



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

9th Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
DAY 11

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1987

Pages 346 to 393

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
Tukttoyaktuk, 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 0A0
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
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1987

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	346
Ministers' Statements	
- 6-87(1) Student Attendance	346
- 7-87(1) Engineering and Medical Training	347
- 8-87(1) Appointment of a Territorial Judge for Iqaluit	347
- 9-87(1) Support for the Arts and Crafts Industry	348
Members' Statements	
- Mr. Arlooktoo on Access to Soapstone Supplies	348
- Mr. Erkloo on Appointment of Territorial Judge for Iqaluit	349
Returns to Oral Questions	349
Oral Questions	351
Written Questions	353
Returns to Written Questions	354
First Reading of Bills	
- Bill 6-87(1) Criminal Injuries Compensation Act	355
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 1-87(1) Boundary and Constitutional Agreements for the Implementation of Division of the Northwest Territories Between the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum	356
- Bill 1-87(1) Appropriation Act, 1987-88 - Department of Municipal and Community Affairs	380
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Tabled Document 1-87(1) Boundary and Constitutional Agreements for the Implementation of Division of the Northwest Territories Between the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum	392
- Bill 1-87(1) Appropriation Act, 1987-88	392
Orders of the Day	392

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1987

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Appaqaq, 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, Mr. Richard, Hon. Nick Sibbeston, Hon. Don Stewart, Mr. T'Seleie, Mr. Wah-Shee, Hon. Gordon Wray

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): Orders of the day for Wednesday, February 25th. Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

ITEM 2: MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With your permission, I have two brief statements.

Minister's Statement 6-87(1): Student Attendance

Mr. Speaker, this year there are over 12,000 students enrolled in schools throughout the Northwest Territories. Getting students enrolled is important, but getting them to attend school on a regular basis is essential. The compulsory attendance amendment to the Education Act was proclaimed last September and we have 14 communities taking part in a training program for school counsellors. But most importantly, there is new determination on the part of parents and local education authorities to ensure that their children are attending school regularly.

Over the past five years attendance has gradually been improving. Last year the overall attendance at NWT schools was just over 82 per cent. That is five per cent higher than it was five years ago. At that time, five years ago, three schools had less than 50 per cent attendance and 19 other schools had less than 70 per cent attendance. Comparing those figures with last year's attendance record and the attendance record of NWT schools as of December, 1986, we have come a long way. Last year only eight schools had an average attendance of less than 70 per cent and as of December, no schools were below 70 per cent.

Fort Liard in the West and Repulse Bay in the East show the most dramatic individual improvement. Five years ago Fort Liard had 33 per cent attendance; last year it was 75 per cent, a remarkable 42 per cent improvement and as of December, 1986 it was 85 per cent. Five years ago Repulse Bay had 47 per cent attendance; last year it was 65 per cent and as of December it was 71 per cent, also an impressive improvement.

Mr. Speaker, this improvement in attendance is due largely to a growing acceptance among parents of the need for their children to have an education. Under NWT law, schooling has always been compulsory for children aged six to 15, unless they were living out of town in the bush or on the land with their families. The act was amended to change that. Now the responsibility for school attendance is on the local education authority, the school principal, the parents and the child.

So far, 27 out of 60 school districts have requested that this amendment apply in their area. Improving attendance is a co-operative effort. In the Kitikmeot Region, for example, which had the poorest attendance last year, five out of six of the school districts asked for the compulsory attendance law to apply to their communities. Two of them asked for, and got, a school counsellor trainee position. As of December the average regional attendance in Kitikmeot was over 80 per cent, an impressive 10 per cent increase over last year.

I should give the MLAs some credit for this progress too, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

Attendance is improving and will continue to improve with the commitment of parents and local education authorities. Such improvement is the first step toward my real goal, seeing all children do well at school.

Minister's Statement 7-87(1): Engineering And Medical Training

As well, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that over the last several months, with the co-operation of my colleagues in the Department of Public Works and Highways and the Department of Health, meetings have been held with senior officials of the University of Manitoba and the Government of Manitoba in an effort to secure university seats for NWT native people in the engineering and pre-medical professional programs commencing this fall.

The university has made a commitment to provide seats in each of these programs for our use and I expect the details to be finalized shortly which would allow students to enrol in September of this year. The engineering access program and the special pre-medical program were of great interest to us as both programs are designed for native people and include significant upgrading and counselling support.

I am pleased that we have been able to make these programs accessible to native students. We will continue to investigate the possibility of entering into this type of arrangement with other universities and colleges where there are programs which respond specifically to the educational needs of native students. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would like to take this opportunity to welcome into the House a former colleague, Mr. Peter Fraser. He is hiding behind a bit of a white beard.

---Applause

Item 2, Ministers' statements. Mr. Ballantyne.

Minister's Statement 8-87(1): Appointment Of A Territorial Judge For Iqaluit

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Mr. Speaker, as honourable Members are aware, for several years now the Legislative Assembly has been asking for an appointment of a territorial judge to be resident in Iqaluit. At the consideration of the budget of the Department of Justice last year, the Legislative Assembly adopted a motion asking this government to place a resident territorial judge in Iqaluit.

As a result of that motion, I requested the judicial council of the NWT to make recommendations with respect to the appointment of a qualified person as a territorial judge for Iqaluit. The judicial council invited applications from suitable candidates. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the council received 73 applications, then scrutinized these applications very, very carefully. A short list of eight candidates was established and interviews were conducted at Iqaluit and Yellowknife. From this short list, four names were put forward by the judicial council. I would like to thank the judicial council, chaired by the honourable Mr. Justice de Weerd, for their efforts considering these many applications.

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to advise the House that the Government of the Northwest Territories has appointed Mr. Orval J.T. Troy, QC as the territorial judge for Iqaluit.

---Applause

Mr. Troy was first called to the Bar in 1952 and is a member of the Nova Scotia, Northwest Territories and Yukon Bars. He was appointed a Queen's Counsel for Canada in 1970. Mr. Troy is well-known in the Northwest Territories. He has spent 11 years as a regional director of the federal Department of Justice at Yellowknife and as the crown attorney for the Northwest Territories, travelling on court circuit throughout the Territories between 1966 and 1977. I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Troy has an extensive practical knowledge of the Northwest Territories and of the various communities in the Territories.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased with Mr. Troy's appointment since he is a member of the Northwest Territories Bar. In my view, Mr. Speaker, we now have a very experienced Bar in the Northwest Territories, and as far as possible we should make appointments to the judiciary from the Northwest Territories Bar. By doing so we will ensure that judges appointed in the Northwest Territories are familiar with the conditions prevailing in the Territories, and are sensitive to the cultural diversity of our territory. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Troy will carry out his duties and obligations as a territorial judge to the best of his abilities and knowledge. Thank you, very much.

---Applause

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

Minister's Statement 9-87(1): Support For The Arts And Crafts Industry

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: (Translation) Mr. Speaker, today I would like to outline the new initiatives the Department of Economic Development and Tourism will be taking to support our arts and crafts industry. We have acted upon the two main concerns expressed to us by producers and retailers. These are, first, to encourage the production of quality fine arts that respond to consumer tastes and, secondly, to provide promotional support to dealers and galleries.

In order to address the demands of the market place, arts and crafts advisers will conduct market place seminars and workshops in every region on printmaking, carving, sewing and crafts. The Executive Council recently approved a new soapstone policy. This would reduce the cost of getting carving stone to remote communities and result in more carving activity in these centres.

The government is considering a policy which could allocate new capital building funds to purchase decorative arts and crafts. This would stimulate local sales, provide unique attractions to visitors to the NWT and instil pride in local products. The department will make funds available for selling catalogues, national and international travelling shows and to provide assistance for artists to attend show openings. The new trade show assistance policy will also help northern crafts people promote their products. In the NWT this will be promoting the northern products.

I am pleased to announce the presentation to this Legislature of the Holman memorial portfolio of prints by the late Mark Emerak and Helen Kalvak. The department commissioned this collection from the Holman Eskimo Co-operative to honour these world famous artists, to recognize these two elders, and I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have been invited to officially open the 1987 Holman annual print collection at Northern Images in Yellowknife next month. I would like to invite my colleagues to come down and see the prints.

The Department of Economic Development and Tourism will continue to give strong support to artisans throughout the Northwest Territories to develop and promote their arts and crafts activities. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Item 2, Ministers' statements. That appears to conclude this item for today. Item 3, Members' statements. Mr. Arlooktoo.

ITEM 3: MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Member's Statement On Access To Soapstone Supplies

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a short comment, it is going to be short because of the time limit. My constituents have soapstone concerns in our community. The people should be given information that residents should be able to go get soapstone from other communities because my constituents should be able to get some work on their own but if there are

going to be people coming into my community to get some soapstone, I think there should be a stop put to it because I feel that my community should be able to have the soapstone available for them. In my community, for my people, the only way of making a living is carving so for that reason I feel that the carvings that they are getting from my community is a very big concern for my people. Maybe if the Executive Council is going to be making funds available to get soapstone from my community, I feel that my community should be able to get a benefit out of it too. I know that in the NWT there should not be any ban over soapstone but I feel that my constituents should be able to benefit from the stone that they have. That is the concern that we have in our community at the present time, that the soapstone that we have is being used up by the white businesses and I do not want the Inuit people in my community to be stopped from getting that soapstone. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: And I did allow a few moments for translation. Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to state my concern. The capital planning is not running smoothly in our discussions in this House. I feel that the roads in Yellowknife are inadequate because I have to walk here and I have fallen down on the road three times on the way to the meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Paniloo, we will make no comments with regard to whether you were coming or going.

---Laughter

Are there any further Members' statements? Mr. Erkloo.

Member's Statement On Appointment Of Territorial Judge For Iqaluit

MR. ERKLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not a problem. I am just happy that Mr. Troy is going to be the judge in Iqaluit because I feel that in my communities in the High Arctic or in the Baffin Region there is always a problem with the court circuit coming in and they have to leave right away after they perform their duties in the communities too quickly. Also the accused have to wait for a long time, so many months, before they can have their case heard. Sometimes the people are confused with what is going on with their cases because they have to wait a long time. Say, for instance, a person goes to court and then is told he or she will be tried later on. When they finally have to go to jail after being free for many months, it does not make sense to them. I feel that now Judge Troy is appointed to the Baffin this is a very helpful part of the government for our region and the answer to our concerns in the Baffin. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Erkloo. Item 3, Members' statements. This appears to conclude this item for today. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. McLaughlin.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Return To Question 052-87(1): Role Of Department Of Health In Medical Evacuation

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Gargan inquired about the use of single engine planes for medical evacuations. Normally in cases of emergency medical evacuations, patients are on stretchers and are attended to by medical or nursing personnel. In such situations, the guideline used by Health and Welfare Canada for a number of years is that the aircraft be a twin-engine craft or larger. If no multiengine aircraft is available, either locally or in another community at a reasonable distance from the patient's home community, then a single-engine aircraft will be used in emergencies. This guideline ensures maximum safety for the patient and the attending staff, and is based on the many years of experience that Health and Welfare Canada have had in providing health services in the North. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Further Return To Question 02-87(1): Decision To Grant Holiday, January 2nd, 1987

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a return to a question asked by Mr. Richard regarding the January 2nd holiday, in which the government gave the employees a day off.

The decision to grant a restricted holiday on Friday, 2nd January, 1987, was made by the Executive Council. The Executive Council based its decision on several factors including the following:

- 1) The 2nd January, 1987 happened to fall on a Friday preceded by a statutory holiday and to be followed by a weekend;
- 2) A substantial percentage of the public service was already on vacation leave and as such most offices would have had skeleton staff;
- 3) It was at the conclusion of the festive season and it was an opportunity to thank public servants for their hard work over the last year.
- 4) Keeping in mind the positive impact such a decision would have on employee morale and productivity and all the circumstances prevailing at the time, it would be a prudent management decision.
- 5) The day off would apply only where operational requirements permitted employees to be excused from duties.
- 6) Similar circumstances were not to arise for several years to come and there would therefore be no concern of setting a precedent.

All senior departmental and regional managers were contacted by telephone to emphasize to them the importance of ensuring that operational requirements be respected in determining which employees would be allowed to take the day off. This telephone contact was followed up by a letter which restated the terms and conditions upon which the day off was being granted.

While it is recognized that the federal Land Titles Act stipulates the hours of operation of the land titles office, the services provided by the office are almost exclusively used by members of the legal profession. Officials within the land titles office were asked to and did contact the major law firms in the city of Yellowknife. It was found that most of the firms had also intended to close their offices on January 2nd, 1987. No filings of land titles documents were planned to be made by these firms on January 2nd, 1987 and no complaints have been received as a result of the closure of the land titles office by that office.

So, Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind all the circumstances outlined above, it was felt by the Executive Council that its decision was justified.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you to the honourable Member for Nahendeh. Returns to oral questions. Mr. McLaughlin.

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

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In return to oral Question 061-87(1), asked by Mr. Nerysoo on February 24th, regarding Musk-ox Program Developments Limited, I have been advised by my officials that a verbal commitment was given to Musk-ox Program Developments Limited, that they were the successful proponent for the delivery of life skills programs for young offenders, in Yellowknife, prior to an appeal being registered. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you to the honourable Member for Pine Point. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Curley.

Return To Question 016-87(1): Use Of Old School Building By Co-op, Resolute

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give a return to oral Question 016-87(1), asked by Mr. Pudluk on February 13th, 1987, concerning the old school building and if the co-op could use the old school in Resolute Bay. A commitment has been made by the executive office in Iqaluit to turn over or lease an old school building to the co-operative in Resolute Bay, which will transform it into a store. The co-operative is now using the building as

a warehouse. I understand that the Department of Public Works, which is responsible for the transfer of Government of the Northwest Territories property, is now preparing the documentation required to implement the commitment made to the co-operative some months ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you to the honourable Member for Aivilik. Replies to oral questions. Mr. Pedersen.

Return To Question 01-87(1): Employees' Day Off Work, January 2nd, 1987

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a return to oral Question 01-87(1), asked by Mr. McCallum on February 12th. Mr. Speaker, as undertaken by me in this House, I have carefully reviewed the directive dated December 30th, 1986, from the Department of Personnel, with a view to addressing Mr. McCallum's concern for employees who were on leave on 2nd January, 1987.

It was the Executive Council's decision to grant a restricted holiday on January 2nd, 1987, based on the several factors outlined by the Government Leader in his reply just before this. The government has from time to time given such restricted holidays to public servants where there are good and valid reasons to do so. An example of this is the customary half day holiday given on Christmas Eve. In doing so, however, the government merely releases the employees who are at work or expected to be at work from the obligation to attend at their work stations. It is not the granting of leave, per se, to the employees. In view of the nature of a restricted holiday, I am satisfied that the directive of December 30th, 1986 was appropriate and does not require any change. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you to the honourable Member for Kitikmeot West. Returns to oral questions.

I will give the House one minute to continue their banter then I will throw out the next person for the rest of the day. So you have got a minute, go ahead. Have fun but after that the rules will be obeyed and anybody that interferes or cross talks between the various sides will abide by the rules. There is 20 seconds, has somebody got something to say so then we can get on with our business? I gave fair warning, that is the last. The minute is up. We are back on Item 4, returns to oral questions. Item 5, oral questions. Mr. T'Seleie.

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 068-87(1): Funding For Shihta Regional Council

MR. T'SELEIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs. There appears to be some confusion in the minds of the Shihta Regional Council with respect to their funding for the current fiscal year. In conversations with the Speaker of Shihta Regional Council, it is my understanding that \$20,000 of their current year's funding has been taken away and given to COPE. I wonder if the Minister has anything to offer that could clarify the confusion?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 068-87(1): Funding For Shihta Regional Council

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is indeed confusion. There was no \$20,000 taken away from Shihta Regional Council to give to COPE. Shihta never had the \$20,000 to start with. What happened was that a couple of years ago Shihta got into some financial difficulties near the end of the fiscal year and they were going to run up a small deficit. They approached the then Minister of Local Government and asked if funds were available to look after their deficit. The Minister at that time indicated that because it was near the end of the year he would wait and see, and if in fact funds were available, he would give them the \$20,000 on a one-time only grant basis. Indeed the \$20,000 was found and it was provided to the Shihta Regional Council but it was made clear to them that this was a one-time only grant. Unfortunately, our former colleague, Mr. Fraser, once he gets money does not give it up so easily and he now considers the \$20,000 that he got to be part of the base of the Shihta Regional Council, which indeed is not the case and I have communicated that to the Shihta Regional Council. The \$20,000 was a one-time only grant, not to be repeated. Thank you.

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

Question 069-87(1): Warehouse Facilities For Housing Association, Igloolik

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of the Housing Corporation, to Hon. Michael Ballantyne. I received a telex from Igloolik on December 19, 1986 and also on January 7, 1987. I gave copies to the Minister yesterday. I know that he is aware of what I am going to ask about for the residents of Igloolik. The housing association's workshop is inadequate in Igloolik and the warehouse is inadequate. Your officials told the housing association in Igloolik that new facilities are expected to be built in the year of 1990 or 1991. Can you tell me if you can put this to an earlier date, for a new workshop and warehouse, so that they could have a good work place?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 069-87(1): Warehouse Facilities For Housing Association, Igloolik

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Member for giving me notice of the question. As the Member knows, we have tremendous need across the Territories for warehouses and we do not have adequate funding to provide the warehouses where they are needed. The selection of what communities will receive warehouses in any given year is based on need. What we tried to do in Igloolik, in the interim before they get a warehouse, which might take two or three years, is to find an alternative method of providing for their needs. There was some talk in Igloolik of a private entrepreneur providing warehouse space in Igloolik. My understanding is that the possibility of leasing from the private developer was not seen as a viable alternative to the community. I have instructed my officials to sit down with the housing association and with the community with the view of trying to alleviate the present situation and try to come up with a temporary solution. As we develop our five year capital plan, depending on availability of funding, those needs will definitely be taken into consideration when we develop that plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question 070-87(1): Tabling Of Policies In Support Of Arts And Crafts Industry

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a question directed to the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. I wonder if I could ask the Minister whether or not he intends to table, in this House, the policies that he made an announcement of, in Minister's Statement 9-87(1), so that this House could be apprized of the details of those particular policies.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 070-87(1): Tabling Of Policies In Support Of Arts And Crafts Industry

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not see any problem with that. I will undertake to do that.

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

Question 071-87(1): Ambulance Service On Territorial Highways

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of Health. Could the Minister tell me whether we have a policy with respect to providing ambulance service on our territorial highways between municipalities?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 071-87(1): Ambulance Service On Territorial Highways

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give the Member thanks for advance notice of this question. The services that are provided by ground ambulance on GNWT highways are actually provided by municipalities in the case of Fort Smith, Hay River, Fort Simpson and Yellowknife; by Pine Point Mine Ltd. in the case of Pine Point; and by, I believe, St. John Ambulance-operated organizations in Inuvik and Rae-Edzo. In this situation it has been recognized for a long time now that the municipalities are operating basically in a Good Samaritan role. In most cases the accidents involve residents of those communities or from some of the other nearby

communities, so that there is a bit of a trade-off in that area. However, there have been questions over the years as to liability costs for those communities and there are concerns that while their ambulances are out on the GNWT highways, especially in the case of the smaller communities, then there is no ambulance available in the community for which purpose it was purchased in the first place.

In other cases the role of this government and Health and Welfare Canada have come into play when it was necessary to use other than ground ambulances. I have been advised that recently nursing stations, as well as the Fort Smith Health Centre, have authorized the use of helicopters to go to the scene of motor vehicle accidents on highways.

Recently the Executive Council of our government, has acknowledged that ambulance service in the NWT is an integral part of the health delivery system in the NWT and that has been officially acknowledged now for the first time. It is our intention, as a government, to take steps to somehow formalize that operation, within existing means, for the time being and we are looking at ways that we can help the municipalities in the delivery of this service. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question 072-87(1): Notice Of Award Of Contract To Musk-Ox Program Developments Ltd.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister responsible for Social Services. Could the Minister indicate on what day the Musk-ox Consulting firm was given notice of success with regard to the contract?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not know the particular day that the advice was given out. All I know is that officials have told me that once they reviewed the proposals that were received that they then advised Musk-ox Program Developments Limited who was the successful proponent, and then after that advised the other proponents that they were not successful. I could come back with the actual day this occurred. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, you are taking the question as notice. Mr. Nerysoo.

Question 073-87(1): Appeal Process For Reviewing Contracts

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable Member is taking that particular question as notice, could he also indicate in the reply whether or not there is an appeal process in place for reviewing of such contracts?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are guidelines in place which all of the departments follow, which I think are settled by Government Services in this area. I would be happy to provide those at a later time. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The question which will be ruled as a separate question to the original, you are taking as notice. Oral questions. That appears to conclude oral questions for today. Item 6, written questions. Mr. Appaqaq.

ITEM 6: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Question W14-87(1): Payment Of Essentials For Children With Medical Escort

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for Health. I have heard that people going to the hospital in Winnipeg and those who are escorting children there have to buy their own diapers and milk for the children while they are in the transient centre. I have heard that it is the same in the Churchill transient centre. I was not happy to hear about this situation and I hope that these people who have bought their own diapers and milk will get reimbursed. Perhaps this may not happen again.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health if he could deal with this situation, which my constituents have had to do and will continue to do. I would be thankful if this situation could be dealt with. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, the honourable Member for Hudson Bay. Written questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question W15-87(1): Education Of Status Indians In The NWT

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct the following questions to the Minister of Education regarding the responsibility for the education of status Indians.

1) In 1955, An Ordinance to Authorize the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories to enter into an Agreement with the Government of Canada Respecting the Education of Indian Children, commonly referred to as "The Indian Education Agreement", came into force. The ordinance has never officially been repealed, yet it does not appear in the 1974 Consolidated Ordinances of the Northwest Territories. Is this law still in effect? If so, why is it not on the books? If not, when, how and why was it repealed?

2) In 1969 the responsibility for educating status Indians was transferred from the federal government to the GNWT. Is this agreement still in force? If so, can the Minister provide a copy of this agreement to me along with any other terms and conditions that may be pertinent to the issue? If not, what specific arrangements or policies currently govern the implementation of federal responsibilities for the education of status Indians in the NWT?

3) Could the Minister also provide me with detailed information on the financial contributions provided by the federal government to the GNWT for the education of status Indians in the NWT?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you to the honourable Member for Deh Cho. Written questions. Mr. Arlooktoo.

Question W16-87(1): Paint Shop For Cape Dorset Housing Association

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My written question is directed to the Minister of the NWT Housing Corporation. The Cape Dorset housing association building contains both the paint shop and administrative offices. This is causing distress to the workers. Would the Minister for Housing look into this matter and see what arrangements can be made for a separate paint shop?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you to the honourable Member for Baffin South. Written questions. Mr. Gargan.

Question W17-87(1): Cruise Missile Testing

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Government Leader. A motion was passed in 1986 regarding the testing of the cruise missile and this Legislature opposed the testing of the cruise missile. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there is an agreement that perhaps the testing could go on for another five years. What is this government's position with regard to the testing of cruise missiles which was opposed in 1986?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you to the honourable Member for Deh Cho. Written questions. That appears to conclude written questions for today. Item 7, returns to written questions. Mr. Clerk.

ITEM 7: RETURNS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Return To Question W5-87(1): Social Appeal Committee At Cape Dorset

Hon. Bruce McLaughlin's return to Question W5-87(1), asked by Mr. Arlooktoo on February 18, 1987. The Department of Social Services is reviewing the use of social service committees with the intent of increasing their responsibilities in accord with the wishes of the community. The department will be discussing the social needs of the community with the local committees and council and will provide appropriate training once the role of the committees is agreed upon.

Return To Question W4-87(1): Social Services Vehicle For Cape Dorset

Hon. Bruce McLaughlin's return to Question W4-87(1), asked by Mr. Arlooktoo on February 18, 1987. In his question, the Member stated that a vehicle is needed in Cape Dorset to transport weak, disabled and elderly people to the airport when they are leaving the community on medical travel.

The Baffin Regional Health Board has established an arrangement whereby West Baffin Eskimo Co-operative Limited in Cape Dorset will transport patients to the airport for a flat rate of \$15 per person. This rate applies to both sitting and stretcher patients. The services must be pre-authorized by staff at the nursing station.

Nursing station staff encourage patients and their families to provide for their own transportation when possible. However, the co-op service is provided when needed. Patients in Cape Dorset who need ground transportation assistance to get to medical appointments or to go to the airport when on medical travel should contact the nursing station.

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

Hon. Bruce McLaughlin's return to Question W13-87(1), asked by Mr. Nerysoo on February 24, 1987.

1) Musk-ox Program Developments Ltd. has an established office in Yellowknife. They offer employment to northern residents.

2) a) Musk-ox Program Developments provides the following to the Department of Social Services: management of the Yellowknife open custody centre in Yellowknife; management of the Baffin open custody centre in Iqaluit; management of the Cambridge Bay group home in Cambridge Bay. Musk-ox Program Developments also has a contract with the Equal Employment Directorate to provide cross-cultural workshops to Government of the Northwest Territories employees.

b) Extensive training has occurred in the Baffin open custody centre program for the local staff. There has been limited training of local people in Cambridge Bay. In Yellowknife the program has been by trained, locally recruited staff.

c) All of the positions in the group home operations are filled by qualified individuals. There have been some problems in the past related to staff turnover in these facilities, which have been resolved.

3) Musk-ox Program Developments do not have a Yellowknife business licence. They were not advised this was a requirement when the company was registered.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Is there any further business under 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.

Item 12, notices of motion.

Item 13, notices of motion for first reading of bills.

Item 14, motions. Item 15, first reading of bills. Bill 6-87(1), Mr. Ballantyne.

ITEM 15: FIRST READING OF BILLS

First Reading Of Bill 6-87(1): Criminal Injuries Compensation Act

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Kivallivik that Bill 6-87(1), An Act to Amend the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: I have a motion on the floor. To the motion. Question being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 6-87(1) has had first reading.

Item 16, 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 for 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, 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; BILL 1-87(1), APPROPRIATION ACT, 1987-88

Tabled Document 1-87(1)

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Tabled Document 1-87(1). We are dealing with the boundary and constitutional agreement and we are on general comments. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was cut off in midflight yesterday and as a matter of fact in midsentence. If I may just backtrack a little bit, I was making the point that everywhere else in Canada native people will be trying to wrest power from well-established governments which are jealous of their powers but here and now in the Northwest Territories we have a chance to build new ways of governing ourselves from the ground up, on our own terms, in our own style and it is an opportunity we should not throw aside lightly.

Some people may think the territorial government with its capital in Yellowknife is doing a wonderful job but, Mr. Chairman, I look at the differing views on this issue and on other issues in this House. I look at the work honourable Members of this House -- enormous work of Members of this House -- have put into the question of division. I look at the polarities which are present in this House, the fact that we have two separate caucuses from the East and the West. Mr. Chairman, this is not a united, coherent Assembly working toward common purposes. We are a collection of diverse interests and two fundamentally different geopolitical entities. I think everyone agrees that the Northwest Territories government and its territory is not something we chose and fashioned for ourselves. It was given to us without our consent and without our involvement. Now, we have a chance to do things our own way in territories of more manageable size. Our new territory will be a territory of coastal communities and I include Baker Lake, devoted to a marine economy and lifestyle. This is Nunavut, Nunatsiakmiut, Inuit Nunanga. Mr. Chairman, Nunavut is aboriginal self-government and the plebiscite on this agreement will be our chance in the East and in the West to take the next step toward that goal.

Federal Commitment To Allow Forming Of Governments

The new federal land claims policy says that self-government cannot be fully negotiated in land claims talks. There are management institutions but self-government has been put out of land claims by the new policy. Even if the constitutional amendment to define aboriginal self-government fails, we now have a commitment from the last two federal governments to allow us to form our own governments. Nunavut could be established by the House of Commons with or without a constitutional amendment. We have convinced the federal government.

Now let us have the courage to convince the people of the Northwest Territories to take this historic step.

Mr. Chairman, I say, courage, because it is awfully easy to say no to something new. It is easy to be afraid of the unknown. When someone suggests a change, the safe, easy, comfortable reaction is to say, "No" and the naysayers and the people without vision have already started to show themselves. They have shown fear and confusion and sowed confusion in order to stick with what is familiar and comfortable. They have many questions for us, many reasons to be afraid.

Discussion Of Capital Location Is Premature

One concern that has been a concern of my constituents is the questions about where the capital will be. Mr. Chairman, permit me to quote from a recent letter I received from the mayor of Iqaluit on this question. "It is the Iqaluit town council's position that any discussion in regard to the selection of a capital location is most premature at this time and any suggestion that our community or any other, for that matter, be excluded is inappropriate and ill-timed. It is the position of our town council that our efforts and energy be dedicated to the full support and assistance of Members of the Legislative Assembly who, as elected representatives, hold the mandate of representing our views. Any considerations which would lead to the matter of the ratification of the boundary agreement reached in Iqaluit last month being diminished in its importance and sensitivity must be immediately set aside and not be allowed to restrict or qualify the debate in which our MLAs are involved. The council of Iqaluit is dedicated fully to the support of the ratification of the boundary agreement as submitted to our Legislative Assembly. We shall also be supportive and active in our campaign in support of the anticipated plebiscite to allow the Legislative Assembly's positive consideration of the ratification process."

The speaker of the Baffin Regional Council has written me, "We agree with the town council that it is premature, divisive and completely inappropriate to be discussing the selection of a capital for Nunavut at this time. Please be assured of our full support for the ratification of the boundary agreement and our willingness to do everything possible to ensure the ensuing plebiscite is successful. Mark Evaluarjuk, speaker."

I also have a letter from the president of the Baffin Region Inuit Association. "The association's board has long supported the creation of Nunavut and the efforts of our MLAs in achieving that objective. Consequently, the board believes that debate in regard to the recent boundary agreement and related ratification process must be a first priority of our elected representatives. Any discussion of a proposed capital is, we believe, premature and ill-advised at this time. Sensitive to the aspirations of all areas in the Eastern Arctic, the association believes that the constitutional development process which will follow the process of division, would be the appropriate time at which to address the question of the structure of a future Nunavut territorial government."

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow these questions to distract us but they will be asked and they will be thrown up as reasons to be afraid. Where will our children go to high school? Where will we go to hospital? Mr. Curley suggested yesterday, "Will we still be able to hunt?" Mr. Chairman, the boundary agreement provides for reciprocal hunting rights by the way, not as was suggested.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, point of privilege.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Curley, your point of order.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. Of course the native people will be able to hunt. That is what I said. If it was translated, it is obviously a wrong impression that was given and I think the Member should very well realize it. My point yesterday, Mr. Chairman, was in terms of aboriginal rights, not on the political boundary, but on aboriginal rights, the case should be that ideally we should have an open boundary, be given the management of resources properly. That is my point. Do not interpret my words on hunting. You know better.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Curley, on your point of privilege, it is not really a point of privilege, it is more a point of debate. Mr. Patterson, please carry on.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may, on commenting on the point of privilege, Mr. Curley yesterday stated, "To me the native people, Inuit, Dene, Metis should never have boundaries in terms of pursuing wildlife." I suggest, Mr. Chairman, he went on to say that should be an open door that should never be locked up by a boundary. "Let us have an open boundary by establishing sustainable yields and resources of wildlife but keep it open so that we are not forcing to bloody boundary like we have always done...we are saying that you are not going to be allowed to hunt here; you are not going to be allowed to trap here." Mr. Chairman, with the greatest of respect to the Member for Aivilik, he suggested that aboriginal people will not be able to continue to hunt as a result of this agreement. I quote his words. "You will not be able to hunt here."

HON. GORDON WRAY: Misrepresentation.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: "You are not going to be allowed to trap here."

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Cheap shot.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: I am quoting your words.

AN HON. MEMBER: That does not mean anything.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Order, please. May I remind Members that you cannot continue to quote at length with the unedited transcript of the House? Mr. Patterson, please carry on.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the boundary agreement, the land claims boundary agreement, provides for reciprocal hunting rights on either side of the proposed line.

Question Of Money Is Balanced By Value Of Having Dominion

Questions have been asked, Mr. Chairman, who will pay the taxes? Will there be enough money? Mr. Chairman, I do not think our constituents are preoccupied with a cash register approach to our future. We can balance the question of money with the value of ruling in our own house, with the pride of having dominion in our lands. Is the Yukon a lesser government than ours because it has a smaller population and a lesser resource base? Other questions have been raised or will be raised. Is the federal government going to grab the Arctic Islands? Who is going to pay for all this? Mr. Chairman, Nunavut may cost more but will be able to negotiate the resources required, and who is able to put a price on the kind of stability that will result?

Mr. Chairman, Members, certain Members want all the answers to all the questions before we take the next step. I say we do not have these answers although "Building Nunavut" did sketch the broad brush strokes of the new government and how it might be designed. But this is not the time to be preoccupied with these questions. Once the plebiscite passes, we will have from 1987 to 1991 or maybe even longer to carefully work out the details. And even then, the new constitutions will not be finalized until they are put to a public plebiscite. One step at a time. Then we will look at resource potential, government services, carefully, over time. Let us not use scare tactics to divert us from the question before us today: settling a boundary line.

Member's Comments On November 3, 1980, Quoted

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that even some of my colleagues from Nunavut seem to be afraid. The honourable MLA from Aivilik, who started all this going in 1971, who invented Nunavut, as far as I know, now seems to have changed his mind. Hearing that was like hearing that Rene Levesque had given up on independence for Quebec. I recall his strong words in November, November 3rd, 1980, when we addressed the question of division and the Assembly was sitting in Iqaluit. Mr. Curley said then, and I am quoting from edited transcripts of Hansard, Mr. Chairman, "I was at Eskimo Point recently speaking to the teachers in that settlement and I asked them the question what their views were, what their concerns were with respect to the division and all the teachers there, not one, there were about 15 of them and not one of them expressed dissatisfaction with division. They said they would get services closer and the positions would be easier and more reflective of the needs of the area." And then he went on to say, "You talk about an option...What are the options? There are only two as far as I know. One is to stay together and support the status quo but that is not what the people in the Territories want." He went on to say "...some Members are trying to say to me, 'Look, if we separate the Territories into two distinct political units we are going to be separating ourselves from the rest of Canada.' I do not think that is what we are trying to do. We are not trying to separate like Quebec did, so I do not think there needs to be any further expression given by the Members about fears and problems which we would encounter. Sure, we would encounter a lot of difficulties, a lot of problems, but we are prepared to work toward solving these problems. I think we are ready and I believe that we are more than ready. Today we are ready to vote on the question if you would permit us to deal with the motion dealing with the division question."

Mr. Chairman...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

---Laughter

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Curley, your point of privilege.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: In this statement that the Member quoted, with all due respect to his very high regard for words of comments made by Members, my comment dealt with my original vision of Nunavut on a tree line boundary. That is what many of the people voted on. That is what I supported. We had support from MLAs from Kitikmeot and Beaufort and that was what I was speaking on. I was not speaking to a proposal which we have before us, which is very much a compromise. He should quote that as well. Destructionist.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: You said it.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Character assassination.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: You do not like being on the receiving end, eh?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Curley, in regard to your point of privilege, in my opinion it is still a point of debate and Mr. Curley, you will have the opportunity to make your point later on, if you wish. So, Mr. Patterson, please carry on.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree that I have not quoted the honourable Member's comments fully. It would take days to do that. But I was inspired by the courage and the willingness he expressed, to be prepared to work toward solving difficulties and problems. And I must say that I am disappointed that he now seems to lack confidence that his people will be able to negotiate a good deal for themselves in Nunavut. Even without 2500 Inuvait. Where is the courage he showed in establishing ITC with a fledgling budget? Where is the courage that inspired him to lead the Expo pavilion when many people said our government was too small and had too few resources to be a leader in Canada?

Confidence That Inuit Can Establish An Effective Government

Mr. Chairman, the Canadian people and the circumpolar world are captivated by the idea of Nunavut. The federal government is not afraid of the idea of a government largely run by Inuit. They are confident that Inuit communities can establish an effective, distinctive government which will develop and manage the oceans, the fisheries, our renewable resources, as they do in Greenland and Newfoundland; a government like the Greenland Home Rule Parliament which may not be terribly rich, but whose people will be very proud and independent. I am confident that the government of Nunavut will be treated fairly by Canadians and will be able to negotiate fair treatment if it is not. Let us strive together to realize a society for ourselves which reflects the proud tradition of a distinct people in a huge area. It may not be as large as some had hoped for, but it is a huge area. It is by far the larger of the two proposed new territories. It includes some of the most scenic parts of the Northwest Territories and some of the most scenic places in the world. It is full of minerals, petroleum and renewable resources.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Where?

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: On the land and in the water.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Prove it.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Some of it is known; much of it, I agree, is still unknown and still potential. Like the Yukon, we will be few in numbers but we will be strong because we will be independent. And we can renew ties with the Inuvialuit.

Mr. Chairman, to the people of the West, I say "Let us go our own way, let us pick up and go home." To the people of Nunavut, I say...

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: ...to Vancouver.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: ..."Let us go forward with determination and optimism."

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Go home to Vancouver.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: To Mr. Curley, I say, do not be afraid. Do not cling to the status quo.

HON. IAGAK CURLEY: I am not bloody well afraid of you, boy.

---Laughter

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Maybe you are getting a little too comfortable in Yellowknife, I do not know. If we do not...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Order, please. In any case, Mr. Patterson, your time is up. Does committee agree that Mr. Patterson continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Please continue, Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am about to conclude. I just wish to exhort our colleagues, my colleagues from Nunavut, do not cling to the status quo. Do not allow ourselves to be spooked by fears and by speculation. If we all work together, we can realize Nunavut. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

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

Request For Chairman's Ruling

HON. TOM BUTTERS: I will speak tomorrow on the agreement but on February 11th, the honourable Member for Yellowknife Centre tabled a document which is an agreement, as I understand it. Yesterday in an exchange between the honourable Member for Aivilik and Mr. Amagoalik, Mr. Curley suggested whether he, Mr. Amagoalik, would be prepared to support a motion introduced in the House to be included in that agreement. Mr. Amagoalik responded that he would accept that. What I would like to know is whether this agreement is an agreement that stands on its own words, or whether this House can change it; add motions and amendments to the agreement as presented to us?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Butters, who are you directing this question to?

AN HON. MEMBER: To you.

---Laughter

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Butters would you clarify that, please?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Tomorrow would be fine, sir. I just wonder whether by way of process, this agreement which has been developed by the Constitutional Alliance is amendable or may motions be included with the agreement, as Mr. Amagoalik said he thinks could occur. I would like to know just what can be done with the agreement. Is it inviolate the way it has been presented to us?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Butters, the point that you raised will be reviewed by the Chair and we will give you the reply tomorrow. The next person on the list is Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a short comment. There are three parts that I have understood as far as the discussions are going about the boundary. If we are going to talk about the boundary alone -- when we talk about all different kinds of things to do with the boundary it gets pretty confusing. But if we are just going to talk about whether you are in agreement with the boundary or not, I think it would be a lot easier for some of us to understand.

We, the Eastern Arctic people and the Baffin Region people, even though we are talking about the boundary of the Northwest Territories, one of the concerns we have is where the capital is going to be located. During the plebiscite in 1982 the Baffin Region residents wanted to have division because they figured that the capital would be in the Baffin Region. I think that is the reason why we have different views. If we could talk about just the boundary itself and to clarify each other, maybe we could go on a lot faster.

Dividing Of Territories Already Agreed

In my constituency the leaders have stated to me that they agreed on the boundary because they wanted Nunavut, but if there was to be a plebiscite for this boundary that we have under discussion right now -- they have already agreed that the NWT should be divided. I realize that if I were a Kitikmeot or I were a Western Arctic person, I think it would be a hardship for me to accept the boundary line. But the people in our area should be given an opportunity to vote in a plebiscite as to the location of the boundary and find out from them through the plebiscite what their wishes are. If we try to argue about it right now or debate it right now, whether they should have a plebiscite or not, I do not think we are going to find out in this House. I know all the comments made by the Members make a lot of sense because we hear the concerns of the Western Arctic and the Eastern Arctic. All the comments made by the Members right now are very good but I do not think we are going to get anywhere. I feel that we should be discussing whether there is going to be a plebiscite or not. I am not really sure whether I would be put in Nunavut area but right now I know I am entitled to be in the Nunavut area -- after the plebiscite. Before the plebiscite I am not really sure where I am going to be because I am half Inuk and half white. So for that reason I am not really sure before the vote where I am going to be. I just feel that the NWT should be divided. As a representative of my constituents I feel that way.

Debate In House Not Going Anywhere

I do not have much to say on that issue from here, but I just do not want to keep on debating this issue in this House without going anywhere. I want to get somewhere, but we should decide in this House what we are going to do instead of debating on it and not getting anywhere. I would like to be able to start something realistic in the discussions in this House instead of going back and forth on what each Member thinks on the division issue. Thank you.

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

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a short comment. I felt at the beginning that the people that are going to be in the Nunavut area when they have a plebiscite -- when they have that plebiscite, that the boundary would be on the tree line. That was our understanding. Some of the lakes in the western area would be in the Nunavut area but now with this political agreement it is totally different from what we expected. We should look back into the 1982 plebiscite. I would tend to agree with that plebiscite.

Discussion On Boundary Line Only

If we are going to think about the political aspects of the boundary right now and understanding what we have discussed here so far and knowing where the boundary is going to be, I feel that when they had the plebiscite in 1982 about setting up a government in Nunavut and the Western Arctic, we thought that was going to come to be, and that the boundary would be on the tree line. But today we know that it is not the same as the 1982 one. Maybe we should show the boundary line as it is presented right now to all the people in the communities. I think we are just discussing the boundary line, only, right now. If we are going to talk about where the capital is going to be and how strong the government is going to be, I think this is going to be done in the future. We are just discussing the boundary line right now, we are not discussing anything about where the powers of the government are on either side. I know that this has to be ratified by the federal government. I feel that I should take this back to the communities for them to vote on the boundary plebiscite and not discuss it any further. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Part of the problem with this whole debate and the issue in the last couple of weeks is the confusion that surrounds just exactly what was done and what it is that we are supposed to do. I guess the confusion arises on our side because from about 1973 onwards until the Coppermine conference, which 110 community delegates attended, there was a very clear understanding on what it was we were discussing when we were discussing Nunavut. That essentially was that Nunavut was clearly a jurisdiction that encompassed all the Inuit communities into one Inuit homeland, essentially north and east above the tree line.

Indeed when a similar agreement to this one was brought forward a year ago or two years ago, it was rejected outright, not only by the MLAs but by nearly every community in the Nunavut area. When I look at the tabled documents from Lake Harbour, Pelly Bay, Pond Inlet, Broughton Island,

the fact that their children do not have any jobs, that their communities are poor. There does not seem to be any hope in sight. When I look at this proposed boundary, I have to say that I do not see any hope in sight, either.

We hear talk about a fishery. Greenland has been developing their fishery for many, many years. It is still not viable enough to make them economically self-sufficient. Go ask Newfoundland and Nova Scotia if their fishery has made them economically self-sufficient. We talk about tourism. We do not have any roads. We do not have any highways. Even if a decision was made tomorrow to build highways into the Keewatin or to Kitikmeot or to improve facilities in the Baffin to bring in tourists, it would be years before those ever came to fruition. We talk about oil and gas. We gave away the only oil and gas that we know that exists and can be recovered at an economic rate in the Beaufort. The Arctic Islands have potential but we know the plan in the Arctic Islands is to take it out by pipeline through the West, so that is where the jobs are going to go.

We talk about Hudson Bay oil and gas. The way things are going we might not even have Hudson Bay. Two successive federal governments, the Liberal and now the Conservative government recently brought in a federal bill called the Canada Laws Offshore Application Act. Luckily it died on first reading but the intention is to bring it back. That act will remove Foxe Basin, Hudson Strait and the Hudson Bay from the jurisdiction of the Northwest Territories and I suggest to you that the same act will remove the same jurisdiction from the Nunavut government.

If that is not good enough, we have Quebec saying that before division takes place, Hudson Bay and James Bay should be given to them and Ontario. That is a position that they have been consistent on. It should not surprise us. Why do you think the provinces made the amendment to the Constitution to allow provincial boundaries to be extended? It was not done on a whim. They have had that goal in sight for many years. People look at our division -- they are like vultures hovering around, just waiting for it to happen so they can come in and take all the good parts out.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: We might as well all commit suicide.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: You first.

---Laughter

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Order, please. The Member's time is up. Do you agree that he continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Wray, please continue.

HON. GORDON WRAY: I would like to be as upbeat as Mr. Patterson and live in the ideal dream world that everything is great and everything is going to be happy and there are going to be no problems. But unfortunately, I happen to live in the real world. I have to deal with realities, because I have to go and talk to people about reality. Those are the realities that we face. It may be pessimistic but the bill is sitting there on the order papers and the statements have been made by the Quebec government. The section is in the Constitution to do it. Those are real facts. Whether it happens or not, we do not know, but certainly the potential is there, and the potential is just as great for that to happen as the potential is for us to develop our resources.

Question Should Not Be Addressed On An Emotional Level

I do not worry about my children's political rights. I worry about their economic future. That is where this question has to be addressed, not on the emotional level. Emotions are easy to deal with. Sure, we could all jump on the bandwagon and wave flags. That is simple, it does not need courage, it does not need vision to do that. Unfortunately, there are some of us that take a longer-term view of things. The Northwest Territories will divide. Maybe not now, but it will divide. All you have to do is look at a map. One day division will come. What I say is, we divide when we are strong, not when we are our weakest.

It is an extremely difficult subject to deal with because you are dealing with people's emotions. People can be intimidated, and scare tactics can be used, and all kinds of threats can be made. We are told that if we do not go with this particular boundary, the land claims are finished. Or they are going to be damaged irreparably. Well, quite frankly, it was TFN who decided to mix the land claims in with a political and a public process that they had no control over. It was their mistake, not ours. Why anybody would involve a land claims settlement in a public process that non-native people can become involved in and non-native people can dictate terms in, I do not know. There may have been good reasons for it several years ago. I hope that the land claims are not set back too far and I do not think they will be. There may have to be some minor readjustments but they will not be damaged to the point where it will not take place. It will take place.

Public Vote Will Determine

I do not want it to be said, that I am against Nunavut. At least the people in my communities know that I am not against Nunavut. I have always been for Nunavut but the Nunavut that I envisioned and the Nunavut that I worked for is not the Nunavut that has been put on this table. But after all the rhetoric of the appointed and elected leaders and everybody who wants to have their say in this, the bottom line must be that no matter what happens in this debate, it has to go to a public vote. We have to find out what the public wants because even though I have strong personal feelings, I know that in my constituency there are many who do not share those feelings. Whether the split is 50-50 or 60-40 or 75-25, I have no way to determine that. The only way any of us can determine is to go to that public vote. I only hope that whatever happens in this House, it will allow that public vote to take place. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. Any further comments? Mr. Curley.

HON. TAGAK CURLEY: Mr. Chairman, I really did not want to be misunderstood. Obviously that is my wish but I will be misunderstood and let us not kid ourselves. I have never departed, I want to be clear, from the position of the original proposal. It takes courage, I think, to stand by that principle in division of keeping Inuit together, whether they be divided together, that if we are to divide, that we should have at least their support and their approval. But through this turn of events recently, we do not have that support and the will of these people is not behind us. I think more and more I am saying that in my view there is an attempt to keep the same goal, by calling it a Nunavut proposal, but it is not the same Nunavut proposal that the majority of the people were originally aware of. When we debated the issues earlier in Frobisher Bay, we were debating the issue on the basis that we were dealing with the tree line boundary. It was difficult for all of us to agree, but these were the kinds of proposals we were debating then. There was unified support throughout the North, from east to west and in the northern part of the Territories. So on that basis we got our strength together, but recently that has not happened.

Position Has Not Changed Since Meeting In Coppermine

I have not changed that position. I did not change my position. Someone else did. I was not asked to see whether I agree with the proposal. If I had been asked three or four times prior to the signatures being put on this document, I probably would have wanted to get back to the same kind of conference as we had in Coppermine and say, "Do you people now agree to divide? Or do you people now change your position from that unanimous resolution that was passed in the fall of 1984 in Coppermine?" We have not changed our position. I know many of my constituents in the community have not changed their positions on that resolution passed in October, 1984. And still today they were saying to me, "We were under the assumption that was the proposal that we were working on." Many of them said, "We should have been consulted first before that turn of events happened." I have not changed that position. Someone else did. And my colleague, did he change his position? Why did he change his position? I did not. So the question is, he changed his mind, but I did not.

In order for people to get involved you should speak to them. If you cannot speak to them then you are not communicating. In responding to the document that the Assembly and Nunavut caucus rejected in February, 1985, my honourable colleague reported to the House on February 25, and I would like to quote some of it because I think it is only fair that I do the same thing, the conditions he says to Mr. Speaker, "The unanimous consensus which emerged" from the Nunavut caucus "was that the conditions precedent to division insisted upon and demanded by the Western Constitutional Forum would likely result in a new Nunavut territory which would not be viable nor have the potential

for provincehood for a long time, if ever. The price demanded of us all by the Western Constitutional Forum, which would have required dividing people with a common economy, language, history and culture against themselves, would have resulted in an unacceptable shell of the original Nunavut proposal." And he went on to say, "Our consensus, therefore, was not to be part of something which would be so divisive amongst people who naturally consider themselves as one; but to resolve to take the necessary time to continue to work together to gain wider understanding of, support and acceptance in the Northwest Territories for the logic, justice, and inevitability of Nunavut."

Mr. Chairman, I did not change my position from that position. Someone else did, not me. Who? And he went on to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, "I did negotiate in good faith with the Western Constitutional Forum, according to the mandate given to me...but I have failed to secure their acceptance of the terms of this tentative boundary." So, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the regional proposal, which is no different today, was rejected and did not have support. As indicated earlier, there is evidence from communities right across the Nunavut area, which supported the Members of the Nunavut caucus. So, I would not want to be accused of changing my mind. I have not changed my mind.

Political Boundary Versus Land Claims Boundary

I think we could negotiate or regroup, so that if we are to give up something we would at least be given something in return, receive something in return. I think that, through this exercise, what we have achieved today is exactly what Mr. Patterson said; that it will be divisive and that it divides region from region and therefore creates more confusion than attempts to try to unite them together. So that is why I think we are coming out with questions today. We are forced to say those things because we are dealing with a political boundary. Political boundary as a public system is something we are working on today. If we were working on the basis of a land claims boundary, I think there would be a whole lot of people who would not be qualified to speak. But, as far as a public boundary is concerned, people must be encouraged to speak their minds. We can suppress it no longer. Or if they disagree with my point of view, no longer should they be disallowed to make a comment. This is why, today, we are hearing right across, from organization to organization, that there are implications much broader than what we have anticipated. Thank you.

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

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few comments that I would like to make during this debate. The first comment I would like to make is, I would very much like to dispel the myth I hear so often when people talk about the "Yellowknife government". There is no such thing as a Yellowknife government except for the municipal government. There is a Government of the Northwest Territories, the headquarters of which is in Yellowknife. There are many people who live in this community that have nothing to do with the government. There are two gold mines in this community and there is a thriving private sector. I just want to make that very, very clear, that when people are referring to the Yellowknife government, they are referring to the Government of the Northwest Territories.

Historical Involvement In Debate On Division

I would like also, like other people, to go back a little bit in history. I have not been involved in this debate as long as many of the Members sitting around this table. I first became involved in 1980. As Members recall in Iqaluit, then Frobisher Bay, there was a debate setting up a unity committee.

At that time I was newly elected as mayor of Yellowknife. In retrospect, I was somewhat naive but I was invited to speak to this Assembly in Iqaluit. I sat in committee of the whole for some three hours. At that time I tried to make the point and tried to give the positive aspects of a united territory. As you can well imagine, my comments were met with some fairly forceful opposition by many Members at the time. I think I learned some lessons from that exchange. I learned that if, indeed, the majority of people who live in the Eastern Arctic want their own territory, it becomes very difficult to force them to live in a united Northwest Territories.

I saw oftentimes, the rancour and the animosity that was created in this House and in the Territories, when the subject of division came up. I saw many times it was difficult for this Legislative Assembly and for this government and for committees of this Assembly to carry out their

duties because of differences or perceived differences between the East and the West. In 1982 it was decided by this Legislative Assembly that there would be a referendum. And that referendum passed. It has been the stated goal of this Legislative Assembly since 1982 to try to effect division in a reasonable manner. Some people have been working on it since 1982, but as Ms Cournoyea and others have pointed out, many individuals have worked on it for many years before that. In 1982, the Dene, the Metis and the Inuit were the prime motivators to support division in the Northwest Territories.

I think that in Yellowknife the vote was three to one against division. There were a number of reasons for that. One reason at that time was people had no idea where a boundary would be. Also at that time, people had no idea what form constitutional development would take, if there were two new territories.

Responsibilities Of Western Constitutional Forum

After the 1982 plebiscite was passed, the Western Constitutional Forum and the Nunavut Constitutional Forum began their work. I can speak more for the work of the WCF here in the West. The work of the WCF was two-fold. One of the major responsibilities of the WCF was to try to reach agreement on a boundary. The other, and I think equally important responsibility of the WCF, was to try to come up with a process for constitutional development in a new western territory that ultimately would be enshrined in either an amended NWT Act or in the Constitution of Canada.

I know here in Yellowknife the debate that has taken place over the past number of years has been very educational for people in Yellowknife. Although we in Yellowknife are often the object of a lot of criticism, I think the people in this community have been very reasonable on this particular subject. I know the WCF has had meetings here. I know my two colleagues and I have had countless meetings discussing the pros and cons of division, pros and cons of constitution-building in the Western Arctic. I think we have had a good measure of support for the activities that have taken place.

Obviously in Yellowknife there are some real concerns about division. The first and most obvious concern is that inevitably there will be a reduction of personnel in government in Yellowknife. So there are many individuals who have made Yellowknife their home and invested a lot of money in houses. We are talking now about second, third and fourth generation Yellowknifers, who have made a commitment to the NWT, intend to live here and want to contribute and who are more than happy to co-operate with native organizations to try to achieve a balance of power-sharing in the NWT. The educational process during the last few years has really strengthened my feeling that, by and large, I think people in Yellowknife are open to change and they are open to improvements to our system of government. They recognize that historically aboriginal people have not had a fair measure of involvement in the government and its decisions.

I think the Yellowknife of 1987 is markedly different from the Yellowknife of 1967. I think the attitudes have changed dramatically and I think that many of the people who came up in 1967 have long gone. We are seeing more and more that the people who are making their home in Yellowknife now are here to stay and they intend to stay in the NWT.

Acceptable Boundary Agreement Is A Difficult Task

In 1985 as we recall we had another very difficult debate in this House about an historic proposed boundary. I recall a group of MLAs walked out of the House. I recall at that time that the so-called western MLAs passed a motion in support of the boundary agreement in 1985. I also recall that very quickly that agreement fell apart. There was a lot of unfortunate name-calling on both sides. I think that the people who were involved in trying to reach that agreement should be commended, as the people should be commended now. They have been given a difficult, if not impossible, task to find a boundary that is going to be accepted by a majority of this House and more importantly, a boundary that is going to be accepted by the majority of the people of the NWT. I think we all should recognize that whenever you go into negotiations and after a lot of very tough negotiations and an agreement is reached, there are going to be people who are happy with the agreement and there are going to be people unhappy with the agreement. I think we are all deluding ourselves if we really expect, in an agreement on a boundary of the NWT, that you will ever find a situation where everybody is happy with the agreement. It is impossible. If people are looking for that, I would humbly suggest we are looking in the wrong place. I think we would have to look for a miracle.

The parties who agreed in 1985 and the parties who agreed again recently, essentially worked out a compromise. That compromise, from the comments in the House, is not acceptable to a lot of people. I will accept that. When I hear concerns put forward by Members of this House, I think they are legitimate concerns. I think it is unfair to tag people with the label that they changed their minds or reneged on their commitment. The reality is when the details of a proposal are put forward, there are those people who agree with the principle but cannot agree with some of the details in the agreement. I think we have to expect that. And I think to expect all Members, even those Members who supported division in principle, for us to expect them to agree with all the details of the agreement -- of course they will not. The rest of us should have some understanding and some patience with some of the difficulties that individual MLAs are having in their constituencies.

Constituents Are Becoming More Involved

I think another reality is that for years the principle of division for Nunavut and constitutional development have been talked about in many communities. But many people have not actually sat down and really thought in detail about the practical realities. What does it mean? What we are seeing now is that those realities are coming home. People who were silent before are now talking. People who have not bothered to be involved in the debate are now becoming involved in the debate. I think all of us should recognize that this is going to happen. The fact that probably dozens of meetings have been held and tons of literature has been put out into the communities, does not necessarily mean that everybody, at the time, was either willing or able to become involved. And now that they see it in front of them, that a possible decision will be made, a lot of these people are voicing their concerns. So the MLAs have to weigh these concerns. MLAs have to now deal with constituents who were silent before and are no longer silent. I think that is happening right now and that is something that does not surprise me whatsoever.

I know that during this process, we MLAs in Yellowknife had some major difficulties also. People talked about taking risks and having vision. I think that we have been fairly consistent during this debate over the last number of years. The concept of division has not originated from Yellowknife or from Yellowknife MLAs. I think Yellowknife MLAs, over the last number of years, have been really open to the desires and aspirations of people in other parts of the Territories to seek their own destiny. During the process we have been fairly consistent, I think, as Yellowknife MLAs.

Praise For Mr. MacQuarrie's Contribution As Member Of WCF

The way the WCF was set up, there was one Member on the WCF, who represented the interest of non-native MLAs, and that Member was Mr. MacQuarrie. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate Mr. MacQuarrie...

---Applause

...for the work he has done over the past years. I know Mr. MacQuarrie has had difficult times. I know there have been times in this House where Mr. MacQuarrie stood alone. I have read the newspapers and listened to radio broadcasts where Mr. MacQuarrie was castigated. Charges spoken against Mr. MacQuarrie. I think Mr. MacQuarrie handled himself with a lot of dignity and a lot of strength and a lot of vision. I think that speaking on behalf of the non-native MLAs, whom Mr. MacQuarrie was representing, Mr. MacQuarrie has kept us always involved in the process. We have had countless meetings with Mr. MacQuarrie, we have reached agreements with Mr. MacQuarrie. If Mr. MacQuarrie talked as a member of the WCF, he did so with our full support. We charged Mr. MacQuarrie with certain aspects of an agreement which we thought were important.

Firstly, those aspects included the Beaufort being in the West. I would like to respond to Ms Cournoyea's comments yesterday. For us it is a lot more than oil and gas. We felt that the Inuvialuit will play an integral and important part in the new western territory. We thought that the Inuvialuit, being a very imaginative, hard-working group of people, can assume, actually, a major leadership role in a new western territory, if there was to be division. So the decision to have the Beaufort in the West was not just based on a crass economic decision of oil and gas. We feel that the Inuvialuit, if there is division, if they are in a new western territory, will play a lead role in generating a new form of government in the Western Arctic.

We also charged Mr. MacQuarrie, if an agreement was reached on a boundary, with that agreement having to go to the people. That was a primary concern of ours; that if there was a boundary, that boundary ultimately would have to be ratified by all the people of the NWT. We felt that on something as important as this, a decision that will have such long-term implications, that it would not be enough to have that boundary ratified just here in the Legislative Assembly, or have it ratified by the Dene, the Metis and the Inuit organizations. I think it is important that they agree to this process but the most fundamental concern that we had was that ultimately the people of the NWT would make the final decision.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Mr. Ballantyne, your time is up. Does the committee agree that he continues?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you, please carry on.

Question Of Division Must Be Resolved

HON. MICHAEL BALLANTYNE: In the last eight or nine years that I have been involved in politics, the division question has taken a tremendous amount of time, energy and financial resources of this government. And I feel that the question has to be resolved. I know that if, for instance, the plebiscite was held and the decision was "No", I recognize that that does not mean that in the Eastern Arctic there will not be people who will continue to push for Nunavut. I recognize that and I respect that right. But I think that at some point, for our generation here, at some point we have to make a decision. We have to make a decision; if we do not divide now, I say give it a rest for 10 years. I say let us get on with the business of the Northwest Territories.

Obviously at some point, because of its vast size, the Northwest Territories is going to be divided. I see it as inevitable. But I also see that all of us, as a government and as MLAs, are dealing with an incredible array of problems. Unfortunately we spend much of our time talking about political and constitutional issues. Out there in the communities people are asking for houses and jobs and education. So I, for one, am prepared to have this boundary issue go to the people. I am prepared to abide by the decision of the people of the NWT. If those people say "Yes, we will divide", then I say get on with it. We will divide. It will be difficult. I am sure there will be many debates in this House as to how the proverbial pie is split up. I am sure it will be a very, very difficult time for those of us who are in this House. But if that is the will of the people of the NWT, so be it. It will be our job as their representatives, difficult though it may be, to carry out those wishes and divide.

On the other hand, if the people of the NWT say "No", I do not think I am prepared to continue debating, talking, using time and energy to deal with it. I, at that point, would suggest that we give it 10 years. Much as Mr. Justice Berger said to people of the Mackenzie Valley, "You are not ready for oil and gas development. Let us have a 10 year moratorium," I would say maybe we all should think about that. I think that perhaps the battle lines are too rigid now. Perhaps if the people of the NWT say "No", maybe our children should have a look at the question. Maybe new, fresh faces should be involved. Maybe there are aspects of this debate that we have been involved in so long that we have forgotten. Maybe we are only talking to each other. These are considerations we must all have.

Division Would Provide Opportunity For New Style Of Government

I know that the Dene Nation and Metis Association see division as an opportunity for some real progress in constitutional development. I know the WCF has done a lot of work in that area. That is true. It would in fact be a new start. We have to look at that. It would be an opportunity to come up with a new style of government. I think that is valid. I think Mr. Kakfwi sees that. He sees that for the aboriginal people, at least in the Western Arctic, that there has to be more than land claims. There has to be more than land and money. What he is looking for are some real opportunities for political involvement at the highest level. I see that also and I think that is very valid.

At the same time I have heard Mr. Wah-Shee and I have heard Mrs. Lawrence express their concerns. I do not think those concerns are inconsistent. I think in both cases Mr. Wah-Shee's constituents, Mrs. Lawrence's constituents, are really concerned about the land claims boundary and the political

boundary. I think Mr. Wah-Shee and Mrs. Lawrence and other Members have a responsibility to bring those concerns forward. In a perfect world, as the negotiators from the East and West who are negotiating the land claims boundaries sit down this week -- hopefully some accommodations can be made, so that Mr. Wah-Shee and Mrs. Lawrence can be supportive -- I also have many Dogrib constituents who are concerned about that boundary. It is something I have to think about also.

Decisions Must Be Made By Members

I have heard other concerns here expressed by many Members. I think all of us have to think about these. I think that if, for instance, at some point in the next two or three weeks there is a vote by some mechanism which we have not decided yet, and it is decided that a plebiscite will be held, I think we have to recognize that everybody here is going to have to make decisions. Are they going to go out to their people and strongly support a new boundary or are they going to come out and strongly oppose the new boundary? Are they going to be silent on the new boundary? I think we fool ourselves by saying that because we might get some agreement here, that necessarily means there is going to be total support by individual Members of this Assembly for a new boundary. It is too difficult, it is too complex, it is impossible. So those that are looking at unanimous agreement of this House for this agreement, I think will be very disappointed because I do not think it is possible to find.

I see now the confusion amongst the people of the NWT as they try to understand various threads of constitutional and political development. We here in this Assembly talk about devolution of powers from the federal government, we talk about land claims, we talk about aboriginal self-government at the First Ministers' Conference process, we talk about division and it is very, very difficult to deal with all of these at the same time. It has been my experience every time we, as a government, try to deal with any one issue, division comes into it. Division is always there. We try to deal with devolution of powers from the federal government and there are Members, who say, "No, no, we are not getting any powers from the federal government until after division." We see where the land claims boundary and the political boundary now have been tied together. We see where the concept of aboriginal self-government, in a way is tied with Nunavut, and has potential to be tied with a new western territory. I think people in the Northwest Territories are very confused about how all these issues relate and how, ultimately, they are all going to work out. What happens 10 years from now -- post-land claims, post-constitutional talks, post-division? How is it all going to fit together? Are everybody's rights going to be protected? I know that is a concern here in Yellowknife.

Somebody said recently that Northwest Territories consists of many minorities, there is an Inuit minority, a Dene minority, an Inuvialuit minority, there is a Metis minority, there is a non-native minority. I think everybody has concerns. And now non-native people have concerns about their rights in the long term. I think those concerns have to be addressed just as seriously as the concerns of native people. I think for this all to work, at some time, hopefully as soon as possible, we have to recognize that we have to all work together.

Major Strides Made In Involvement Of Native People

When I hear insulting comments about the white government in Yellowknife, that bothers me. This is not true. The Government of the Northwest Territories is controlled by this Assembly, which has a majority of native people. Those aboriginal people have put eight people on the Executive Council and they could have put eight aboriginal people on the Executive Council. They give direction to this government. I think this government is making some major strides in involving aboriginal people in all aspects of this government. I know, to a lot of people, this is not enough. That is fair enough. To a lot of people we are moving slowly. I suppose, in the perception of today, we are, or it seems at times that we are moving slowly. If you can compare it with an evolutionary historical process anywhere else in the world or in history, we are moving at an incredibly rapid rate. I do not think that a government or a group of people have moved as quickly as we have in the Northwest Territories in the last 20 years at any time in history. I think sometimes, sitting here, we lose our perspective.

To end my comments on this particular debate, I just want to say that I am going to remain consistent to the stand that I have taken. Mr. MacQuarrie as part of the WCF negotiated an agreement. I can live with that agreement. I find it a little bit ironic now that there are Members, Inuit Members and Dene and Metis Members who are coming from a different position now. I understand why they are doing that. It would be very ironic if ultimately division was only

supported by the three MLAs from Yellowknife and the MLAs from Baffin. I hope we do not get hung up with a technical discussion in the House as to whether we adopt, accept or ratify the agreement. I think my bottom line is that we have asked these people to come up with an agreement. They have taken on that responsibility. They have come up with one. And for me, I say, "Let us put it out to the people." Let them decide. The people will say if we divide or not.

We might start looking at ways that we can divide. I know that as an M.L.A. from Yellowknife I am going to be very sensitive to the concerns of people here in my constituency; if there is loss of jobs; if it is done properly and fairly; if vacancy rates and attrition could be used to cushion the blow. As I said to Mr. Amagoalik yesterday, if the federal government is not forthcoming with enough money to pay the extra cost of division that I would be one of the first ones to say, "Well, we will take an extra two years; we will take an extra three years." I cannot accept the idea that we are going to reduce government services to pay for new government buildings whether it is east or west or to pay for a new government.

Moral Commitment Of Federal Government

It would be interesting to see, finally, how the federal government is going to react. I do not think that the federal government really believed that we could come up with an agreement. So for the first time they are taking this proposal seriously. I think they have a moral commitment. I think that three successive Ministers of Indian and Northern Affairs expressed, in principle anyhow, support for division if we, the people of the Northwest Territories, decided to have division. And for me, as soon as possible, I would like to take this boundary proposal and place it before the people of the Northwest Territories. I for one, will abide by their decision. Thank you very much.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wah-Shee): Thank you. We will take a coffee break at this time. Thank you.

---SHORT RECESS

We are on Tabled Document 1-87(1). General comments. Mr. Sibbeston.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by saying that I fully support the idea of putting the boundary agreement to the people in a plebiscite this spring. It has been five years since the last vote on this issue and the people of the North need to be able to restate their views on the matter of division. Much work has been done by the Constitutional Alliance to reach this agreement and I believe that this Assembly, no matter what our individual reservations may be, should pass this question on to the voters for decision.

Let me assure this Assembly that I am fully prepared to do all I can to bring about division if the people of the North show their continued support for it. Mr. Speaker, I have listened closely to the debate yesterday and today and I see that there is considerable opposition to the present agreement and even to division itself. Certainly the points of view that have been expressed today and yesterday I would not have thought possible a number of years ago, but yet they are here in this Assembly today. Some have said this agreement would split the Inuit, create only half a Nunavut. Others have expressed doubts about the economic viability of Nunavut if it were to be created. So the issue of division, in some respects is becoming divisive, not just between the East and the West but even among the Nunavut caucus. So while I am prepared to work for division if the people want it, we must be prepared to deal with the possibility that the plebiscite will fail. For if that happens, then division will be delayed perhaps indefinitely. Then we must find ways to make a united territory work.

Baffin Region Have Experienced Autonomy

I have given this matter much thought. As my honourable colleague for Iqaluit noted, I have travelled to the Eastern Arctic quite a number of times during the last few years -- three times in the last year. And every time I go to the Baffin I become very impressed, I am very inspired by the people there. In many ways they have democracy. They have much better government than the Dene down the Mackenzie Valley. The people in Baffin have experienced autonomy -- how it is to run your own lives and be independent. They set up the first regional council years ago. They were the first to set up hospital boards. They were the first to set up an educational board.

In many ways our government has been very good and responsive to the people of Baffin. So I see that the government of the day is reasonably good to the people of Baffin. The matter of distance is something that we cannot do anything about and that is something that people will have to deal with in the future.

I have a deep sympathy with the aspirations of the Inuit people for their own territory. I know what it is like to feel alienated from government in Yellowknife. I fought for years to make the territorial government more responsive to the needs of the native people and people in small communities. I know what it is like to worry about the survival of your language and culture. For these things, I have fought.'

Problems Of Isolation And Distance Faced By Some Dene Communities

The problems of isolation, alienation and survival are faced equally by some of the Dene communities in the West. Liard, as an example, is a small Dene community in the southwest corner of the North and they feel very isolated and a bit alienated from the government these days. The people there have been trying to get on their economic feet for the last few years and recently they have lost bids on three contracts. So they are not feeling very good toward this government because our government has still decided to go with the lowest bidder concept. We still have to make some accommodations and special provisions for people in the small communities that want to become involved. Liard too, is very distant, in that it takes over two weeks to get a letter from here to Liard and inasmuch as there is a road, there is no scheduled plane service or bus service or anything of that sort. So people of the West have felt some alienation toward the government and capital here in Yellowknife. The matter of distance and so forth is not just felt by the Inuit people living afar in Baffin, but by some Dene communities in the West.

If the plebiscite fails this spring, I think we must be prepared to make immediate changes in the way that our government operates. Some of these changes have already been suggested and agreed to in the boundary agreement. I fully support the idea of rotating the leadership between eastern and western Ministers. This must become a practice or convention of our government. I also support the continued practice of having equal representation in cabinet of the eastern and western Ministers. This Assembly must be prepared, too, to make changes. Alternating sittings of this House between east and west may be expensive and difficult, but this is essential if we are to heal the wounds that will likely be created if the plebiscite fails. If we are to have only one territory, then all people must feel they belong.

These changes, however, are not enough. We must look beyond the immediate future, beyond the narrow concerns of the present. The North is a society of minorities. Every group, the Dene, the Metis, the Inuvialuit, Inuit and non-native are all minorities in the present territory. If the plebiscite fails and division does not occur, we cannot allow the process of constitution-building to cease. A new constitution for the Northwest Territories embodied in a new NWT Act or even one that is eventually embodied in the Canadian Constitution must be written. I do believe that aboriginal self-government can be achieved in a united NWT. The process has started; the work that the WCF has been doing can be applied to all of the territory. The fact is that many of the aspirations, many of the hopes of native people for many years are beginning to happen within this government. Many of the hopes, many of the aspirations with respect to language, culture and involvement in government have become a reality already. A good start has been made in this area. Many of the things that people want in self-government have been achieved today in the Northwest Territories and this process can continue. All I am saying is that I think we have got to begin looking realistically at the possibility that the plebiscite may not succeed in favour of the yes vote.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I do support the plebiscite and I am prepared to work for division, but I am also prepared to deal with the real problems that will exist if division does not occur. The plebiscite will not end a process of constitutional development in the North. It will only determine the goal toward which we must work. I urge all Members, no matter which side of the issue they support, to be prepared to continue working for the good of all northern people toward new systems of government for the North. Mahsi cho.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Sibbeston. Are there any further general comments? Mr. T'Seleie.

Concerns Voiced In Public Meetings Held By WCF

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, in considering this boundary agreement I can only go by some of the research that I was able to do. In October 1985, the Western Constitutional Forum did tours of all the communities in my constituency and I was able to get the transcripts of the public meetings that were held in each community. Some of the comments that were made at these public meetings by people in the communities are important for this discussion, since the WCF was the public forum that was set up to allow members of the public to voice their concerns with respect to division, to the question of a plebiscite and also to the question of a constitution. What I would like to do is read into the record some of the summaries of these public meetings.

When the WCF was in Fort Franklin, there were five main points that came out from the public meetings: 1) The development of the new constitution is very important to aboriginal people. Aboriginal people must be involved in this process. 2) The Dene should have a guaranteed majority of the seats in the territorial council. 3) Consensus among all northerners is important in regard to the location of a boundary for division. 4) We are not aware of any Inuit at any time having hunted, trapped or fished in the Great Bear region. There must be more meetings and more discussions between the Dene and Inuit regarding this matter of selecting a boundary for division. 5) The Western Constitutional Forum should make every effort to keep people in the communities and settlements aware of what is happening regarding division and constitutional development.

In Norman Wells the types of concerns that were raised were: 1) A strong central government is important and necessary. At the same time, however, it is also important to provide regional governments with sufficient power and authority to make decisions about certain matters that directly affect the people of a particular region. 2) Regional structures should be charged with representing areas that are as homogeneous as possible. 3) Members of a regional council should continue to come from local authorities; direct elections to the regional council could adversely affect the accountability of its members. 4) The concept of "one man, one vote" is important. 5) Sometimes it appears that we pay too much attention to the boundary issue and not enough attention to the issues involved in constitutional development. 6) Maybe we could abandon this idea of dividing the NWT in favour of addressing the concerns and addressing the complaints of the Inuit. In this way we could all remain in one territory. 7) On one hand the need for another plebiscite on the question of division is desirable because it would provide the members of the Western Constitutional Forum with a clear mandate. On the other hand, another plebiscite may serve only to polarize people and cause even more hard feelings between the North's cultural groups. 8) If division must occur, the Beaufort Sea area must remain in the West. 9) The January, 1985 tentative agreement on the location of a boundary for division appears to be the most acceptable boundary alternative.

Lack Of Control Of Regional Affairs

I will not go into reading some of the points that were raised in the other communities. They are basically the same. One thing that is fairly clear, at least from my reading of these transcripts, is that people want the opportunity again to vote on the issue of division. At the same time the consensus of the region seems to be that the issue of constitutional development, with strong forms of regional government, is very important. Many of the comments expressed frustration with the lack of control of regional affairs. I think one example that was raised in these transcripts is that, under the present constitution of the NWT, it is possible that if a mine or a large non-renewable resource related development were to occur next to an established community, under the present laws it is possible and it is entirely legal that the people that come to work for that particular mine, or whatever it is, could vote in an election -- it is their right that they could run their own candidates and the people who have always lived in that community could find themselves being represented by people who were here only three or six months or a short time. This was one concern that was raised and it could lead to a situation of long-term residents, most of whom are aboriginal people, having their community represented by, basically, outsiders. It is the feeling of many people that the constitutional forums need to put something in place to address that particular circumstance.

Because of the fears of that situation occurring, there needs to be some kind of protective mechanism for the longer-term residents. When we think about it in the North, I think, myself, this situation is unique to the North because you are dealing with communities that are not what you would classify as melting pot communities. There are old communities, the societies are aboriginal, some of the people cannot read or write or speak English and yet everybody everywhere

is saying that the people all have rights. If people do not have the tools to be able to exercise their rights, then my feeling is that the constitution should be able to protect them and, at least for the very foreseeable future, I do not see that situation changing. So that is why I think that this protective mechanism has to be there and a protective mechanism could be a residency requirement for voting. In fact on the question of the plebiscite, which we are discussing today, the president of the Chamber of Commerce in Norman Wells, during one of these meetings with the WCF, said that the people that should be allowed to vote on a plebiscite should be the people that have been in the North for 10 years or more; that the issue is important and newer residents should not be allowed to vote.

Improvement In Government Through New Constitution

Also, Mr. Chairman, I think that I agree with my constituents' comments from these transcripts when they expressed a need for better government, improved government, something that should be done through a constitution. One example is, as we heard Mr. Patterson saying earlier, the Northwest Territories as it is now structured is not something that any of us had anything to do with. I agree completely with that. If we take it one step further, if we look at the government regions in the way they are organized, I think we could see another example of where regions have been established without any consultation with communities. I do not know where the decision to put certain communities in certain regions came from but I know that it is not done along the cultural or ethnic lines that I would like to see. I always felt that the native people that I represent have more in common with people further south, the Slavey people in Wrigley and Providence and Simpson, and someday I would like to see that whole area reorganized.

With regard to the boundary, I would like to say that I know from my experience that as far as aboriginal pursuits or subsistence pursuits go, no line can stop people from pursuing their hunting, fishing and trapping and my feeling is that no law should do that. Looking at it from that perspective, I have a hard time recognizing the importance of drawing a line because I know that people will go over the line when they have to. In those terms I do not see it as very important. I do not see the possibility of anyone ever being taken to court because they went on the other side of the line because I think that aboriginal people have an inherent right to pursue their traditional activities. That, I would suspect, is protected in the Canadian Constitution and that would override any kind of ability of any other government to take any aboriginal person to court who crossed the line.

Mr. Chairman, I support the agreement. I am prepared to endorse it. I would especially like to see the agreement go to a plebiscite as soon as possible but I also think that everyone should be prepared to continue to work on the issue of a constitution and that that work of improving government to regions needs to and has to continue. It has been said here that the Northwest Territories government has improved but I think that there still needs to be a great deal of improvement.

Agreement Includes Commitment To Constitutional Development

In April of 1982, at the last plebiscite, I know that a majority of the people of the communities that I represent voted "Yes" for division. I, myself, supported division. I supported it publicly with the belief that in voting for division we were also supporting a Dene homeland; and in the present case I find myself to be in the same position, because I have read the agreement and the clauses having to do with the constitutional development. I find them to be clear and I think there are enough guarantees in that agreement for people to vote in favour of the boundary agreement. But having said that, I also want to say that in supporting or endorsing the agreement, I do not want to mislead people into believing something that is not possible and I have to take the agreement at its word, that there is a serious intention to proceed with constitutional development in the Western Arctic. The commitment is there, and based on that I would like to endorse the agreement on a boundary. Those are the comments that I had, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Any more general comments? Mr. Angottitauruq.

Many Changes Since 1982 Plebiscite

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have commented before, yesterday, but I did not really clarify how my communities really stood toward the plebiscite -- not the plebiscite but toward the division boundary. So, I would like to clarify it truly from the views of the mayors in

my communities and the people I spoke to. When we say my communities do not support it, we mean that when we study input from the people and we have meetings with people, with a small majority this might be so. That is exactly what I did. I have spoken to a number of people, young and old, and I have spoken to all the mayors, who are the elected leaders of those communities, and it is the views of those people toward the boundary that I want to bring forward.

First of all, the mayors -- and since the time of the plebiscite they had in 1982, things have changed a lot. There is no doubt there have been a lot of changes. It may be a short five years, but in those short five years there has been talk toward division of the Northwest Territories. At the same time, there have been some new voters who have received powers to decide through voting -- to be entitled to vote. So regarding division of the Northwest Territories, in my constituency, in my communities, they have changed a lot since 1982, and this is how they feel. From that day on, the majority of the people I could meet with has opposed the boundary. As I said yesterday, I am willing to put forward my vote in the Assembly to have the plebiscite go through, and that is the only way I would find out exactly how my communities feel. I would not use my own private investigation toward how the people feel because I touch only a few people. When people go to the polls, they really tell how they feel.

Concerns Of Constituents

Before that, I would like to address a few concerns they have. For those people who have been negotiating the boundary, it has been a good thing for the Northwest Territories and it is only the good things we have heard. In the back of the minds of people there are concerns that they have and I would like to bring some of them out. They would want to know where the capital is going to be. They will want to know how government services will affect them after division. And what is the education system going to be like? How about treatments and going to the hospitals? And what about the economic development of the two new territories? So I believe the boundary issue has been playing a really important role for people and there have been some concerns. That is one of the reasons why the principle of the boundary that was proposed a few years ago has not been agreed upon. Those are just a few questions that have never been asked and I believe the negotiators would not answer them properly because when we try to do something and when we try to sell it to the people we only mean to say good things about what we are trying to sell.

I believe our Northwest Territories has some population and to divide it will bring better service to the native people. But I always believe a smaller number -- when a smaller number is put there, it is much weaker than a larger number. So before I make my final comments about the boundary -- I guess what I am trying to say as a person who sits in the Assembly is that I want to make people think twice before they really make a commitment when the plebiscite comes in. Because it is their decision we need as much as they need ours today.

So when the mayors had an executive council meeting this fall, right after the boundary and constitutional agreement was signed by the two forums, they were quite excited about the whole issue. Now they are saying they should have had the boundary over east of Pelly Bay, which means that they would rather get their services as they are used to, from Yellowknife as the capital. The reason, they said, is that if once we have division go through, we may end up just exactly like the Baffin Island people. In a way, we might start complaining that the capital is too far from us, for the reason that the boundary is going to be closer on their side. Those are a few things and they have a lot more concerns that have not been expressed. Those are just a few of the concerns they have and I would like to bring them out on their behalf.

Unacceptable Boundary Could Be Renegotiated

Then again, I have not changed my mind from yesterday. I would like to see the plebiscite go through; that is when I will finally know whether the people want division of the Northwest Territories or if they accept the boundary. From what I hear in my communities and the rest of the Northwest Territories, if that should be it, and if the majority of the people in the Northwest Territories said "No", the division issue is not going to die. The next negotiated boundary might be more acceptable to the people of Kitikmeot. They are not saying, "Let the boundary die." They just do not have a satisfactory feeling toward where it is going to be at this time.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks on what we are dealing with and I hope the best result comes in if they have a plebiscite this spring. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you, Mr. Angottitauruq. Any further general comments? Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I saved my general comments for almost the last because I wanted to hear some comments from the people who are being directly affected by this plebiscite. The feeling that I am getting from most of the Members is that, yes, there should be a plebiscite to give us some indicators on which direction this government should be taking. On the other hand, I have gone through this particular document and it does recognize, it affirms and guarantees the unique rights of the Indian, Inuit and Metis people. But that is all it does. It does not say anything about protecting those rights so that they are never eliminated. We also heard questions of people who went against this particular agreement, saying that it takes guts to go against a particular agreement. I would hope, too, that if this particular agreement was affirmed by the particular constituencies of those who are going against the agreement, that it would take guts for these MLAs to also resign because they have not gone with the wishes of their people. I would hope that it would work both ways.

The other thing with this particular agreement is with regard to the constitutional development with both forums. This is one area that I do have a bit of concern with, because if the Dene are going to be a minority, the type of constitution they would come up with would be quite different from what the Inuvialuit and the Inuit people would be coming up with. So there is another concern that I have.

Economic Potential Not Being Developed

I understand, too, that there is a lot of concern expressed by some of the Members with regard to, if you do not have an economic base, how could you be self-determining? I would have to say that this government and its policy have allowed a lot of federal policies which are questionable under the Canadian Charter of Rights and the Canadian Constitution to go unquestioned. I am saying that because there is a lot of economic potential over here, but this government has allowed that this be dictated by the federal government. The only way that it ever went in our favour is if it was challenged by this government under the Charter of Rights or that under the Canadian Constitution, you cannot do that sort of thing. I could only use as an example the egg quota that was given to us by the egg marketing board. The only reason they have done that is they do not want it to go to the Supreme Court of Canada. But the same thing could apply to the lumber industry up here, too. Those are areas that have a lot of economic potential. All our lumber is still shipped down south and we still have to buy our lumber from down south rather than from the people who produce it up here. The Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, too, dictates the amount of fish that we sell down south. They are the ones that we have to buy fish from, from Winnipeg, and we do not have the option of buying fish from Hay River, for example, which is where they ship their fish from.

In another area, I know that there is a decline in the seal industry but a tanning industry certainly would help people in the East perhaps in that particular area. I understand too, that some of the Members said that if you do not have the economic base, how can you have a government unless you have the money but I like to think that the economic base does not always turn to the dollar sign. I am saying this because most of the aboriginal people who live up here know how to live off the land, they know how to hunt, they know how to trap, they know how to fish and those are the resource people that tourism should rely on. There should be some flexibility in this government for this potential to be developed rather than restricting it through licensing and regulations and policies. As long as there is a certain quota, perhaps that is met, I think the aboriginal people should have that opportunity to practise those traditional ways of life so that they do support themselves and also are still practising what they know best.

The other area that I was concerned about was with regard to people referring to white man's government when they referred to this Legislature. I would like to maybe distinguish between two cultures that are here in this House. There is the aboriginal and there is the white culture. What is referred to as a consensus government is what traditionally was practised by the aboriginal people and the economic base that they have is not based on the dollar sign but rather out there on the land where they could support themselves. Whether division comes or not does not make any difference to them one way or the other. They still have an economic base that they could depend on for their livelihood. It is not always dollar signs that we should refer to.

Traditional Decision Making

Traditionally in the Dene communities, I could refer to the fact that, as far as recorded history goes, the aboriginal people did live up here for over 30,000 years -- that was way before Moses' time and Jesus' time -- and they have governed themselves quite effectively. They have survived

this long in the harshest land that is known to man. Now, how did they do that? They have not done that by having cultural clashes. But most of the decisions were based on collective decisions in the community or in the group of people that were up here. They lived with the animals, they lived with the seasons and they lived with the climate; and one person was selected to make the decision on where they should be going for the winter or for the summer or for the spring or for the autumn. That is the way, I hope, this particular agreement went and we did hear two leaders who represented the aboriginal people, the Inuit people and the Dene people, and this is what they think is best for the people they represent. Myself, as an aboriginal person representing a particular constituency, I would have to pretty well go along with what the leaders are saying. I would like to think that they have made the right decision and that it is up to us to live with the type of decision that was made.

The other problem that I hear from Members, that they keep referring to, is that we cannot govern ourselves. But really, self-determination is not what you have in a portfolio or what you have in a particular department but what you could get from a particular department to make yourself more self-reliant. In other words, maybe instead of the Ministers controlling the public servants, maybe the communities should be giving direction to these public servants as to the way that they should be going, especially to the people that they are serving. This is the direction that I would like to see it go. I realize that we do need a lot of training if you want to serve other than maybe the aboriginal people. But at the same time, you know, in order for the aboriginal people to be served, the people that are serving them have to know the type of unique culture that they have and they have to consider that when they are implementing or making a regulation or policy that directly affects them. Now this is the way that I see self-determination go -- that the government or the public servants are the resource people for the communities. The communities certainly could govern themselves if they had those resource people there to help along the way. As far as self-determination goes for the aboriginal people, they still have that option, to go either in a society that is totally foreign to their own culture or else stay to the one culture and still go on the land and be able to sustain their livelihood.

Boundary Viewed As Not Final

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that I will go along with the leaders that signed this particular agreement and that the decision that I make in supporting the agreement is the right one and that I do not cause any hardship with the other people that might be quite affected by this particular agreement. I would also like to say that once the plebiscite is held and decisions are made, that this agreement itself is not the final version of what constitutional development is and that the boundary is not the final boundary that is going to be final. I would also like to commend Mr. MacQuarrie for the job he has done representing the West in this particular agreement. I also miss the cartoons that he is usually in when it comes to division. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Any more general comments? If there are no more general comments, what is the wish of the committee? Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to be very long. I would have liked this time, since I gave my representative on the Western Constitutional Forum my support in attempting to work with other people of both forums to come to some kind of an agreement and to put forth a boundary which was their task -- I would have liked this time to be one of the good guys. It looks the way things are going, I am still going to be a bad guy because we are still trying to push from the WCF this thing forward. I was in the past criticized for not allowing it to go ahead, for not supporting division. I listened to the very skilful orators from the East over the past number of years many, many times and they have finally convinced me that division should go through. Now I come to it today, when it is around the corner, and the same people who convinced me over the past years are now trying to convince me to go back. I would have liked this time to say to my friend -- I do not like speaking about him when he is not here but everyone knows that Mr. Curley and I are good friends anyway -- I would have liked this time to have said to him, "Go home." I listened to him say that to me for about eight years. I thought now with division, I knew where home was. Now if there is no division I do not know whether I should stay here, go some place else or just where home is, but at my age I am finished travelling. I have been everywhere. I am staying here in the West.

Be Realistic About Attaining Dreams

I would have, as I say, liked to have been able to indicate to other people in the House that what we are trying to do is to allow people to reach their aspirations. I, as many of us do, dream. I spend a lot of time dreaming but I know that you cannot get everything you dream for; reality has

to come in somewhere. There are a lot of things that I would have liked to have had in the agreement. Personally, I would have liked to have had a better border, if you want to call it "border", or better boundary line but it was not going to happen. If somebody wants to dream for something, I think they should be realistic in what that dream is going to be. As I had indicated, I am only one of the Assembly and I was represented on the WCF by only one person, Mr. MacQuarrie, and I undertook to give him my support in what he was trying to do to reach an agreement with his other colleagues in WCF as well as meeting with people with NCF. He certainly had my support. I was under the impression, naive though it was, that the other representatives on both forums had the support of their people. Apparently, that is not it.

I will approve the agreement on division and I will approve the boundary line, thus allowing the plebiscite to take place, in which all peoples of the North will be able to indicate whether they like it. I believe that this is the only way that we can go. To do otherwise would, in my estimation, shirk the responsibilities that we have as legislators here. I believe it is time that the question was put to people. I would have hoped that those in the East who have indicated that they are for the approval of the agreement -- and hence, the plebiscite -- I would have hoped that they would have been able to see themselves prepared to go out to sell the division in their communities. I give my support, as I said and I know others have, to Mr. MacQuarrie but if there are eastern Members who are not prepared to go out, I do not know how they could expect me, a Kabloona, or people like me, to be Miceys on this kind of a deal. As I said, we were blamed in the past, if we are going to go around and sell it and they are not going to sell it, then we are going to be blamed again.

Granted, the boundary enclosed within it is not the ideal one but I do not believe anybody looking realistically at it expects to get all that they want to. There has to be some compromise, that is why we as a Legislature, put these people together, to work that out. They have come up with it, second time around. I think it is time that we look at this whole business and attempt to settle it. As I say, if you are going to dream, we will try to reach for something, make sure that it is attainable. I believe that there are enough checks and balances to allay any kind of fears or concerns of those concerned. Everybody has a veto on it, especially the entire population of the Territories in order to determine where this division is to be. If we settle the question whether it should be divided, we have to determine where. I am prepared to put this forward to the people of the Territories. That is all I have.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Any more general comments? Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I feel I have to comment since it is interfering with my constituency and I probably have more effect on that boundary line, more so than a lot of these people. When they first held a plebiscite in April, 1982, there were not too many people aware of what they were voting for. In some communities they had never heard of it and they were just told to go out and vote. Nothing was explained to them properly and they were very confused. A lot of them did not know what they were voting for and they went out and voted.

I realize their aspirations in Nunavut to have their own government, and they have my sympathy, because I know what it is like to live in a small community. My communities are not too far from the main centre, from headquarters, but many times I have a lot of problems communicating with the government and it takes a long time for anything to be accomplished. I know that feeling. What I cannot accept is that the proposed boundary as it stands -- I will not accept. Neither will my constituents be accepting it.

Proposed Boundary Cuts Across Traditional Hunting Ground Of Dene

How can they expect us to support a line when it cuts right down through their traditional hunting ground? The support probably would have been there if they had just considered that, but I do not believe they consulted with us enough. Instead they were so eager to sign off the agreement and dash off to Ottawa. That is putting the cart before the horse, as far as I am concerned. The line is not based on traditional land use. The Dene have been using that land. I remember when my father used to go trapping in the barren lands. So did my grandfather. They were trapping that area for many years and they were out there many times, over the proposed, so-called overlap boundary. The people of Snowdrift still maintain that area for their hunting and trapping. I am having a hard time when my neighbour from the next constituency is telling me that that is his traditional hunting ground, when originally he is from Scotland. No offence, Gordon.

I do not feel threatened by anyone. Not even by Steve Kakfwi to come in here when he mentioned an election year. The people at the community level are very smart. They know what we are doing and how hard some of us are working for them. We do not have to use this boundary line as an issue for election. Self-government is fine. I believe in that too. How many of our people are ready for it? We have to look up to people from the South to do some of our work, such as nurses, RCMP, teachers -- some of our people are training now, so we do have some teachers coming out, but how many lawyers, doctors? We still have to look south for resources for our own self-government and I think we should be concentrating our effort toward training some of our people, educating them to take over some of these responsibilities we are going to be faced with.

I did not think I would see the day that the people would come to us and dictate to us, but I see that is what happened yesterday. I do not think anyone has to dictate to us and tell us we have to support the boundary or we have to support the plebiscite. When we have meetings in the communities, many times I feel that our leaders are only hearing what they want to hear. They do not really hear what the people have to say. I was involved in some of the meetings that took place on WCF and at the meetings I attended, most of the people at the community level opposed it. When we went to Fort Res for a meeting on division, no one came from the Dene Nation. Only Larry Tourangeau was there, and Bob MacQuarrie came with us. The people were really upset. They wanted the land claims settled first, before division. They felt that it was too much talking about division and they still have not even settled their land claims.

My constituents expressed their dissatisfaction with the proposed agreement in the strongest possible terms. Unless a new line can be negotiated they will not support the plebiscite. In fact there is every indication that a strong opposition to the principle of the division may result if acceptable changes cannot be made. The most commonly expressed reason for the opposition is that the proposed boundary does not match the traditional land use pattern of the people in my constituency. They perceive that boundary as taking away their rights to the land they have used for generations. I will not endorse the agreement until they consider pushing that line back at least to where my constituency ends. They cut off a big portion of my constituency and they expect me to sit here and support that. It is almost like a joke to me. No way will I ever accept something like that. I would rather share the Thelon Game Sanctuary with the Eastern Arctic. Maybe that is something that should be considered, having two strong governments, east and west and let alone that division. The minute that you put a line through, people get very defensive. I do not want to go on and on and talk about this. I could sit here for hours saying the reason why the line should be pushed back. The people that I had meetings with explained themselves to me, where exactly they were, and that is away past the overlap. And even the overlap is too close to my area. Saying all these nice words -- "guaranteed", "protect our rights" -- as far as I am concerned that is not good enough. We have heard those words before and I am not just looking at myself, I am looking at a long-term thing for generation to generation and I am not only talking for myself. That is all I have to say. Mahsi cho.

---Applause

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

Motion To Defer Discussion Of Tabled Document 1-87(1), Carried

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not speak. I just wanted to move a motion. Mr. Chairman, I move that this committee defer discussion on Tabled Document 1-87(1) to Thursday, February 26, 1987 as the first item of business.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Nerysoo, could you repeat your motion, please?

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that this committee defer discussion of Tabled Document 1-87(1) to Thursday, February 26, 1987 as the first item of business.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Your motion is in order. To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 1-87(1), Appropriation Act, 1987-88

Department Of Municipal And Community Affairs

Community Works And Capital Planning, Total O And M

We are now dealing with Bill 1-87(1). We are on community works and capital planning on page 13.11. There was a motion on the floor.

Continuation Of Discussion On Motion That O and M For Community Works And Capital Planning Be Reduced By \$100,000

I will read the motion. I move that the O and M estimates for community works and capital planning be reduced by \$100,000. To the motion. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, I just want to very briefly indicate my support for Mr. McCallum's motion. We spoke many times last week about the problems that some of us have overall with this large deficit being proposed. We were asked and invited by the different Ministers of the government to point out specific areas where Members feel that the budget is fat. I have a large number of specific items which I will be proposing will be reduced as we come to those departments. Mr. McCallum is concerned about the proliferation of PYs and this is the first activity that has been put forward for consideration. He has pointed out that it is not necessarily required to increase PYs by the number proposed -- I believe it is three; that we take one out of the additional PYs, represented by a dollar figure, and he is using a round figure of \$100,000. I think it is reasonable. I do not think it will tie the hands of the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs to find the \$100,000 in this particular activity to reduce his O and M.

Mr. Chairman, we will need a lot of \$100,000 items to make up the \$20 million or so that I think that this overall budget is fat by. But this is a start and I would encourage Members of this committee and particularly Members of the standing committee on finance who, I understand, are in agreement that the overall budget is large. This is the first response to Ministers who have asked for specific responses and I think that the motion should be supported. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. To the motion. Mr. McQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not support this motion. I intend shortly to support a much grander motion for the reduction of the government's budget and if one is not put forward by somebody else, I certainly would consider putting it forward by myself. But I am persuaded that we should, in that exercise, leave as much flexibility as possible, with the government. I certainly will support any motions that recommend where cuts ought to be made. That is the approach that I would like to take -- supporting motions that recommend where specific cuts ought to be made without ordering them and then supporting a grander motion that effectively reduces the government budget. I hope that such a motion will come forward and I anticipate that such a motion will be coming forward and when it does I certainly intend to support that, Mr. Chairman.

Motion That O And M For Community Works And Capital Planning Be Reduced By \$100,000, Defeated

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

Mr. McCallum.

Motion To Recommend Reduction Of Community Works And Capital Planning PY Request By One PY, Carried

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I move that this committee recommends that the Department of Municipal and Cultural Affairs reduces its person year request in the activity community works and capital planning by one PY.

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Can we have a copy of your motion please? Mr. Pedersen.

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe there is any Community and Cultural Affairs department.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): We are just waiting for the copy of that motion. Okay, your motion is in order. For the record, I will ask the Clerk to read it for me.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): The Motion reads, Mr. Chairman, that this committee recommends that the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs reduces its PY request in the activity community works and capital planning by one person year.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Question has been called. All those in favour, raise your hands. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Community Works And Capital Planning, Total O And M, Agreed

We were in community works and capital planning. Total O and M, \$1,525,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Community Planning, Total O And M

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Community planning, total O and M, \$1,111,000. Agreed? Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I get an indication from the Minister what the two extra PYs are with regard to planning advice for local government; where they are going and what they are?

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. They are two positions. One for Baffin and one for Keewatin lands officers. Over the last few years there has been a major increase in the number of land applications coming in and we are making an attempt to regionalize the land application process, to streamline it and make it more responsive. We have a need to put a lands officer in every region over the next three to four years. We are justifying it on the number of applications and right now the Baffin and Keewatin have the two highest ratios of land applications. The plan calls for Baffin and Keewatin this year and Inuvik the year after. We had originally anticipated putting three in, one in Inuvik, one in Baffin and one in Keewatin, but I guess because of the downturn up there, the number of land applications has drastically dropped off in the Inuvik Region, so we think we can cover this from Yellowknife right now. But that is essentially what we want to do with them.

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

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the material that I have it is indicated that there is an increase here due to the addition of a senior planner at the headquarters level to provide an advisory service to tax-based municipalities, and a planning technician was to go to the Keewatin. Now I hear from the Minister that we have one going to the Baffin and one to the Keewatin. Does that mean, Mr. Chairman, that this additional PY in this particular task is not going to headquarters?

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The notes I have on the 7.8 new PYs I am asking for -- I am asking for 14.8 but 7 of them are to fund existing positions which were unfunded. I am asking for 7.8 new PYs. Those PYs are .5 of a PY in the Fort Simpson area office; .3 of a PY for the

recreation officer training in Baffin; one lands officer for Baffin; one lands officer for Keewatin; one planning engineer -- but that is in the community works and capital planning division. The planning engineer is the person who would set up the municipal works training program. In this there are two positions; one for Baffin, one for Keewatin.

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

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I recognize that the Minister had indicated that to me yesterday when we were talking about capital works and capital planning and when we get into the other activities, he will tell me about the increases under lands that will be going into that under municipal affairs, under sport and recreation. I am concerned with this PY. I want to know from the Minister, does he plan on adding another additional PY to the headquarters staff? That is all I asked. That is the information that we have from the standing committee. I would like to go beyond that again, Mr. Chairman, to ask the Minister, since he brought up the subject of the 7.8 PYs, to indicate to me where the Minister found the money to fund these unfunded positions. How are these positions paid for?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Mr. Butters, do you wish to speak right now?

Motion To Extend Sitting Hours, Carried

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to ask if it is appropriate to move a motion to extend the sitting hours until this item under discussion is concluded. If so, I will do so.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Your motion is in order. To the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Question has been called. All those in favour, raise your hands. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Mr. Chairman, my apologies. The Member is correct. In community planning there is a senior planner for Yellowknife to work with the tax-based municipalities and provide them with planning advice. So the Member is correct. And the other PY is a technician for the Keewatin Region.

Community Planning, Total 0 And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Community planning, total 0 and M, \$1,111,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Surveys And Mapping, Total 0 And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Surveys and mapping, total 0 and M, \$343,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Arctic Airports, Total 0 And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Arctic airports, total 0 and M, \$711,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Sport And Recreation, Total O And M

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Sport and recreation, total O and M, \$5,859,000. We are under sport and recreation, page 13.15. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, I understand that on this activity there is also an increase in PYs and if I recall, sir, the reason for two of the PYs was because of the fast-tracking of these capital projects at this time. I am wondering if the Minister could confirm that the increase in PYs in this instance is a temporary matter and that we would see a reduction a year from now. I wonder if the Minister could say that with a straight face and have me believe it, that if we increase the PYs here because of the fast-tracking of projects, that he will come back a year from now asking that we please reduce those two PYs out of this activity.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if Mr. Richard will believe me. They are two-year term positions and the reason they are two-year is that most of the facilities will not get under way until the summer or late fall of 1987, which means that the construction is going to be continuing into 1989. But they are two-year term positions and yes, when the two-year term positions are up, they will no longer be required by this division.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Sport and recreation, total O and M. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: I asked this question earlier this week in a general way about the effect on the O and M budget of the fast-tracking of recreational facilities this coming year. It is in this particular activity, I take it, that because of the government's subsidy of the approved operating costs of these recreational facilities in the communities, this activity's O and M budget will increase drastically in a year and two years from now.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We anticipate the increases to be in the order of about \$800,000. That is the O and M component of the new recreational facilities. Thank you.

Sport And Recreation, Total O And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Sport and recreation, total O and M, \$5,859,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Municipal Affairs, Total O And M

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Municipal affairs, total O and M, \$35,136,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, after the Minister's opening remarks on Monday, I had asked him about the government's plan to implement the many recommendations of the Watson report. The Minister in his response, as I recall, only referred to the fact that we will have, later this session, a new Property Assessment and Taxation Act placed before us. Without even seeing it, I anticipate that legislation does not address all of the recommendations of the Watson report. The Minister has kindly let me see a copy of that report. The report clearly points out the many inequities of the property taxation system that exists currently in the NWT. Most of the communities -- I should say the property owners in those communities -- certainly with respect to school taxes, have been paying the same taxes per property unit for the last 15 or 20 years.

That leads to many inequities, as is pointed out very graphically in the Watson report. So I would like to ask the Minister at this time when we are dealing with municipal affairs if he could deal specifically with some of those other problems and tell me what specifically is the department or

the government doing with that report. It has been in the hands of the government, I believe, since April of last year, almost a year ago. And one of the items that is pointed out in that report is that there have been previous reports that have simply sat on the shelf and, through procrastination or whatever, there has never been any work done at improving the property taxation system. I would hope that with the time that has been spent by those consultants and by many government officials participating in that report and likely the high cost of producing that report, that some action should be taken and perhaps should have been taken by now, since the report was received some 10 months ago. I would ask the Minister to respond in that context, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

Decision Paper On Review Of Property Taxation System

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the Member that there are many inequities in the property taxation system. The Department of Finance, in conjunction with the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs, is working on a decision paper for the Executive Council. The decision paper was delayed for a while, simply because of the co-ordination that was required on the legislation. The same people were doing the same thing and so we decided to make the legislation a priority; but the same people are working on the decision paper. It is our intention to move toward getting rid of the inequities and inequalities in the way in which we tax, particularly, moving away in all cases from the -- as you know, many buildings in the non-tax-based areas are based on an assessed value. I think they are using the year 1967. Well, we have to bring all of those up to the same level right across the Territories and provide some rationale for at least increasing property taxes, the minimal rate that would be equivalent to at least the inflation rate.

The Member can appreciate that it is a very complex problem. It is one that has not been attended to in the past and I think the Member referred to that, that it has not been attended to, but we are determined to use this Watson report to attempt to bring some rationality to the system and to make some sense out of it. As I said, the Department of Finance and my own department, Municipal and Community Affairs, are in the process of preparing a decision paper for the Executive Council. I am not exactly sure when that decision paper will be ready. The wish or the goal we have set is to have a paper ready for the priorities and planning committee by April of this year. At present, we are on target for that date, which would mean that if it goes to P and P in April that the Executive would get it probably within a couple of weeks of going to P and P.

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

Development Costs For Lands Selected In Claims

MS COURNOYEA: Mr. Chairman, in regard to municipal affairs and the selection of land within communities for Dene selection of land in the claims, would the Minister be able to apprise me of what arrangement is being made in terms of the development of those particular lands? Who will be paying the development cost? Who will be paying the taxation, as these lands are within the community, and will the property around and beyond the lands take up the total development cost or is the federal government going to be required to put forth money toward this territorial government to develop those particular lands?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: We have not addressed that question yet. We are just barely now beginning to get into defining the criteria and process for land selection. We really have not addressed the question of who is going to be responsible for development cost.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Municipal affairs, total O and M, \$35,136,000. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if this municipal affairs section is the section that deals with the assessment of property and if it is, I would like to ask the Minister whether or not when people have their houses or their property assessed for taxes, whether there is an appeal process on the value at which their property is assessed -- whether there is a way that people can appeal these assessments.

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, there is an appeal procedure. I am not sure, but it is either 60 or 90 days after receipt of the assessment notice. So there is a two or three month appeal period in which an individual can appeal the assessment.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Municipal affairs. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to similarly get an indication from the Minister of the projection for an increase on O and M or the grants and contributions. As I understand it, sir, here the \$30 million in grants and contributions, which is a large part of this total O and M, is the money that is the financial support that is given to municipalities; and what is the projected increase in that figure as a result of the capital projects that are currently being proposed in the communities? The figure that the Minister gave earlier under sport and recreation, Mr. Chairman, of \$800,000 is, as I see it, roughly 50 per cent higher than what is currently being spent on that item over in sport and recreation, the assistance for operating the recreational facilities. In the \$30 million figure, could the Minister indicate what is the projection of the increase in that figure as a result of the capital projects presently being proposed? Thank you.

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

Projected Growth In O And M Costs

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The overall growth that we are projecting, which covers everything but not the recreation, which we have covered off in the recreation budget, is about 3.5 per cent -- roughly one million dollars.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, just a comment. This is the sort of projection that, I indicated earlier, from my sitting through the discussions in January in the standing committee on finance meetings, that this department does have some hard and fast figures for the results of the many capital projects down the road. I think if we transfer that through all of the capital projects throughout the entire government it is plain to see, Mr. Chairman, that there is going to be an increased growth in the total O and M requirements of this government two years down the road. And it is hardly likely, Mr. Chairman, that this government or its successor will be able to reduce the growth in O and M to zero from the \$50 million level presently being experienced across the government. So these responses from this Minister, Mr. Chairman, simply confirm my major concern that the government in its overall fiscal framework is being totally unrealistic in its assumptions. Thank you.

Municipal Affairs, Total O And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Municipal affairs, total O and M, \$35,136,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Lands, Total O And M

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Lands, total O and M, \$756,000. Agreed? Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Just a point of clarification. I would like to ask the Minister what the situation is right now with regard to property tax when it comes to status Indians. I understand that under the Indian Act the lands that were designated for Indians were given to the King. Is it still the situation now that where a native person owns property that this government charges the Government of Canada rather than the individual? Is that the situation right now?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. The Member is referring to taxes on lands reserved for Indians. Our position with Indian Affairs is that it is Indian Affairs' responsibility to pay the taxes on that land. We believe that Indian Affairs has given the direction to federal Public Works to pay those taxes, but we have not got them to put it in writing yet. But that is our position, that Indian Affairs are responsible for paying those taxes.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Does the Municipal and Community Affairs department still mail property tax directly to individuals regardless of whether they are on lands reserved for Indians or not? Because I understand that in the communities anybody that has a dwelling or a piece of property is mailed a property tax assessment regardless.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: I am advised that it was not our practice, but it may have happened this year because of Indian Affairs advising the assessment department that they were no longer going to be responsible. But for next year, our position is that those tax notices should be mailed to the Department of Indian Affairs.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Lands, total O and M, \$756,000. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for further clarification with regard to the last comment regarding the issuance of assessments on federal lands. Are the individuals that have received the assessment going to be responsible for paying those particular taxes or is it still going to be the federal government that is going to have the responsibility?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are holding the federal government responsible. That is our position.

Lands, Total O And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Lands, total O and M, \$756,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Detail Of Grants And Contributions

Total Grants

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Page 13.18, detail of grants and contributions. Total grants, \$846,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Total Contributions

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Contributions. Total contributions, \$36,106,000. Agreed? Mr. Nerysoo.

Structure Of Sport North

MR. NERYSOO: Just with regard to Sport North and that particular contribution -- and I realize that it is only a portion of the contribution -- has the Minister had an opportunity to have discussions with Sport North and consider the idea of reorganizing the structure of that particular organization?

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. Yes, I have had discussions with them, not specifically in terms of restructuring the organization but to see how better the organization could perhaps do little programs in the small communities in the regions. There is a debate right now taking place between ourselves and Sport North as to who would be better to do that job. There is a school of thought which says that perhaps our recreation people at the regional level may be better to assist

community bodies to affiliate themselves with Sport North. That is an ongoing debate right now. We are very actively pursuing the whole idea of how to improve, I guess, Sport North's profile in the small communities or at least to get information to communities as to what Sport North is all about and how it can assist people and things like that. We are working with Sport North on preparing information programs and things like that. I have met with the Sport North officials twice and my people are in constant touch with them.

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

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you. I appreciate the efforts of the Minister but if I could maybe make a recommendation to the Minister to maybe reorganize the structure and I say that in terms of not all organizations being involved, but more that the board membership of the organization -- with respect it is a good idea for the various organizations and various sport associations to make presentations as to how and whether or not there are going to be funds allocated to particular organizations throughout the Northwest Territories, or parent organizations such as the NWT Basketball Association or the Volleyball Association but I have difficulty with the idea of them sitting as the directors of Sport North, you might say. I can understand if they reduce the number of board members to be reflective of some of the regions throughout the North, but with those people making the decisions after presentations from the particular organizations, the manner in which it is now run causes me concern because in reality it is always the parent organizations that are more organized and, therefore, the communities have a tendency to lose out because they do not have a relationship at all to the parent organization. So it is just a concern I have and I think it is something for your discussions. I have to probably make my own presentation to Sport North very quickly but it is an issue that ought to be raised and ought to be addressed. We have to somehow reduce the number of board members involved but as well be reflective of representation from regions. That is just a concern I have.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Mr. Minister, do you wish to make a comment on that?

HON. GORDON WRAY: No, the Member was giving me advice.

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

MR. GARGAN: Thank you. Just on a point of clarification. You have a legal agreement signed between Sport North and your department. How long is this legal agreement for and also does it bind you to make a contribution of \$382,000 until the agreement...

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you. It is a two year agreement and yes, it is an agreement on the funding.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Gargan.

Lotteries As A Source Of Revenue

MR. GARGAN: We could make suggestions where there are areas where we could make cuts. I am just wondering with regard to this Sport North. I know I mentioned this when we were in Department of Finance regarding lotteries and what is the department's position with regard to lotteries and to accumulate, maybe, revenues for the North, just as most provinces do have lotteries for revenues. I would like to find out what this department is doing, presumably Sport North is the one that takes care of lotteries, and whether there is potential there for northerners to make contributions and also get people to win in these lotteries from up here.

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Member would allow me to perhaps not answer that at this time but provide him with a letter outlining the various responsibilities because I know that Sport North has a franchise on certain tickets and they can subfranchise that out. I also know that some lotteries can be obtained by communities. I just do not have all the information at hand right now but I can get the information and provide it to the Member.

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

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I have no problem with waiting for the information.

Motion To Report Progress, Defeated

Also, Mr. Chairman, I move that you report progress.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Okay, we have a motion on the floor. All those in favour?

MR. RICHARD: I thought we were going to finish this department.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): All those in favour, raise your hand. Opposed, if any? The motion is defeated.

---Defeated

Total Contributions, Agreed

Total contributions, \$36,106,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

Total Grants And Contributions, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Total grants and contributions, \$36,952,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

School Levies And Property Taxation

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Detail of work performed on behalf of third parties. That is on pages 13.21, 13.22, 13.23 and 13.24. That is an information item. Any comments? Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: On Monday when we were in this department I had asked the Minister to provide me with some information about school levies. He said that he would. I note then, on page 13.25, on revenues, recoveries and transfer payments, that the school levies are to increase by \$91,000 and the property taxation is to drop by \$461,000. Can the Minister indicate to me, though his colleagues said they wanted to increase the school levy by 10 per cent, why the school levies are only expected to increase by \$91,000 then?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Two answers. First of all the property taxes dropped by \$461,000 because of Norman Wells. They have since become a municipality. Norman Wells is now a village, a tax-based municipality, so the taxes do not show up in our budget any more; they show up in Norman Wells. The school levies only show a \$91,000 increase because the decision that was announced the other day was just made so they are not reflected in this document. The decision to raise the school taxes by 10 per cent are not reflected in the main estimates.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: May I have an indication from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is it 10 per cent of the \$1.5 million that you are now going to increase it by?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Yes, that is a rough approximation.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): We will go back to Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Minister, where is the information that we were going to get on this?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: I believe my colleague, Mr. Butters, was preparing the information.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Butters, do you wish to make a comment?

HON. TOM BUTTERS: No, the Member will have an opportunity to bring the matter up again under the Department of Finance because as the Minister has indicated, it is a matter that is being handled between the two departments and he can bring it up then. I will have the full information for him.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): We will go back to page 13.09. Mr. McCallum.

Proposed Increase In Person Years

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some idea from the Minister on the proposed increase in PYs. He indicated that he was looking for 7.3 new ones. Are there now people in positions generated by these PYs?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Not in the 7.8, in the other seven there are. There are 14.8 new positions that we are asking for here; the 7.8 are ones that do not have anybody and seven of them are what we call unfunded positions but yes, there are bodies in those jobs.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: But in the ones that there is nobody in, of the positions generated by those PYs there is not anybody now fulfilling that particular position, is that correct?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Correct, Mr. Chairman, with the exception of the Baffin recreation officer trainee, which is the 0.3 PY. She will no longer be a trainee as of January of next year, she will come on full-time, so we need 0.3 to cover those three months.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we were talking about this and the motion has been taken on it. I just have some difficulty then with the kind of response that the Minister gave to me when we were talking about PYs back on Monday, that if we were to take one of these new PYs with nobody in it, as he has suggested or told me now, and we were to deduct salaries associated with it or costs associated with it, I have some difficulty with the comments of the Minister that, you know, it could wipe out two regional positions because that is the sum of two regional positions. You cannot wipe anything out if there is nobody in it. I will have to lay somebody off who is already working -- well, there is not anybody working in those particular positions. He just indicated that there is not anybody. You cannot lay off anybody if you do not have anybody in the position.

He may have to cut down on some kind of capital project, like the Fort Smith swimming pool, which is \$105,000. Well, I can indicate to him, even though it was said in a jocular fashion and maybe other people took it the wrong way -- I can give him a list of things in his capital projects that he could cut out in the Keewatin -- very easily, a six bay parking garage in Baker Lake. Maybe he could cut it down to four bays or three.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. McCALLUM: At Eskimo Point, the renovations to the hamlet office of \$800,000 -- maybe you could do it for \$700,000. There are many of those places around.

Vacancy Rate In Department

I just do not understand, Mr. Chairman, why the Minister in response to something that I believe is of a serious nature, can indicate in the response that he is going to have to lay people off. The Minister has indicated to me now, told me in point of fact, there is nobody in the positions -- the new ones they are looking for. He already has the money for the 7.8 PYs. He gets that money from the unfilled positions, his vacancy rate, that he has been carrying in the instance of the second

assistant deputy minister, for a matter of eight to 10 months. Now, he thought he was doing well because he is keeping his vacancy rate down. Granted, we gave him the right PY to hire an assistant deputy minister, but he has not hired one because he is reorganizing the department. But he used the money that we gave him there to provide for the funding of hiring other people. In point of fact, Mr. Chairman, in this booklet that we have, if he gets 14.8 new PYs he will have a department total of 145.3 for which he has a total of 172.8 positions. What I would like to ask the Minister now, Mr. Chairman, is how many positions does the department have vacant and are there any others of those positions that the department has that have been vacant such as the ADM, for more than six months?

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

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member correctly quoted what I said on Monday. What I said was that if the determination is by cutting \$100,000 from my budget, I still have to assess the priority of that particular activity. We say that we needed that one position to make sure that the capital projects go ahead and my choice is to cut two positions. That is the only choice I have. If I do not get the \$100,000 I have got to find it somewhere else, if the determination is that I have got to hire that person. So that is what I was indicating. It is not just a choice of cutting out a position. If there is work that is needed to be done and somebody has to do it, something else may have to be sacrificed.

With regard to the vacancy rate and the comments on the ADM position. What I did on the ADM position was -- although again it is somebody that is needed -- I had instructed the department to try and bring down the number of unfunded positions that we are carrying and to manage within our budget at least for the balance of this year and therefore it was a management decision not to fill the ADM position in order to do that. We have three positions which have been vacant for more than six months. One position is a planner and another position is a community planner. Both of those positions went through reclassification. The people quit, then it went through reclassification, it went out to competition twice, we could not find people to fill them and that is the reason why they have taken so long to fill. There is one more position which has been vacant for six months. This other position is the aquatic program co-ordinator which is a seasonal position for summer months so we have left it vacant over the winter because nobody swims up here in the wintertime, outside. So we do not need the position. All the other positions are of a short nature. With respect, I know the documents that you have show 172.8 PYs. In fact, that is not quite correct. I have 164.8. Two of those positions are funded by MOT; one of those positions was a land claims co-ordinator which I dropped and five of them were what we were originally going to put in community planning positions. They are no longer there. So there are eight positions off since these documents were produced. The actual number is 164.8. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Total O And M

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Total O and M, \$49,189,000. Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister, of this \$49 million in total O and M, does he not feel that there could be some volunteer payments reduction of that dollar figure in this department? I notice, Mr. Chairman, over on one of the summary pages at the beginning of the main estimates document that this government as a whole anticipates lapsing main estimate appropriation to the tune of \$19 million in this coming year and I believe we were told in the standing committee on finance that that is comprised of a \$14 million lapse in O and M total and a five million dollar lapse in capital total, and that therefore, the \$14 million lapse in the O and M of the entire government was calculated at approximately two per cent of the government's O and M.

Now, this Minister, Mr. Chairman, has as good a working knowledge of his department's expenditures as any Minister in this government and he has been with the government, the Executive Council, for a number of years. He has seen the lapses happen. The government are being realistic in their projections by acknowledging on the summary page that lapses will occur to the tune of two per cent. Can the Minister advise us what portion of the \$49 million in O and M, in his experience, will lapse in the coming year? If the two per cent figure is applied that is roughly one million dollars. Now this department is not like other departments and each department is different. Maybe the two per cent figure is low for Municipal Affairs, maybe it is low for Public Works, I do not know. I know this, Mr. Chairman, that the government is acknowledging that there are going to be lapses. For myself, speaking personally, I would just as soon not give them the \$19 million

authority. Take the \$19 million off the \$789 million and give them \$770 million; they are saying in effect that is all they need in total. But getting down to this department, if those lapses are expected to happen, could this Minister get by with \$48 million instead of \$49 million?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

Departments Differ In Lapses

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member is correct inasmuch as there are lapses, but he is also correct when he says departments are different from each other. This is one of the departments in the government where there are not many lapses simply because most of the money goes out in the form of grants and contributions. Last year we lapsed less than one per cent of our total budget. If we were to do that again this year, for example, the lapses would only really come on the money that is expended at the headquarters level. That is only six million dollars of this total budget. Even if we went on last year's lapse rate -- and it could be higher this year, we do not know -- but going with last year's rate, the lapse in this \$49 million may only have been in the neighbourhood of \$60,000 to \$80,000. This is not one of the departments in which O and M can lapse a lot, because of the high number of grants and contributions that we give out.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, since the Minister is educating me in this area, could he tell me which departments are the ones that lapse O and M dollars?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: I have a hard enough time worrying about my own two departments without knowing the lapse rate of other departments. That probably would be something that we could get for the committee in terms of what last year's lapse rates were like. In Municipal and Community Affairs, however, there has been a substantial lapse rate over the years in the capital side. In the O and M side, no, but in the capital side there has been and there probably will be lapses this year again. They are very difficult to judge; you can only really go on the trend figure because you never know what is going to happen. A searift could miss, or bad weather, and a building might not get built -- there are a number of things that could happen but really, on the O and M side not much has lapsed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Richard.

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Chairman, I hear this first Minister, whose budget we are considering first, I hear him saying that of the \$14 million in lapses in O and M, very little is allocated to his department. I would like to ask the Minister, or perhaps the Minister of Finance should respond, when those who crafted this budget sat down and arrived at the \$14 million figure, did they look at the uniqueness of the various departments and the differences in the departments, the difference in lapse rates over the past, or did they, in fact, apply a two per cent factor to the total O and M? Because, Mr. Chairman, the problem I have is if we put each of the Ministers in the hot seat and they give a response like this Minister, then where does the \$14 million lapse come from? If they say, "Oh, not my department", well then that means, Mr. Chairman, that they are saying that the deficit will not be \$55 million, it will be \$75 million this year. Now someone has got to own up to the \$14 million lapses in O and M. It has got to come from some department. Now this Minister is owning up to \$60,000 or \$80,000, and we have a long way to go on lapses.

Projections Questioned

Mr. Chairman, I say these things in the context of my remarks last week that I have a concern about the projections. I do not recall in previous years the government acknowledging the predictability of lapses but to their credit -- I will give them credit on this one -- to their credit they are acknowledging that that is a fact of life and we are going to have lapses. In the context of the overall deficit, I say we should not be voting those projected lapses, we should not even be asked to vote them. And as it applies to one department, if we apply a two per cent factor-- unless I am told otherwise, I am assuming that is the only method in which the government did it -- then one million dollars of this \$49 million is not going to be spent on our best projections, so why are you not asking us for \$48 million instead of \$49 million?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: The Minister of Finance can answer overall on the lapse rate, but just to indicate to the Member that last year the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs lapsed about 0.6 per cent of its O and M budget and about four per cent of its capital budget. Now, those were last year's figures.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, the lapse rate is not determined by an examination, department by department of the experience in previous years. A global figure is developed on past experience in a global sense, so Mr. Richard is right. I do not have the figures with me now, but I could provide for the committee an indication of lapse rates in the past. If you did see a lapse in any one particular year, you would have to look at the particular circumstances related and associated with that lapse. It could be a one time only arrangement which would cause it but I could provide figures for the committee if desired.

Total O And M, Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Total O and M, \$49,189,000. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): That is the end of the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs. I will rise to report progress.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Erkloo.

ITEM 18: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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; BILL 1-87(1), APPROPRIATION ACT, 1987-88

MR. ERKLOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Tabled Document 1-87(1), Bill 1-87(1) and Bill 7-87(1). Mr. Speaker, I wish to report that Tabled Document 1-87(1) has been deferred and further, that your committee has been considering Bill 1-87(1), Appropriation Act, 1987-88, and wishes to report that the Department of Municipal and Community Affairs has been concluded, with the amount of \$49,189,000 for operations and maintenance.

Motion To Accept Report Of Committee Of The Whole, Carried

Mr. Speaker, I move that the report of the committee of the whole be concurred with. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the whole, are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Carried

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

ITEM 19: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Orders of the day for Thursday, February 26th, at 1:00 p.m.

1. Prayer
2. Ministers' Statements
3. Members' Statements
4. Returns to Oral Questions

5. Oral Questions
6. Written Questions
7. Returns to Written Questions
8. Replies to Opening Address
9. Petitions
10. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
11. Tabling of Documents
12. Notices of Motion
13. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
14. Motions
15. First Reading of Bills
16. Second Reading of Bills
17. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Tabled Document 1-87(1); Bill 1-87(1); Bill 7-87(1)
18. Report of Committee of the Whole
19. Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. This House stands adjourned until Thursday, February 26th, at 1:00 p.m.

---ADJOURNMENT

Available from the
Publications Clerk, Department of Culture and Communications
Government of the Northwest Territories, Yellowknife, N.W.T.
\$1.00 per day; \$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