transborder concerns and conflicts will be minimized where possible in determining a boundary; where transborder interests in lands and resources necessitate, reciprocal provisions will be made in the constitutions of both territories to allow joint resource management and use, renewable resource harvesting within those areas and such other matters as may be agreed upon. So it was things like that, that guided the deliberations of the members on both forums. And that resulted in the boundary proposal that you see before you. So it is not an arbitrary boundary proposal. It took into account many factors and many people's concerns and it seems to all members on that forum who signed the agreement that this is the best possible line that you can come up with.

Constitutional Provisions Contained In Agreement

It is a good agreement for other reasons than just that boundary line, because it is not just a boundary agreement but it is a boundary and constitutional agreement and it seems to me that the agreement contains other provisions that ought to alleviate some of the concerns that people have expressed. For example, in the agreement there are provisions for a constitutional process in the West that would enable aboriginal people even though they would be a minority in a western territory, to participate directly in shaping a western government.

Earlier today, Mr. Kakfwi alluded to the importance of that provision for aboriginal people, to the fact that it is something that is unique in Canadian history. It is clear too that in the agreement, although a representative of the Inuvialuit did not sign the agreement, there is provision in the agreement for the Inuvialuit as well to participate directly in that constitutional process as full members with the same rights and powers as other members on the Western Constitutional Forum. It is recognized that that process could be a difficult process and that it might fail but it is also clear that if that were to be the case that aboriginal people would then seek to implement any right to aboriginal self-government they might have, quite apart from this process.

Agreement Contains Provisions With Respect To Land Claims

Another element in the agreement that I think is a safeguard has in a way to do with land claims, although the forums are not directly intruding in the land claims question. The two provisions I mention are, firstly, that it is recognized that aboriginal people may feel that they have traditional hunting and fishing rights in a land area that winds up in a territory that they are not living in. For example, I know the Loucheux at the present time find considerable difficulty as a result of having some of their traditional lands in a totally different political jurisdiction -- the Yukon. But this agreement indicates that where that kind of concern exists, the two governments will seek to reach agreements to respect the rights of aboriginal people in those areas before division occurs.

The other matter with respect to land claims is simply that we have agreed to accept, as a political boundary, a ratified land claims boundary. I wish to assure everyone that that does not mean that politicians, such as myself, who are not aboriginal, will have any role whatsoever to play in the negotiations with respect to a land claims boundary. That is the job, because it is the right, of aboriginal people. It will be the Dene/Metis on the one hand and the Inuit on the other, who will seek to negotiate a suitable land claims boundary. What this agreement says and therefore need not be changed in any way is, that when that land claims boundary is ratified, we will accept it as a political boundary for division.

Agreement Process Is Very Democratic

There are other facets of the agreement that I think are important because they point to the fact that what we have here is an agreement that will only stand as an agreement if it is affirmed at several significant points by various peoples and eventually the whole people of the NWT. It is a very democratic process. You have an agreement before you that is signed by individuals -- but not just any individuals, individuals who were asked by various parties to try to reach this agreement. In other words, I was asked to participate by this Legislative Assembly.

The next step in the process -- it is very democratic -- is that each of the parties that those individuals represent, will be asked to approve the agreement. In other words, the chiefs of the Dene Nation will be asked to approve the agreement; the board of the Metis Association of the NWT will be asked to approve the agreement; the board of ITC will be asked to approve the agreement; the board of TFN will be asked to approve the agreement; and the Legislative Assembly will be asked to approve the agreement. Because each of those parties sent individuals to the negotiations and those individuals have signed the agreement.

Now the reason that is a democratic process is because if any one of those parties says "No, we do not accept that agreement", then there is no agreement. It does not go any further. The parties would have to sit back down perhaps and try to do something else. But it would not be said that an agreement exists if any one of the parties that I listed, says "No" to the agreement. So people have an opportunity through that process to have input.

Again I allude to the matter of the ratified claims boundary. If the Dene/Metis on the one hand, or the Inuit on the one hand, refuse to ratify a land claims boundary, then there is no agreement. There is nothing to vote on as a political boundary in that case. So people have that kind of opportunity. And then finally, very democratic, because if it receives the endorsement from all the parties then the boundary for division must still be put to a plebiscite of the people of the whole NWT.

I think that is a very fair, measured and reasonable process. It has been the declared wish of the people of the NWT -- at least that is the evidence we have on the table, the results of the 1982 plebiscite to divide the NWT. It was the clear wish of the Legislative Assembly to support division in principle and the Legislative Assembly sent some of us out to try to reach an agreement. Well, those some of us that you asked are saying, "We reached an agreement." We think it is a good agreement and we brought it back to the table here now, asking you, who sent us out, what you think about it. We would like to hear what you think about it and of course we hope that you will endorse it. We hope that you will approve the work that we did. And while no vote in this House is being scheduled for today, this is an opportunity for Members to make comments. At some point in the near future there will be a motion asking for the Assembly to approve this agreement and if that is approved, to put the question of the boundary in a plebiscite to the people of the NWT.

So what I am saying is that I feel those of us whom you asked to do a job for you, have done it to the best of our ability and now we are back asking you to do your jobs and help everyone to take the next steps that the people of the NWT have wanted us all to take. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was involved in the signing of the boundary agreement. I think I was involved for approximately two years. First of all, I would like to thank the chairmen of the Western and Nunavut Constitutional Forums. They had a heavy workload and we came into a lot of problems at times. The people that I worked with, I would also like to thank them. We were working together but sometimes we did not agree right away. It was very difficult to agree amongst each other at times when we were dealing with the boundary issue. But right now, for myself, I am not going to change my mind. I would like the boundary to be as drawn. If I try to criticize, I think that is going to be the end of it and we are going to have to go back to consult each other on the whole issue over again.

People Must Make Their Own Decisions

I would like to repeat what Mr. MacQuarrie has just stated but I am just going to make comments on what I think and what my constituents think. I do not want anyone to be confused on this issue. I want everyone in the NWT to be clear about the agreement that we signed, even if it is agreed at the Legislative Assembly level, because I want to hear from the people of the Northwest Territories. Because we are going to find out only after the plebiscite is held whether the boundary is good or not and we cannot encourage our people which way to vote. If we try to encourage our people, I think we are going to make a mistake for them. The people of the Northwest Territories should make up their own minds how they want to vote; whether they want to vote "Yes" or "No". As for myself, I have told my constituents that I am going to let them do whatever they want to do on the voting of the boundary line. I am not going to be encouraging them to vote "Yes" or "No" because I might make a mistake and I am not going to try to change their minds. I just want that clearly understood by the NWT residents that, as a Legislative Assembly, we cannot encourage our people which way to vote.

In 1980, when we were dealing with the boundary issue in November, the standing committee on division dealt with this and the papers are very thick from their work then. Then some people expressed their concerns on this issue. There were a lot of people that voted on it. So after we dealt with this boundary issue, later on we again dealt with where the line was going to be drawn. In those days we almost had an agreement after two years but they stopped it because they did not like where the boundary line was. We wanted to give further clarification as to where the boundary line was going to be and where everybody can be happy about the boundary line. And they wanted them to consider the Inuvialuit region so that they could have a place and they have been dealing with that for a long time also. The NCF had a chairman from the Inuvialuit region -- after they

stopped chairing -- they pulled themselves out from the NCF by themselves so that they could figure out as to where they would be placed, whether they are going to be in WCF or NCF. After that it seems like this was impossible so we did a review on this, if it would be possible for them to be members below the tree line. It seems like this caused confusion and we used a large amount of money for this. We used \$4.5 million for almost four years, dealing with this issue.

For those reasons I came to Yellowknife on January 3rd for a meeting of the standing committee on finance but I was told ahead of time that I might be invited to the NCF meeting in Iqaluit. I was called and invited, if I could be involved in the proceedings of the agreement. It is evident now that we have to go forward with this, that is why I was one of the people who signed the agreement. I do not want to make my speech lengthy. If there are some people going to be speaking on this issue, some of us Members who signed the agreement, I will be able to answer some questions if there are any, or if there is any confusion, we will try to clarify it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Pedersen.

Tree Line Boundary Proposed To Morrow Commission

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope there will be an opportunity in this debate to perhaps come back to it after we have heard each other's viewpoint. I want to thank the previous two speakers for clarifying and putting some things in historical perspective for us. I suppose I have to do the same thing to clarify the position of my constituency.

In the 1970s, Mr. Chairman, my community made a submission to what was called the Morrow Commission and a member of that commission was Ms Cournoyea and as well, I believe, a Mr. Peyton from Pangnirtung. It was a commission that travelled throughout the Northwest Territories to determine a boundary for the then-new federal electoral constituency of Nunatsiak. The proposal that the commission brought around the communities was a north-south boundary line. My community, through their elected representatives, made a submission that the boundary line should be the tree line. The main justification we used to make that presentation was that we felt that sometime down the road there would be moves to divide the Northwest Territories and when that division occurred, if it ever occurred, that the only line that was acceptable to us was the tree line.

Further on, Mr. Chairman, Mr. MacQuarrie mentioned some of the results of the 1982 plebiscite. He did not mention that the communities in my constituency voted against division by, I believe, a larger majority than the overall percentage it was carried with, in the NWT. I also want to point out that the agreement that was reached in January of 1985 by the Constitutional Alliance was unanimously rejected by the Nunavut caucus of this Assembly, to the extent that our representative resigned as the chairman of NCF and the entire Nunavut caucus felt it necessary to walk out of this House rather than debate and have to be involved in approving the agreement. We felt that the agreement was so unacceptable that we took what were rather drastic actions.

Going a little bit further than that, there was a mayors' meeting, which those who have followed the whole process will be aware of. This was in March, 1985, where the mayors of the Kitikmeot West communities and the Beaufort communities met and discussed the agreement, which we had found to be unacceptable. One of the resolutions, Mr. Chairman, from that meeting was that the communities of the Beaufort Sea and Kitikmeot West wish to remain united on the issue of division and constitutional development. That viewpoint has not changed.

Again, further to that, Mr. Chairman, there was a Nunavut constitutional conference in Coppermine, in my home community, that went between September 24 and 28, 1985. Many Members of this House were present at that one. I am sure the press will remember the meeting, it being the meeting that we kicked you out of. There were some very strong statements that came out of that one and some resolutions, one of which was that the conference unanimously asserts its commitment to political self-determination through the creation of a new Nunavut territory which must include communities within the Beaufort, Keewatin, Kitikmeot and Baffin Regions, including the offshore and the Arctic Islands.

Boundary Line Not Acceptable To Constituents

I point this out to you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the committee, to illustrate that the position of my constituents on this issue has not changed in over 10 years, since it was first brought up. It has not changed today with the bringing in of this latest agreement which,

incidentally, to us is not a new agreement. There are some good points contained within the agreement but the critical part of the agreement to us is still the boundary. That boundary is no different from the boundary that we threw out of here two years ago. The only thing that has changed is that the line that goes from the southeast corner of the COPE land claims boundary and heads into the Keewatin and then downward to the provinces, two years ago was a corridor, and the agreement said that the line would be somewhere in that corridor, depending on which line the Dene/Metis and TFN agree upon. The line has since been clarified, otherwise it is precisely the same boundary. It is no more acceptable to my constituency today than it was two years ago.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a very informative presentation today from the two leaders of the Constitutional Alliance and I appreciate that one. I think I can say that, without necessarily agreeing with everything that was said. There has been a lot of talk back and forth about it, why some concerns of people are irrelevant. They have been described by other people as being invalid, as being nonsense -- such concerns as families not being broken up, education, medical, whatever -- Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee, I submit to you that if people bring them up, then they are very valid and very real concerns. They are not to be dismissed lightly.

Another Plebiscite On Division

I want to point out also regarding the vote in 1982 that was referred to -- in my constituency we feel that we must have another plebiscite and whereas we cannot agree, and I have very clear instructions on this, that I cannot agree to ratifying the agreement that is in front of us, if it contains the boundary, but that I am to do everything I can to bring the question of division to a public plebiscite. The reason my people so very strongly feel that way is that it is five years since we had the last plebiscite. A lot of young people have since reached voting age and they want to express an opinion. Among the young people who have reached voting age in the last five years that I have contacted in my constituency and others have contacted, we have not found one, not one, who supports division based on the boundary that is in front of us today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude at this time and I hope that I might be able to come back at a later time before we take a vote, after hearing other people's arguments. I just want to emphasize that the position of the people in Kitikmeot West has not changed. We have supported for many years a creation of Nunavut. However, to us Nunavut means a tree line. If we cannot have Nunavut today, if we cannot reach an agreement on that today, we do not find any urgency in reaching a bad agreement just for the sake of reaching an agreement during the life of this Legislature. The tree line may not be acceptable to those people who represent the West of the ones that are appointed during the life of this Legislature, but there is nothing to say that this will remain the same in the next Legislature. Boundaries have always been a difficult thing to decide upon. Mr. Amagoalik alluded to the fact that wars have been fought over boundaries and blood has been spilled. Very few boundaries have ever been settled in a very short time period. In my constituency, people see no reason that we should give up on the principle of Nunavut, which was a principle that unified Inuit people, not divided them, and we simply do not wish to sell ourselves out for a cheap little version that some people call Nunavut. We cannot refer to this proposal as Nunavut. I intend, as I have said before, to do whatever I can to bring this question to a public plebiscite but I cannot endorse the boundary as outlined in this agreement if that becomes part of the question that we must vote on. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Erkloo.

Boundary Issue Should Be Settled

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to have too much to say. I want to save my energy to speak to the motion, if there is going to be one later on. In my constituency they keep saying that land claims takes too long and they are getting impatient about it. There have been rumours that land claims negotiators are waiting for the Nunavut Constitutional Forum to decide the boundary and vice versa. My biggest concern is that if we do not approve the proposed boundary, it will mean that we are blocking the process of land claims settlement. Therefore, I feel that we should try to settle this proposal in our Legislative Assembly.

In my constituency, as well as in Kitikmeot or Kivallirmiut, it is said that ITC claimed that they would have a tree line boundary. That has always been their stand and everybody knows about that. We also all know that John Amagoalik used to be the president of ITC and he has worked very hard on

the negotiations of the land claims on the tree line before. We should ask within ourselves why John Amagoalik has changed from a tree line boundary to the present boundary. It is obvious that it is very difficult to settle a boundary issue and you cannot satisfy everyone.

People are for division in the NWT and would want to have the Nunavut issue settled quickly. Even though we cannot satisfy everyone -- the Inuit, Dene and other people, we should think about our constituencies. If they are going to vote on a plebiscite, they will vote on what they think -- for it or against it. As representatives of the people, in the 10th Legislative Assembly, we have to give our people the chance to decide for themselves.

It is true that the NWT government has improved from the time it was moved here to the NWT. But we have always stated, though, that the NWT is too vast a jurisdiction to govern properly. I will stop for now. I would like some support from my colleagues before the end of this session, to settle this issue once and for all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Mr. Angottitauruq.

Some Oppose Division

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make some comments as one of the elected Members of the Assembly. As it was mentioned, we cannot satisfy everyone. First of all, I would personally like to remind the Assembly and the NWT that I have not always been a supporter of division of the NWT. My community leaders in my constituency are opposing division of the NWT. But then as a Member, I myself would like to bring the plebiscite to the people. That is where I believe I will be the best leader of those people in my time -- to try and do it in a democratic way. Let the people decide. If I try to tell them that division is not good for them, my children and any other people's children will be the ones that will be touched by the division of the NWT. Therefore, I would like to speak in favour of the plebiscite that is going to be held, if it is going to go through. If I try to oppose it at the Assembly, I would be taking away the rights of all the voters in my communities. Therefore, I just want to say that I support the boundary and constitutional agreement that we are discussing today. I believe that is one of the best ways I can put it to my people. In between that, if people do not like it, they can speak for themselves as to whether they like it or not. It is the choice of the people. I hope that the other Members can support it, too.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: (Translation) I just do not want to discuss on and on. The first persons that were created in the world were told to do whatever they pleased with their land. In regard to the division of the NWT, I want to express my point of view in this matter. I think it would be better, not just for the purpose of what we would like to do. But what we heard today seemed to be very good and they said it will improve the government system in the NWT. If these things do not come about, the lifestyle in the Baffin Region will never improve. We have to think of the realities. Is it going to improve the lifestyles in the NWT?

Boundary Will Not Benefit All Regions

When I started in 1975, we wanted the Inuit and all their Inuit cousins to be in the Nunavut territory. It would be the Inuit homeland. The Inuit from the Inuvialuit region, we cannot leave them behind and our Inuit cousins in Kitikmeot, we cannot leave them behind. I do not support that idea. For this reason, I cannot support what we are talking about today. It will not improve the situation for Kivallirmiut, Kitikmeot, Inuvialuit as well. It will not improve their lifestyles or their future. If it is not going to improve that region, it will not be of any benefit to the people of Baffin. Although Baffin people are looking forward to having Nunavut territory, their own territory, it means there are two meanings to having self-government.

The self-government question in Nunavut will have to be settled through the Tungavik Federation of Nunavut. If Tungavik cannot settle the constitutional question, it is none of our business. It is their negotiation process through Ottawa that they are having problems with. If they cannot settle the constitutional issue within 10 years, maybe they should change their delegation with the federal negotiators as well as the Inuit negotiators. For the fact that they are saying that it would be beneficial to the people of Baffin Region -- we have to look at other people too, aside

from Baffin Region. We have to look at Inuvialuit, Kitikmeot. We want you to help these people. We want Baffin Region to help our other regions of Kivallirmiut -- there are several people that I think -- and they have their representatives. They have just been appointed; they have never been elected.

Questions To Ask

We would have to ask, are we going toward -- it would be of benefit toward Nunatsiaq. Will it improve the government system in the NWT? They have local government now, and hamlets in their communities; how could they improve their local governments? They would have to look toward Ottawa, not through the NWT. Ottawa would never improve the lifestyles in the NWT. We seem to be still looking back toward Ottawa, not to ourselves, to improve our own system in the NWT. We can learn by ourselves. We have settled this issue already.

In the process that we have been following through in the Legislative Assembly, we have to look not just in our land but in other people's lands as well. What has been presented to us today is in a hurry; this is a quick answer to the question. The answer to the question was that Inuit wanted to be together. All the Inuit did not have the government; they were stronger within their unity, and if Baffin Region does not want to help other regions of Nunatsiaq, then there are six people from Baffin Region and from Kivallirmiut there are only just a few representatives in the Legislative Assembly. If this constitutional set-up in the world -- let us look at other developing nations in the world to see how well they have developed themselves. They have gone through the process of convention, or have they gone through other people's convention? (Translation ends)

I think this issue that we are faced with today is not as simple as it may seem to be made by some of the individuals, including my honourable colleague from Iqaluit and Baffin Island, because I do not believe that there is a government in the world that is so perfect that it spreads the wealth around so that most people can depend on it in terms of employment. Government is one part of the solution to the problems of any jurisdiction that allows free democracy. I think this government has been fair, that it has been devolving that responsibility and it has allowed people to speak freely; simple, small jurisdiction in terms of population.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Without interruption?

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: I think today too, that we should not just be looking at our own simple constituents' interests.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: ...that this problem is beyond my jurisdiction, my constituency. You know, when we first put forward the proposal to divide the Territories it was because the territorial government at that time, as our Leader earlier stated, was not responsive to the majority of the native people of the Northwest Territories. That was why, in 1975, we put forward the case for division. We call it a Nunavut proposal and it happened right in Iqaluit at that time. That was to establish the movement so that Inuit people, as a whole, can at least be recognized that they do have a political force and that force was starting to move. I think we have made a significant contribution through that movement. I think we have taken -- I remember giving Ludy Pudluk a call when I was president of ITC and asking, "Why do you not consider running for territorial government?" and I called the other fellow but he did not win the seat in Iqaluit. At that time it was called Frobisher Bay. But that was not Dennis; that was Mr. Solomonie. These were the kinds of things we were encouraging people to do.

But today we are faced with the proposal that we have before us. It is an end-all and solution to all the problems that people have been experiencing for years, that by putting forward that boundary proposal, in spite of what people in the other parts are feeling, in Beaufort, in Kitikmeot, that it is going to solve their problems. Today, that is a little bit hard for me to accept because I think, when we come down to the reality, when we come down to the real grass-roots reality, economic problems, unemployment problems, and the problems in general with respect to restraint, and the government problems are real. We cannot find solutions through government initiatives only. There must be an economic base.

Economic Prospects For East Not Good With This Boundary

And today, when I look at the prospects of being in that area with that boundary, my prospects are not that good. We do not have the tax base that many of the larger communities in the Western Arctic have. I do not enjoy having a few gold mines opening up. I do not have the road transportation to subsidize my freight costs in order to develop my wealth, my potential. All I have is "You have got a potential" someday, maybe. But the banks and the financial institutions and the investment communities do not buy that. There must be real, hard-earned dollars deployed in order to even start exploring. Concerning the economic impact of division, one report says that it might take at least 10 to 20 years before initial exploration would begin to show some results in terms of extracting of resources. I am afraid that by jumping to this thing, that by stating to the people that unless you support this proposal we have no hope in the future, we are really choosing the wrong path, because it takes time to develop these resources. It takes time to develop infrastructure, a transportation system in that part of the North. It is going to take a lot of time even to get in place the real nuts and bolts of the government machinery required.

Nunavut Proposal Was To Keep Inuit Unity

The spirit of the Nunavut proposal, on the tree line proposal, was to keep the Inuit together. I think that it regionally was a non-compromising proposal in terms of Inuit unity, keeping them one in spirit alone. Symbolically it is important, but today with the Inuit people being divided into more than three areas, I am not sure what we are proposing today achieves that. In short, it is going to benefit many of the Members because, you know, it is an election year. Sure, it is popular to support the proposal because it is an election year. But I do not believe that an average individual who is concerned about bread and butter issues is really concerned whether it is an election year or not. They are thinking of the long term. And I think they are thinking long-term enough to think that some of the things that are happening today are really not all that bad. Always with government, there is room for improvement. I support that. But I think this proposal, even in my constituency, is going to be given a hard look because some regions are not dependent on the government intervention. They are not dependent on the government jobs. They depend on the ordinary initiatives of the business people and there are many business people that are concerned. These are the people that are going to continue to build the North, more so than the government. I think that is why the people, aside from any of my colleagues in the Eastern Arctic, are saying, "Let us look at the reality, let us get down to the reality instead of the economics of these two areas." I can see that the western region, in terms of long-term prospects of non-renewable resources, is good. You know, there are good possibilities in that area but...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): I am sorry, Mr. Curley, your time is up. What is the wish of committee? Do you want him to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Go ahead, Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just going to conclude really by stating that, although the economic situation in the Western Arctic is a lot better than what we have and the fact that the tax base -- the private sector is going to be retained here. I think many people, and I hope that there will be many people that will be prepared to look, not only at their own area but the North as a whole.

Wildlife Has No Boundaries

When I speak about the land claims area, I intentionally leave the two aside because I want to speak as an individual. I want to speak as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. But when I speak as the Inuit person, native person, that aboriginal right to me should never be compromised through this kind of institution. My aboriginal rights, my resources, are like the wildlife of the Northwest Territories. They do not have boundaries. To me, the native people, Inuit, Dene, Metis, should never have boundaries in terms of pursuing wildlife. That should be an open door. That should never be locked up by a boundary. If I were in a negotiating position, that is where I would want to make a deal, with my aboriginal friends. Let us have an open boundary by establishing sustainable yields and resources of wildlife but keep it open -- so that we are not forced into a bloody boundary, as we always have done. We manage through traditional practices. But when we talk about the boundary put forward in this agreement, we are saying that you are not

going to be allowed to hunt here; you are not going to be allowed to trap here. That, to me, is not the way the aboriginal people have always managed their resources and practised. That is not the aboriginal way, but we have consultants who are doing the aboriginal work, who are setting this kind of checkerboard style of management of our resources in the Territories and I think that is where many of our problems begin.

But in terms of the political boundary, I think again, that what we want to achieve, we are not achieving through the proposal. I think we are breaking up more today, than trying to unite them. That is obviously a bad consequence, if we are going to have to experience that, and I am a bit sad about that part. Qujannamiik.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you, Mr. Curley. Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Members are aware, I was one of the members of the Western Constitutional Forum who participated in the variety of meetings and also one of the signatories to the agreement. Personally, I think the agreement itself contains a lot of constructive ideas which would be beneficial to the people of the Northwest Territories, as we evolve, as far as the constitution of the Northwest Territories is concerned.

Member Has Difficulty With Endorsing Political Boundary Outlined In Agreement.

One of the areas of difficulty that I have really has to do with the political boundary as outlined within the agreement. It has been indicated that the process has to go through a number of things, where the native people will be participating in regard to ratifying the agreement, before it is a go. If we endorse the agreement as it is, with the political boundary as it is outlined, then the actual vote on the plebiscite itself will contain the political boundary that is being outlined within the agreement. There has been some talk that there could be some flexibility but in my view I do not think there is that kind of flexibility that people are talking about. The people that I represent in my constituency, the Dogrib tribe, have a fundamental problem with the political boundary that is being outlined. They want to see some changes to the political boundary. There are also differences of opinion in regard to whether the aboriginal claims boundary and the political boundary should be one. It is the opinion of the people that I represent that those two should be separated. To have your claims boundary as your political boundary is something that I have never supported from the very beginning, because I have always taken the position that when you are talking about a jurisdiction for two governments, then where the boundary lies should not be dictated by the claims. Your political boundary has to take into consideration a lot of aspects, other than just the aboriginal boundary.

There have been recent meetings in my area. The outcome of these meetings was that they wanted to sit down and have negotiations take place with the leaders of the Inuit from the Eastern Arctic, to see if we could have some changes made to the political boundary, which in turn, the Dene people in my area could support. I do not think there is a problem with the agreement itself and the ideas contained in the agreement. The difficulty that I have, which is similar to the Kitikmeot but for different reasons, is that we are not looking at the political boundary just for today. We are not interested in entering into an agreement just so that we can tell the people of the North that we have reached an agreement, so we can go to the election in October. I think if you are going to reach an agreement, it has to be something that the majority supports. I would like to think that the concerns that people bring out in regard to this agreement would be addressed and would be accommodated. Whether the concerns were to come from High Arctic, the Baffin area, Keewatin, or Kitikmeot, then surely, as MLAs, when we are debating the agreement we would take that into consideration. As far as I am concerned, my area is of no less importance, and the concerns that the people that I represent have.

So the concern I have today is that the political boundary that is being outlined, I do not see being changed. I see it going to a plebiscite vote and I can tell you today that my tribe is not in support of this agreement because of the political boundary attached to it. I do not have to go to my region and say, "Do not support that agreement." That is the way the majority of my people feel right now. And to change it around, I would have to go around in my region to get them to support it and turn it around 180 degrees. Personally, I am not really prepared to do that, unless the concerns of my people are addressed.

I think some of us are convinced that perhaps this agreement should go ahead even though there are concerns in other sectors of the NWT. You know, let us go ahead with it whether they like it or not. But let me tell you that if this agreement is accepted and it goes to a vote, you are going

to have a certain percentage of the population of the NWT who will not be prepared to endorse this agreement. I think if you were to do a percentage -- it is not only in my area, it is in other regions as well.

Reaction Of Inuit To Negative Vote

The other thing is that I am not really convinced that even if the vote does take place and the majority of the NWT say "No" to division -- I am not sure what the reaction of the Inuit people will be to that. Will they accept only the votes in the affirmative? What if the vote went negative, are they prepared to accept that? In other words, this issue has been around for quite a few years and we say, "Okay, let us turn it back to the people." You can only do that so many times, and after a while, you know, we either live together as all the residents of the Northwest Territories or we do not. But the fact remains that if we are going to reach an agreement, then my feeling is that I do not think this question can be resolved solely on a question of claims.

The other thing is that in order to achieve division of the NWT, you will not get it through a tree line, because the majority of the Dene will not support the tree line boundary. As far as we are concerned, that issue is long dead and buried. We are not prepared to go back to the table and renegotiate Nunavut along the tree line.

I think this issue has really taken its toll in regard to the way that we function as legislators, elected representatives of the Northwest Territories. Division to me has been a cloud that has been over our heads in the NWT -- a political cloud -- for some time. It has implications in regard to how we even deal with the budget of the NWT, how we spread out the resources, how we even elect Members of the Executive. So it certainly has had its impact. I would hope that we can conclude the matter one way or the other; either we have division or we do not. If it is the desire of the people of the North that they do not want division, then let us get back to the constitution and work on the whole unit of the NWT. But if it is the desire of the NWT that they want division, then I think we should go ahead and conclude that matter and not drag it out for the next 20 years. It is also my opinion that I do not think that the majority of the NWT are all that excited about division.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): I am sorry, Mr. Wah-Shee, your 10 minutes are up. What is the wish of the committee? May he continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Wah-Shee, continue.

MR. WAH-SHEE: There is also a question of resources. We have a budget now that is approaching \$800 million. We have a population of 51,000 people. And any way you cut the pie in terms of where the boundary will go in division, I think that one territory will probably end up with something like over 30,000 and the other territory with less than 20,000. Then you go back and ask the Canadian people to finance two units of the NWT with a relatively small population. I am not really sure that the federal government will be all that excited in trying to finance a fairly expensive real estate in the NWT, so that the people can govern themselves, and so forth. We all know that the federal government is experiencing deficits in the billions, not millions, and those have to be addressed.

NWT Living Off The Good Will Of The Federal Government

We in the NWT, as someone from the Members of the government indicated, have only raised something like 9.9 per cent or something like that, or whatever. But the case is that we are not financing our own administration. We are basically living off the good will of the federal government, through your Minister of Finance going cap in hand to meet with the Minister of the federal government, so that we can have these wonderful facilities in the NWT; so we can hold our conferences; so we can have the very finest of education, and so forth. If you look at it purely from the financial sheet, I do not think it makes that much sense when you are talking about division. So that is the reality that we have to address and I do not think we can just brush it aside and say, "Let's not worry about money and resources." That is not really the case.

As far as the agreement itself is concerned, I would like to see some changes. I do not want to have to endorse the agreement as it is, which includes the political boundary. So excluding the political boundary, I do not think anyone has any problem supporting it.

---Laughter

---Applause

MR. McCALLUM: Would you run that one by us again?

MR. WAH-SHEE: I am not in the same situation as the honourable Member for Iqaluit, where he had a problem convincing his own caucus. My situation is the other way around. The western caucus is so anxious to endorse this that they would like to limit discussion on it so that we can get on with the budget.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of privilege.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Point of privilege, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that that was made in the spirit of jest, but I would like to point out that that is precisely what it is, there is no element of truth in what the Member has said. That is his last statement.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Wah-Shee.

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Chairman, can I carry on without any interruptions?

---Laughter

You see in any given situation you have to have the other side of the coin. I think that people appreciate that they do not always like to hear things that they want to hear. I think that they would like to hear the other side of the story so that they can hear both sides, so that in the end they can have a very constructive thinking process that will take place before they make a major decision.

---Laughter

So as far as I am concerned, I would like to see negotiations and discussions take place as soon as possible and if those discussions conclude in a favourable manner to both parties, then I think you will find that there will be more support for it. But at the present time, I cannot really indicate that the people that I represent are all that eager to endorse this agreement. That is not to say that we do not support the aspirations of the Inuit people; we do. But the problem is that we have to work out an arrangement that we can live with, at least from our side of the border anyway, if there is going to be division.

I would like to agree with the remarks that were made by Mr. Curley in regard to the aboriginal rights. We should not have boundaries that would limit the exercise of the rights of the native people to harvest and so forth. I think that we have an opportunity here to perhaps conclude the matter of division in the interests of everyone. But as far as I am concerned, it will depend on the meetings of the Dene and Inuit leaders and it is my hope that they will conclude these meetings and discussions with a mutual agreement which will make life a little easier to support division. So with that, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought maybe I should let you know how my people feel.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Ms Cournoyea.

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say something before but I really do not know how to follow those statements. I think we will have more opportunity to discuss this subject at another time. I do not think we are going to conclude today. But just because there are a couple of statements that have been made and we may not discuss this until Thursday again, I would like to correct one thing. I have been in this ball game since 1969 and that is a long time ago and I think the honourable Member, James Wah-Shee, was also involved at that time.

Inuvialuit Claim Was A Critical Issue

The question of making lines to resolve issues is not a new thing. Perhaps being in it 14 years maybe, too, many things are a little clearer and maybe we do not understand the more complex issues that people seem to be bringing up and putting on the table. I realize that Mr. Wah-Shee says that the Inuvialuit are dead and buried. I know he did not say it in those harsh words but the tree line boundary is. But at one point of time when we discussed, the settlement of the Inuvialuit claim was a critical issue, when all the Mackenzie Valley and Inuvik and Yellowknife and non-native people were clamouring to get into the Beaufort Sea and they wanted to resolve easement in the Beaufort Region for development and exploration. We as a group of people -- and I am sure you are all getting tired of hearing about the Beaufort Sea -- knew that in order to have some mandate, some claim, and have our people's position recognized, we had to do something at that time. We had the Beaufort development; we had Dome; we had the Berger Inquiry and the pipeline. And where were the resources? They were in the Beaufort Region. We tried to accommodate the people's push in the Western Arctic, Mackenzie Valley, Inuvik and primarily Yellowknife, which had quite a lot to say and predominantly at that time this Legislative Assembly did not have a great number of native people in the Assembly. So we are a people of accommodation. I think our record shows that.

Now, the one thing that I feel has been sorely misrepresented today was the settlement of the Inuvialuit claim. At the time we settled that claim it was fully understood by Inuit Tapirisat of Canada that this was not a political issue that we were dealing with. It was to expedite and allow them to take a longer period of time to settle a claim because the pressures were not in Baffin, were not in Keewatin and were not in Central Arctic. The general principle at that time was an argument that we could take 10 to 15 to 20 years to settle our claim. So we said, "So be it."

Claim Settled Against All Odds

It was the endorsement of James Arvaluk at that time, who went for us to see the Minister to say, "We feel that at this time if you do not settle that claim it probably will erode. There will be a lot of development and people will get discouraged and nothing will be done." That is why the claim was settled and we did it against all odds. Everyone said, "You can't do it. You can't do this. You can't do that." But we did it and I am very happy at this time that we did have the support of ITC. Sure, people did call and say, "Maybe you are doing the wrong thing." But that is because they did not live there. They were not facing the issues that we were facing. By and large given that caution, we understood it, we tried our best and we settled our claim.

Settlement Did Not Determine A Political Boundary

Now, what would happen now today, with this discussion going on with the Inuvialuit and the bargaining that has been going on for the last while, if we did not have a claim? What would happen? It is hard enough for the people who are in between -- Keewatin, Kitikmeot, the Dogrib nation and all that area to settle a claim. That is probably not as critical but it is critical in a lot of ways. But it is not as exciting as the Dene and Metis people who live in the Mackenzie Delta -- and ask them what we had to struggle through; struggling with the Yukon government, the oil companies and this Legislative Assembly who did not really give us a heck of a lot of support in those days, but we did it. And I do not wish to hear that our settlement determined a political boundary and that we excluded ourselves from Nunavut. We did not. In the arguments by and large, if you wish to use the argument that the Beaufort Sea should be in the West because of the oil and gas resources, so be it. Make that argument, but do not make it on the backs of the Inuvialuit who had the courage and the effort and the determination to settle a claim against all odds, without a heck of a lot of support from anybody.

We are willing to support Nunavut. I am. I believe in it. I will support Nunavut but what we are talking about now does not appear to be Nunavut to me. We made an agreement in Coppermine that the Beaufort Sea communities will make a certain determination, not on anyone else's back, and then we would go and visit with Cambridge Bay and Coppermine. We were not given that opportunity. What time was three weeks from the Iqaluit meeting to now? And we are told over the radio that we are cowards, that we hold things back, that three weeks would allow those questions that are being put forward right now. What about this little change? What about that little change? But I hear that we have no choice, that this is what we are dealing with. You take it or you leave it. But not everybody wants a little change, so, sorry Beaufort, you are dead and buried. So, I think what is good for one person is good for another. Mr. Chairman, I know we are going to continue to talk about this.

Now, the other issue all of a sudden is that we are going to start sharing those resources in the Beaufort Sea collectively. You dumped the Inuvialuit in with the West as a minority group of people. I am sure there are other places that are a minority. I have to speak for the constituency that I represent, but that is not in the absence of recognizing others. But you dump us and now all of a sudden, today, somebody wants to start sharing the resources and say that is on the table again. The reason that is not on the table is because they dumped us. So at some point in time I want to know whether we are dealing with what is on the table now or if people have the opportunity to change it. I was told that we did not.

ITC Had Respect And Support For Inuvialuit

So, Mr. Chairman, in terms of historical events, I suppose everyone has their own opinion on how those things happened and I guess we can all have selective memories. But I will say one thing today, that as long as we had an association with Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, I always felt we had a chance, we had our little arguments but one thing we had was commonality of interest. And that is living in a region that did not have any trees, living in an area populated with animals and sea mammals, we could talk easily about that. We had that respect from them, that to a certain point they supported us, going along our way because of distance. And today, I will tell you, I have not had the experience from the Western Constitutional Forum of same respect or that same recognition of the situation we are in. There might be some word changes or some nice peripheral things that can happen in the future but there are fundamental changes that have been taking place in that region that affect everybody. Sometimes I like to put the question: Does anyone really care about the Inuvialuit or is it the oil and gas there or the riches that are there? Not a heck of a lot of people encourage themselves to live there. I basically do not feel that we are going to talk about numbers in the future, about how many people are going to be left in the West, because I am sure we are talking about person years in the civil service and I am sure 50 per cent of them will be quite pleased to move to Nunavut because that is where the jobs are going to be.

The real issue, I believe, is the rights of the people in those regions, particularly when you are creating a minority. I would like that theme to have place in our discussions. We would like to be accommodating but I do not think that I am willing to endorse a paper to my people, to say "That is fine." But then this is not a surprise to anyone, because at least, Mr. Chairman, I hope I have been consistent in the arguments I place forward. In the negotiations toward this agreement, in my experience of what negotiations were and are -- we never did negotiate. We got a bunch of positions that says, "You are dead and buried, do not bother talking any more about it." So I do not know how you negotiate across those lines. And right now the Inuvialuit are going to go into a position where we are facing those lines.

The talk about the land claims boundary as opposed to the jurisdictional division boundary. I had a question before, but I am going to wait a little more because after Mr. Wah-Shee's presentation, I am not sure whether those two things are linked. Up to the point where he spoke, I thought that they were. So I will just hold off on that one until I get a little more information.

But Mr. Chairman, 14 years involved in this process, to me it may seem a long time, but it really is not. Someone said this claim is not going to be signed in blood. But you know, in dealing with people, when you have a cut on your hand or on your face and the blood is flowing all over, you can see it, and oftentimes you will survive. But internal bleeding is what you are causing to us, and to me that is more dangerous and probably not necessary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Mr. Patterson.

Constituents Still Feel Distant From Government

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was one of the Members in 1979 who advocated division. My constituents felt that our government was very far away and, with the greatest of respect for the honourable Government Leader, I still believe that my constituents feel very distant from our government. An annual visit from the Government Leader or the Commissioner, or even three annual visits, although they are much appreciated, are not enough. I resent the suggestion made, Mr. Chairman, that we in Baffin are not sensitive to the needs of other regions or that some of us are jumping on this issue to get re-elected. I have made my position on this clear since 1979 and I have not been a Minister travelling throughout the NWT simply to look after my own constituency.

The debate we had today takes me back to the one we had in 1981 in Iqaluit when the Ninth Legislative Assembly decided, in principle, that the NWT should be divided and recommended a plebiscite. I can remember what elation I felt when we heard the results come in in April of 1982. The bigger communities in the West, as I saw it, had given us their silent approval or their tacit approval by not turning out in great numbers, although those who did mostly voted "No". In the Kitikmeot and Inuvialuit communities there was a mixed or sometimes negative result. Many of the Dene voted with us out of respect for self-government and at the insistence of their leaders. In my constituency, people left their sick beds to vote "Yes" for division. The turnout on the vote was 72 per cent and 82 per cent voted "Yes".

At that time we never thought it would take this long to get this far. But now we are here and I must say I am glad we appear to have finally got some agreement on the boundary. I know it excludes the Inuvialuit, I know it does not go as far as we had hoped in Coppermine, but we have worked on this for five years and I spoke at length, at the last session, of our responsibility to the people of the NWT to finish what we have begun, to get on with this matter. This agreement is the best that we could arrive at. It will permit the establishment of a new government. Now I know some people may be tired of having had to wait so long; some people apparently have lost heart. Some people are now saying other things are more important but, Mr. Chairman, I still have a dream. And I do not see government as the only solution...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: We believe you.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: And I did not interrupt Mr. Curley when he spoke, Mr. Chairman. I wish you would tell him to keep his mouth shut...

AN HON. MEMBER: Twice, you did, twice.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: You tried.

Nunavut Represents More Than Dollars And Cents

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I do not see government as the only solution, Mr. Chairman. But I also do not see the situation as so terribly bleak. Mr. Curley, first of all, seems to think that Nunavut will happen next week. This is only the first step, Mr. Chairman. It will take a lot of time for us to work out the details. But Nunavut is something that I hope to live to see -- or even something less than the Nunavut that we had hoped for. It represents something for my constituents that is very hard to put into words and very hard to put into dollars and cents. But I do not think that is only a matter of dollars and cents and economics. It represents self-determination, self-government, self-sufficiency, something we will carve out for ourselves. Not something given to us, not something left over from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, but something we will struggle for and will attain if we have courage and vision and faith. Of course, we do not have all the answers today about the tax base and about the oil revenues and about the extent of mineral values. We do not know exactly how much it will cost or where the capital will be. We do not know where the high schools and hospitals will be.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Not in Iqaluit.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Curley can see the future. He says things will be no better. He says Ottawa will not help. I say to him, "Do not be so negative and do not be afraid." With your help, his help and his talent, together we will have the strength and the courage and the spirit to solve all these problems together. The people of Nunavut will be few in number but we are rich in land and water and history and culture, and together I am confident we will make sure Canada treats us fairly. We will make sure that we have our share of resources. We will make sure we have the financial support, the extra financial support, even, that we will need in the earlier years.

Opportunity To Create New Way Of Government

It will not be an ethnic state, Mr. Chairman, but it will amount to an aboriginal government because Inuit will be 85 to 90 per cent of the constituency in the foreseeable future. Aboriginal leaders across the country, since the Constitution was repatriated in 1983, have said that aboriginal rights, if they have any meaning at all, mean aboriginal self-government. And there have been slow progress and efforts to work toward an amendment to the Constitution which will

Available from the
Publications Clerk, Department of Culture and Communications
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