



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

9th Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD  
Official Report  
**DAY 31**

**THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1987**

**Pages 1281 to 1315**

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

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## Speaker

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

Angottitauruq, Mr. Michael, M.L.A.  
Gjoa Haven, N.W.T.  
X0E 1J0  
Office (403) 360-6600  
(Natilikmiot)

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

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

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

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

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

Curley, Mr. 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)

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 Central)

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, The Hon. Ludy, M.L.A.  
P.O. Box 240  
Resolute, N.W.T.  
X0A 0V0  
Home (819) 252-3719  
(High Arctic)  
Minister of Culture &  
Communications and Government  
Services

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  
Economic Development & Tourism

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  
THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1987

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	1288
Returns to Oral Questions	1288,1290
Oral Questions	1288
Returns to Written Questions	1289
Petitions	1292
Tabling of Documents	1292
Notices of Motion	1293
Motions	1293
First Reading of Bills	
- Bill 3-87(1) Charter Communities Act	1309
- Bill 4-87(1) Child Day Care Act	1311
- Bill 5-87(1) Cities, Towns and Villages Act	1310
- Bill 10-87(1) Hamlets Act	1310
- Bill 15-87(1) Local Authorities Elections Act	1310
- Bill 16-87(1) Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act	1312
- Bill 21-87(1) Settlements Act	1310
- Bill 22-87(1) Statute Law (Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms) Amendment Act	1312
- Bill 23-87(1) Statute Revision Act	1312
- Bill 32-87(1) International Child Abduction Act	1312
- Bill 33-87(1) Public Service Vehicles Act	1311
- Bill 34-87(1) Public Service Act	1311

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	<u>PAGE</u>
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 27-87(1) Territorial Parks Act	1313
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 27-87(1) Territorial Parks Act	1314
Orders of the Day	1315

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1987

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Curley, Mr. Erkloo, Mr. Gargan, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. McCallum, Hon. Bruce McLaughlin, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Paniloo, Hon. Dennis Patterson, Hon. Red Pedersen, Hon. Ludy Pudluk, Mr. Richard, Mr. T'Seleie, Mr. Wah-Shee, Hon. Gordon Wray

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Wah-Shee): Orders of the day for Thursday, May 28, 1987.

Item 2, Ministers' statements.

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

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to advise the House that in the absence of the Hon. Tom Butters, I will be acting as Government House Leader. As Members know, Mr. Butters is in Ottawa attending the funeral of the late Air Marshal Campbell. I will respond to any matters directed to Mr. Butters. I will also respond to any questions for the Hon. Michael Ballantyne, who as the House knows, is attending the federal-provincial meetings of Ministers of Justice.

The Government Leader advised Members of his absence in Whitehorse at the federal-provincial meetings of Ministers responsible for regional economic development. The Hon. Dennis Patterson will respond to any questions for Mr. Sibbeston. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Item 4, returns to oral questions. Mr. Pudluk.

ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Return To Question 0147-87(1): Contract With Outcrop Ltd. Re NWT Data Book

HON. LUDY PUDLUK: (Translation) I have a return to Question 0147-87(1) asked by Mr. McCallum on March 19, 1987, regarding the NWT Data Book. The NWT Data Book is privately published and distributed by Outcrop Ltd. This government does not have any contracts or other agreements with the publisher. When their new edition comes out, we normally make a bulk purchase of copies of the book from them for our own government use, taking advantage of their volume discount rate. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 4, returns to oral questions. Item 5, oral questions. Mr. Erkloo.

ITEM 5: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 0166-87(1): Air Fares, Kitikmeot Region

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question will be directed to Hon. Ludy Pudluk, the Minister responsible for Government Services. In the central Kitikmeot Region we heard that the airplane fares were lowered, so I want to ask the honourable Minister how much air fare the people from the Kitikmeot Region would be saving in 1987-88 with regard to airplane fares.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Pudluk.

HON. LUDY PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, at the moment I do not have the correspondence with me. Perhaps while we are dealing with oral questions, I will be able to answer your question before we go on to the other items. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 5, oral questions.

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

ITEM 7: RETURNS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, the following returns have been filed: Return to written Question W22-87(1), asked by Mr. T'Seleie of the Minister of Government Services; Return to written Question W31-87(1), asked by Ms Cournoyea of the Minister of Renewable Resources; Return to written Question W27-87(1), asked by Mr. T'Seleie of the Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs.

Return To Question W22-87(1): Cost Of Heating Fuel From Norman Wells Refinery

The Hon. Ludy Pudluk's return to Question W22-87(1), asked by Mr. T'Seleie on March 3, 1987, regarding heating fuel costs:

1. What is the cost per litre to the consumer of home heating fuel in Fort Franklin, Fort Norman and Fort Good Hope?

Fort Franklin	48.0 cents per litre
Fort Norman	46.0 cents per litre
Fort Good Hope	46.0 cents per litre

2. What price does the government pay for this fuel at the Norman Wells refinery?

Fort Franklin	32.98* cents per litre
Fort Norman	26.60 cents per litre
Fort Good Hope	26.60 cents per litre

\* Fort Franklin is resupplied by winter road in February of each year by truck. The product price is higher due to the changing market conditions and the increased cost at Norman Wells associated with loading trucks rather than barges in July for Fort Good Hope and Fort Norman.

3. How is the price arrived at in determining the final price to consumers in each of these communities?

	<u>Fort Franklin</u> Cents/Litre	<u>Fort Norman</u> Cents/Litre	<u>Fort Good Hope</u> Cents/Litre
Product Cost	32.98	26.60	26.60
Other O & M Costs	7.12	14.60	10.36
Commissions	7.90	4.80	9.04
Price to Consumers	<u>48.00</u>	<u>46.00</u>	<u>46.00</u>

Other O & M costs include: O & M allowance, bad debt allowance, loss allowance and subsidy costs.

Return To Question W27-87(1): Regional Council Funding

The Hon. Gordon Wray's return to Question W27-87(1), asked by Mr. T'Seleie on March 9, 1987, regarding regional council funding:

In response to the six-part question put forward by Mr. T'Seleie, the following information is provided in accordance with each part:

Part 1

I am unable to provide the total funding each regional council received in the fiscal year 1986-87 as regional councils receive funds from various departments within this government as well as the federal government in certain cases.

Following is the assistance provided by my department including the values of any assistance in kind, where applicable, and as it relates to those areas normally considered under the general funds section of the policy on assistance to regional councils.

<u>Council</u>	<u>MACA Contribution</u>	<u>Assistance In Kind</u>	<u>Total</u>
Baffin	\$270,360		\$270,360
Keewatin	207,830		207,830
Kitikmeot	173,000		173,000
Shihta	122,500	\$26,400 *1	148,900
Dogrib	124,600		124,600
Deh Cho	146,200	49,200 *2	195,400
<u>Unincorporated/Developing</u>			
South Slave	109,500	19,770 *3	129,270
Beaufort-Delta	89,300		89,300
Delta Tribal	25,000		25,000
COPE	50,000		50,000

\*1 Figure represents the assessed value of double-wide trailer provided by the GNWT to Shihta for \$1.00 for an office, the payment for utilities and janitorial services at \$8400 and minor renovations to the trailer in the amount of \$3000.

\*2 The GNWT provides 1230 sq.ft. of office space in their Fort Simpson area office. This figure represents an annual market value determined at \$25.00 per sq.ft. which includes a utility portion of approximately \$6600.

\*3 The GNWT provides 659 sq.ft. of space in a government building for the office of the South Slave Council. The annual market value of this space in Fort Resolution is estimated to be \$30.00 per sq.ft. which includes an annual utility portion of \$3400.

Part 2

Funds provided from Municipal and Community Affairs under the regional and tribal councils budget item are provided as a total contribution. Allocations are unconditional in that there is no specific amount designated for base funding related expenditures. The allocation is not calculated on any formula method. For the past three fiscal years, allocations have been determined on the funding provided in 1983-84 and the application each following year of the GNWT's government growth factor, inflation factor, of that particular year.

Part 3

Given the approach outlined in Part 2 of this question, allocations are not made according to specific categories. The 1986-87 fiscal year audits will not be available till sometime in the next fiscal year. Based on the 1985-86 audits received to date by the department, the following chart reflects expenditures of the regional councils in the areas the MLA has requested:

<u>Council</u>	<u>Travel</u>	<u>Accommodation/Meals</u>	<u>Honoraria</u>	<u>General Meeting Costs</u>
<u>Keewatin</u>	Combined Travel/Accom/Meals \$108,080		\$40,225	\$ 1,875
<u>Baffin</u>				
General Meetings	\$30,262	\$ 9,813	\$14,975	\$20,650
Executive	17,982	25,405	23,053	0
Baffin Total	\$48,244	\$ 35,218	\$38,028	\$20,650



<u>Council</u>	<u>Travel</u>	<u>Accommodation/Meals</u>	<u>Honoraria</u>	<u>General Meeting Costs</u>
Deh Cho Combined	Transportation/Accom	Meals		
	\$93,222	\$6,938	Not identified	Not identified
<u>Dogrib</u>				
General Meeting	Combined			
	\$17,964		\$13,300	Not identified
Executive	Combined			
	8,237		5,800	Not identified
Dogrib Total	\$26,201		\$19,100	

<u>Council</u>	<u>Travel</u>	<u>Accommodation/Meals</u>	<u>Honoraria</u>	<u>General Meeting Costs</u>
----------------	---------------	----------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

Kitikmeot

(Audited statement not available. Information taken from council financial statement)  
 Council Meetings \$53,255 \$14,342 \$ 8,843 \$ 210

Shihta

General Meeting (1)	7,055	5,812	14,690	4,974
General Meeting (2)	3,811	4,495	6,300	699
Executive (1)	6,508	7,401	4,708	250
Executive (2)	1,727	1,017	95	
Shihta Total	\$19,101	\$18,725	\$25,793	\$5,893

Part 4

The number of communities represented in each regional council and the voting delegates in each council, according to the Regional and Tribal Councils Act, are as follows:

<u>Council</u>	<u>Number of Communities</u>	<u>Number and Description of Voting Members</u>
Baffin	13	15
Kitikmeot	6	12
Keewatin	7	7
Deh Cho	9	15
Shihta	6	13

Unincorporated

South Slave	6	15
Beaufort-Delta	7	21

Part 5

The act requires a regional council to meet at least once in each half of every calendar year and the policy on assistance to regional councils commits the Minister to funding up to five days in each session plus four days travel for each session for each voting delegate.

The act does not require executive meetings to be held. The policy allows the Minister to fund executive meetings based on three-day meetings and four days for travel. Two executive meetings are provided for and there has been a practice of recognizing a one-day executive meeting tacked on to each regular session.

Part 6

The Financial Management Board and the Legislative Assembly allowed the government growth factor on funding to regional councils at 3.5 per cent for the fiscal year 1987-88. I intend to provide that to the councils as well. The total appropriation is \$1,282,000.



Return To Question W31-87(1): Land Use Planning Funding

The Hon. Red Pedersen's return to Question W31-87(1), asked by Ms Cournoyea on March 17, 1987, regarding land use planning funding:

The Northwest Territories Land Use Planning Commission allocated \$45,000 to a joint meeting of the Dene/Metis leadership to discuss land use planning, its relation to the claims process and potential for a joint Dene/Metis planning program within the settlement area. The funds were provided to assist with travel, meals and accommodation but not honorariums. The allocation did not come from the core contribution provided to the Government of the Northwest Territories for participation in planning.

Representatives of the Northwest Territories Land Use Planning Commission and the northern land use planning office attended the meeting, informing the joint leadership of planning activities and various aspects of the program to date. Resource people from the Dene Nation prepared comprehensive briefing materials on land use planning for the Dene/Metis leadership. The materials were also distributed to members of the Northwest Territories Land Use Planning Commission and the northern land use planning office prior to the workshop. A report on the discussions and recommendations arising from resolutions passed during the meeting, will be provided to the commission. That report can be made available to the Member.

I have been assured by the Land Use Planning Commission that an evaluation of the outcome of this meeting and its implications for planning in the Mackenzie Valley and the Western Arctic will be provided to ensure that the objectives for the expenditure of these funds were fully met.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Item 8, replies to Opening Address. Item 9, petitions. Mr. Erkloo.

ITEM 9: PETITIONS

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition here from Pond Inlet, Petition 8-87(1). Mr. Speaker, this petition is late. It is with regard to the boundary plebiscite that was requested from Pond Inlet. Today is May 28th and I know this is late, but I would like to give it to you for your information and I would like to pass this on to my colleagues. The people in Pond Inlet, the area that I represent, are still talking about the possible plebiscite on the boundary. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 9, petitions.

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

ITEM 11: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table the following document: Tabled Document 63-87(1), Child Day Care Standards Regulations. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Item 11, tabling of documents. Mr. Erkloo.

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table Tabled Document 64-87(1), letters from Pond Inlet with regard to airstrips in Pond Inlet. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 11, tabling of documents. Mr. Pudluk.

HON. LUDY PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to go back to Item 4.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unanimous consent is requested. Are there any nays? Mr. Pudluk, proceed.

REVERT TO ITEM 4: RETURNS TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Return To Question O166-87(1): Air Fares, Kitikmeot Region

HON. LUDY PUDLUK: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the question that Mr. Erkloo just raised. He wanted to find out how much the residents of the NWT would be saving from the air fare in the Kitikmeot Region. The government information in 1986-87 of the communities of

Cambridge Bay, Gjoa Haven, Spence Bay and Pelly Bay indicates that 4400 people travelled into those communities. If the new rates were to be used, the public would have saved \$438,000 last year, but for the years previous to that the information is not available. I hope I answered your question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 4, returns to oral questions. We now return to Item 12, notices of motion. Mr. Richard.

ITEM 12: NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice Of Motion 24-87(1): Meech Lake Accord

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on Monday, the first day of June, I will move the following motion: I move that this Legislative Assembly strongly protest the denial of participation by elected representatives of people of the northern territories in a constitutional conference which directly and indirectly affects the people of these territories; and further, that the Assembly's objection be immediately communicated in the strongest possible words through the Speaker to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the First Ministers of each of the provinces. Mr. Speaker, I will later seek consent of my colleagues to deal with this motion today. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item 12, notices of motion.

Item 13, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Item 14, motions. Mr. Richard.

ITEM 14: MOTIONS

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, I would ask, sir, for the consent of the House to deal with my motion this afternoon.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Unanimous consent is being requested. Are there any nays? Mr. Richard, proceed.

Motion 24-87(1): Meech Lake Accord

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada provides for the constitutional framework of Canada, its governments and institutions;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada also guarantees rights and freedoms for all Canadian citizens;

AND WHEREAS the Constitution of Canada specifically recognizes the existence of the Governments and Legislative Assemblies of the Yukon Territory and the Northwest Territories and compels these governments and Legislative Assemblies to be bound by all provisions of the Constitution of Canada;

AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister of Canada and the First Ministers of the provinces propose to convene a constitutional conference for the purpose of considering certain amendments to the Constitution of Canada known as the Meech Lake accord, including amendments that directly and indirectly affect Canadian citizens resident in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories;

AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister and the First Ministers have not invited elected representatives of the Governments of the Yukon Territory and of the Northwest Territories to participate in the discussions at the proposed constitutional conference;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Slave River, that this Legislative Assembly strongly protest this denial of participation by elected representatives of people of the northern territories in a constitutional conference which directly and indirectly affects the people of these territories;

AND FURTHER, that the Assembly's objection be immediately communicated in the strongest possible words, through the Speaker, to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the First Ministers of each of the provinces.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Richard, your motion is in order. Do you wish to speak to the motion, Mr. Richard?

MR. RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members are well aware of the background which leads to this motion. Recently, Mr. Speaker, I was reading some of the debates in this Assembly a number of years ago and I am certain that other colleagues in this Assembly are even more aware than I am of some of the events of 1981 and 1982. But more recently, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of this country and 10 provincial premiers, leading Canadian politicians of all political stripes, met at Meech Lake in the province of Quebec. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was exactly four weeks ago today. And at the end of the day, they announced to the Canadian public that they, these 11 people, had been able to reach a consensus, a unanimous agreement, in fact, among themselves, as to how the province of Quebec might be convinced to sign the constitutional accord that had been reached by the others in 1981.

These First Ministers agreed that they would each recommend to their respective legislatures and parliaments a series of amendments to the the Constitution of Canada; a Constitution, Mr. Speaker, which is the supreme law of this country, which makes reference to the rights of all Canadians; a Constitution which makes reference explicitly to this Legislative Assembly, makes reference explicitly to this Government of the Northwest Territories; a Constitution that explicitly states that this Legislative Assembly and the government are bound by the Constitution, by the supreme law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that these First Ministers had not expected to reach agreement on that eventful day, four weeks ago, and of course, they had not bothered to invite the First Ministers or the Leaders of the two northern governments to the Meech Lake meeting to participate in those important discussions. But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, they did reach agreement and they did issue a document now known as the Meech Lake accord setting out their agreement in principle and they asked their lawyers to transform this accord into a formal constitutional text. And they announced that they would meet again at a constitutional conference to be held within a matter of weeks to approve the formal legal text.

Now, Mr. Speaker, failing to invite the leaders of our two northern territorial governments to the Meech Lake meeting was an oversight. Maybe. But surely everyone thought they will invite the elected representatives of the two northern governments to the formal constitutional conference. Mr. Speaker, just to be sure, the two northern governments sent letters and messages to the Prime Minister and to the premiers and they said in those communications, "Hey, remember us? We are the ones that are mentioned in the Constitution. We are bound by the Constitution. Let us know when and where you are going to be having this meeting to discuss these things. We would like to be heard."

#### Leaders Of Northern Territorial Governments Not Invited To Formal Constitutional Conference

But, no, Mr. Speaker, we have not been invited. As appalling and reprehensible as it may seem, we have not been invited, not even to be heard. I understand, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the Government Leader or the other Ministers could confirm this, that letters and phone calls from elected Ministers of this government to the Government of Canada have not even had the common courtesy of a letter of reply or a return phone call.

What possible excuse could these 11 First Ministers have in this democratic country in 1987 to deny us the fundamental right to be heard? Perhaps I might speculate, Mr. Speaker, that it is because they are going to be discussing something that is of no concern to us. Something far removed. Perhaps the fishing rights of the residents of New Brunswick on the Miramichi River and that alone. The difficulty, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not know, we do not know what they are going to discuss because as opposed to other Canadians whose elected representatives have a copy of the agenda and a copy of the draft constitutional amendments, our elected representatives have been denied even this information.

Those of us who read the Globe and Mail and listen to the CBC -- and if it is in the Globe and on the CBC it must be true -- do have some idea what they will be discussing at the First Ministers' Conference next week in Ottawa and it is of concern to us. It is not some obscure thing that affects only residents in a small portion of Canada. It directly affects us.



Mr. Speaker, I will not go into the details or the contents of the Meech Lake agreement. Others may wish to do that but in my view, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of this motion, there are two categories of issues in the Meech Lake agreement and in the constitutional text that is being put on the table next week in Ottawa. Firstly, there is a category of issues that directly affect us, such as the creation of new provinces or the extension of boundaries. The First Ministers are well aware that these issues affect us. That is one category of issue. There is another category of issue that directly or indirectly affects us. They may not know that; it may have been an oversight on the issues of the Senate appointments and the Supreme Court of Canada appointments.

#### Right To Be Heard

I am prepared to believe that there are matters that are simply oversights but with both of these categories of issues, Mr. Speaker, we need to be heard. There would not be any oversight of northern interests if northern representatives were there. But even those issues in the category of which the Prime Minister and the other First Ministers are aware that they affect us, we are entitled, Mr. Speaker, to be there and to be heard. Our position should be heard. Mr. Speaker, there is a famous quote -- I cannot remember who said it, or the exact words but it goes something like "I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." Mr. Speaker, this motion simply says to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the 10 premiers, "We demand our right to be heard." Thank you.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. McCallum.

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly on it, I am pleased to have seconded the motion. I think it is a motion that, as Mr. Richard has indicated, is of great concern. We will recall, many of us here, that back in 1981-82 when the Constitution was patriated we agreed, most of us agreed, that it should be patriated at that time. We did not agree with the changes that were made, specific changes and agreement, and in order to bring nine of the 10 provinces together we did not agree with the changes that were made to the Constitution or to the draft that we were involved with. When the Constitution was drafted, there was a clause that stated that the Prime Minister of the day would invite the northern peoples, representatives of the northern peoples to the first conferences and where things were of a concern to both territories. Now, in 1987, things have changed. In 1982 we were trying to get into Confederation and Quebec wanted out. Now, in 1987, the rest of Canada wants Quebec and we are still trying to get even a say in trying to be part of the Confederation.

#### Blame For Exclusion With Premiers As Well As Prime Minister

As Mr. Richard has indicated, the blame for our exclusion is not just resting on the shoulders of the federal Prime Minister but it is also with the other 10 premiers of this country who have their closed shop and as long as we are not provinces we are never going to be able to be part of it. Not only with the Senate provision, the Supreme Court but also of course with the amending formula and nothing will take place. The problem here being, Mr. Speaker, that we want to be part of it; we think that there are things that will directly affect us and, again, that indirectly are affecting us but we have to have at least a say in what is going to happen.

We should enjoy the rights of other citizens of this country. The rights of a Canadian citizen should not stop once you get over the 60th parallel. If you live in Canada, you should have the rights of other Canadians and we should have the right at least to be able to say what we look forward to. Other parts of it may be better for us under the Meech Lake accord but by and large we do not have a say in that and I think that what this motion is saying is that we have to express in the strongest possible terms our displeasure at being excluded, not just to the business of being overlooked. As Canadian citizens we should not simply sit here and take that, being overlooked, but we want to make sure that we have a say in what happens to this country that we live in, and as Canadian citizens that should be one of our rights, to enjoy the privileges of being a citizen of Canada.

As it is now, we are not. We have no idea how to become a province and if the provinces have their way, they are not going to allow us. And as long as you are not a province, you are not going to be part of the amending formula. You are not going to be able to take part in appointments to the Senate, nor to the Supreme Court if those things are to remain in the document that will be drawn

up by the lawyers. I think it is necessary for us as an Assembly to indicate to the Prime Minister and to the other 10 premiers of this country that we are not satisfied with simply sitting here and having somebody else look after us. We are capable of looking after our particular goals and aspirations and our needs as well as having big brother, the federal government, do it for us. The federal government held this land in trust for the people of the Northwest Territories until such time as we were capable of looking after it and I believe that we are at that time now, to look after our needs.

Accord Gives Distinction To Province Of Quebec But Not To Northerners

There is nothing in it to indicate there is any distinct status of people of the Northwest Territories, aboriginal people or northerners, but there is now with the accord a distinction given to the Province of Quebec. We demand and we should have the same kind of recognition as Canadian citizens. So I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to second the motion to indicate to the Prime Minister and the 10 premiers our displeasure at this accord.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Erkloo.

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the motion that is on the floor. There are 10 provinces that exist today, and when there are amendments to the Constitution they will require the agreement of seven of them. But according to the information that I have been getting, I think that they are going to try to change that. The amending formula is going to be changed to include that all 10 provinces would have to agree. If the Northwest Territories' leaders are not included in this formula, it does not seem right.

It used to be in the past all the governments had premiers and even the territorial government had appointed commissioners and the commissioner was next to the Minister of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Now there are quite a few leaders in the Territories which come from the rest of the North and who are native people included in the Executive of the Territories, but these can be taken away any time and replaced by appointments.

But now, I say that there are more northerners and native people in the Executive of the territorial government. So if anything that is going to be dealt with concerns the North and its aboriginal people, I think that we should be included in the debates. I do not think that I have to repeat what has already been said because a lot has been said about it through the newspapers and radio that nobody in the Territories is qualified to -- we are excluded from appointments to the Senate or the Supreme Court of Canada even though the provinces will have the right to make appointments or make the recommendations that they want to make. So, those of us who are in the Northwest Territories will get further and further away from it. For that reason we are trying to start to run our own affairs and make decisions that will affect us and, not being invited to important meetings such as the one we are talking about, I tend to wonder why are we sitting here even though we are not even recognized as a legislative body by the federal government and the 10 premiers of the provinces. We are Canadians and I feel that we should be included right along in there. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the motion. Are you ready for the question? Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess when something like this happens, your first reaction is not to believe that it actually happened. You sort of try to convince yourself in your mind that they have just made a mistake, it was an oversight. I think that was maybe the reaction of a lot of us when we first heard about it. We did not appreciate the significance of what had happened and then when we began to find out the details through the newspapers, we started to worry about it a little bit and the deeper we dug into this issue, the more concerned we became.

But the type of thing that was done is so reprehensible that you first of all start off by thinking, "Well, you know, this is Canada and these things cannot happen." And you think, "Well, there must have been a mistake, it must have been an oversight." But damn, when you start to dig into it, perhaps in the case of some of the provinces, indeed, it was an oversight and they simply did not know what it was they were doing. But certainly on the federal side of the table, the more we learn, I guess, the more convinced we become that, in fact, it is deliberate.

When you look at the newspapers and the radio and television commentary on what has been happening, it is only in the last couple of days that you start to see a little bit mentioned about the Territories. Up until now there has been nothing. I have to believe that that is because most Canadians and most people who are observing this process also really do not know. I think what we have to do now is to start spelling out clearly for other Canadians what is taking place right now in Ottawa and what will take place next Tuesday at Meech Lake.

#### Apartheid System Proposed

The federal government in complicity with 10 provinces and the two federal parties are proposing to amend the supreme law of the land which, in effect, will put into place a system of apartheid. A system that is as reprehensible as anything in South Africa and you wonder how we can have a leader of a federal government who, on one hand has been very eloquent and very outspoken within the Commonwealth about the treatment of non-whites in South Africa, when in fact he is proposing to do the exact same thing within the supreme law of this land to residents of the North. Because this is what this agreement does; it makes us second-class citizens. We are not citizens like other citizens. They have more rights than we do. We have only zeroed in on a couple of very obvious ones, namely that no northern resident can become a senator or, in fact, no northern lawyer or member of the bar can ever aspire to the Supreme Court. But the scary thing is that there is more than those contained in this document. We just have not been able to figure out all of the implications yet. But, the implications would be very wide-ranging and deny us even more rights than we even think right now.

I cannot believe for a moment that people like Pawley and Ghiz and Peterson and Broadbent and Turner, really understand what they are doing. I have to believe that they do not understand what they are doing because if they do know what they are doing, quite frankly, as a northern resident, it scares the hell out of me. Watching The Journal on the television last night, I think it is becoming apparent that, in fact, at least on the provincial side, they really are not sure of what they are doing. When questioned on several aspects of the agreement it was obvious we were getting different answers from different premiers.

I guess when you tie it into what took place not that long ago at the First Ministers' Conference on Aboriginal Rights, you have to start saying, "Surely to God we have not elected in this country such a hypocritical bunch of people as we seem to have." Because not more than a few weeks ago, Vander Zalm and Devine and Getty and Peckford, sat in front of national television and told leaders of the aboriginal organizations that they could not enshrine aboriginal self-government in the Constitution because they did not know what it meant. And yet, a few weeks later, they are going to enshrine Quebec as a distinct society in the Canadian Constitution and they do not know what that means. So, it seems as if we have now officially got from, apparently, the political leaders in this country, a statement that essentially says there are two classes of citizens in this country: There is Quebec and the rest of us, and particularly Quebec which has certain rights and we will not worry about what they are right now, we will figure that out later. And then there are northerners and native people and unless they tell us and unless we can figure out what their rights are, then we are just going to ignore them. So, it is becoming apparent that there really are, in the minds of those people, different classes of citizens.

That is pretty scary stuff in a country like Canada, that is supposed to be a democratic country. These kinds of things are not supposed to happen here. You expect them from South Africa, you expect them in the Philippines or in Korea or in any one of the racist states or totalitarian states that exist in the world. But it is not supposed to happen here. We are supposed to be above that kind of thing.

#### Federal Government Hungry For Power

So then you start to try to figure out what happened. How did this happen? I think on the federal side, there are a number of reasons. This country, unfortunately, is being governed by a Conservative government that knows that if it continues in the present way it is going to lose power in two years. This is a collection of people who for 20 years sat on the outskirts and were hungry for power and were desperate for power. And they are going to want to cling to that power as much as they can because they know that they may never get another chance for another 20 years. And Mulroney is so desperate to show the rest of Canada that he can negotiate a deal and bring the provinces together that he has literally trampled over the rights of many people in this country to do so.



I think what we in the North have to be concerned about is that from all indications, regardless of what the political leaders in Ottawa are saying, the bureaucrats are gearing up in the North to come back in here in a major way. We, as a government, went to the owners of a new apartment building that is being built in Yellowknife -- I think there are 65 housing units -- to see if there are any housing units available. We find out that 45 out of the 60 have been reserved for the federal government. We do not know for what and we do not know who is going to be taking them but all over the North we see housing starting to come back in for the feds and they are starting to move back in. We know that in terms of a northern accord which would give us significant control over natural resources, Marcel Masse has said, "No way." This is the federal government's last playground. We see in Indian Affairs which is committed to downsizing its staff, in fact, what they are doing is shuffling their staff in between divisions and in fact a division headed by a woman called Danielle Wetherup, which is responsible for economic development in the Territories, has tripled in size within the last month and a half. When asked, the comment was, "Well, you people obviously cannot look after yourselves up there; we are going to have to do it for you." There are signs all across the board that the federal government is getting ready to move back into the North in a very major way. That has to lead me to believe that what the federal government is doing is deliberate in this whole scheme of things.

#### Price Paid By Other Canadians

On the provincial side, I have to believe that when they sat around the table they could not believe their good luck. When Mulroney offered what he did, they were so eager because they are there representing their provinces and as we all know any power that they can get from Ottawa for the provinces is more power to them and their cabinets and their legislatures and like any politician, if you offer them power they are going to grab it. I have to believe that the provinces in the desperate grab for power and in their own minds, in this unbelieving state they were in of not believing that here was the Prime Minister of Canada offering them so much, grabbed for it without really realizing what it was that they were taking and the price that perhaps other Canadians may have to pay for that power grab.

So, you look to the opposition parties, to the Liberal, to the NDP, and you say, "Well, surely, there is somebody in there that can speak up." But once again we are facing a federal election in two years. Both of those parties are desperate to make inroads in the Province of Quebec. They do not want to rock the boat too much for fear that they might not get votes in the next election. There is no statesmanship being shown here, there is no vision, no future of Canada. We are talking about raw political power and that is what the game is all about.

I guess the NDP is the one that surprises me the most because I thought that -- and I guess it is naivete -- but I thought they might be above that a little bit. I thought that they might at least acknowledge that Canadian or citizens' rights were being trampled in this country but in a very peripheral way they have done it because for the first time they are up in the polls in Quebec, so I guess we are seeing the true side of that political party as well.

#### Quebec Aspiring To Gain Northern Lands And Waters

We know that Quebec has made it quite clear that they would like to grab some of the waters of the Northwest Territories and use their political power to do so and I can quite frankly see them not wanting to have a northern government with any kind of veto or any kind of a level of jurisdiction comparable to theirs which may affect that. They have made their case quite clear. Bourassa has been open about it. He wants James Bay and it was not that long ago that I read an article in the newspaper where the Quebec Minister of Indian Affairs said to the newspaper, "God forbid, we might have to go to Frobisher Bay one day to negotiate with them. We will have to make sure that we get the waters and the land that we want first before they talk about any type of northern province and northern government." That is not a hidden agenda, they are being quite open about it.

So, all in all, I really do not think that even northerners, people outside of this room and most people in the communities really understand what is happening here. But we are about to lose probably the most significant battle that we have ever had to fight. Our development as a territory, our development as a people, our political aspirations, our economic aspirations, are literally going to be frozen in time and I think that no matter what we have to do, no matter how much money we have to spend, we have to fight this to the very last because there is nothing more significant that can happen to us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Patterson.



### Opportunities For Political Development Taken Away

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it has been a rather bad year for political development in the Northwest Territories in many ways. After five years of hard work, the goal of defining aboriginal self-government was not reached at the First Ministers' Conference on Aboriginal Rights. That door of opportunity for political development slammed shut. The federal land claims policy excluded political rights from the land claims talks. Another door of opportunity for political development for aboriginal people was slammed shut. Due to failure to reach agreement among ourselves, the goal of my constituents for the creation of a new territory of Nunavut has been thwarted. This is a door that has almost been closed although there may be some hope yet. And now, the very potential of the Northwest Territories or future territories to become provinces, a right every other citizen of Canada enjoys, has been snatched from us, if we are not successful in taking action to prevent this from happening. Another door of opportunity for political development has been or is almost slammed shut on us.

Mr. Speaker, some honourable Members have been quick to condemn the current federal government over this matter but I would like to say that it was not the current federal government that put section 42 into the Constitution upon its patriation. Section 42 was a new rule which had never been applied before to any residents of Canada. At that time, the new rule required the consent of seven provinces comprising 50 per cent of the population of Canada before another province could be created. That provision which was bad enough then, which caused all Members of this House to travel to Ottawa to protest to Members of Parliament and the Prime Minister, is now even worse. Now all 10 provinces' consent is required. This is a matter which unfortunately has come upon us in a great hurry. Unlike the previous changes, there are no public hearings nor committee hearings planned at this time. There is very little time. The matter may be virtually concluded next week and it is astonishing to me how casually this profound matter is being dealt with, over lunch, over coffee, in closed meetings, without our participation or even our presence as observers.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the highest order of law in the land, so difficult to amend that it might as well be called immutable. If provincehood is virtually unreachable then we have been frozen in time. Mr. Speaker, we are being treated unfairly in this accord as compared to other Canadians in other ways. I understand this agreement will permit senators and Supreme Court judges to be appointed only from lists presented from the provinces. If this goes through, Willy Adams may be our last senator from the Northwest Territories. We will never have an opportunity for a judge of the Northwest Territories to be named to the highest court of the land. I find it ironic that this could be happening at the very time when the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada is on circuit, travelling in the eastern Northwest Territories because he considers this a very important part of Canada. I wish the Prime Minister and the premiers considered more carefully what an important part of Canada the Northwest Territories is.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Wray that if provincehood is to become virtually unreachable by these new provisions, then I too am very concerned that the federal government may from now on question our right to even be given provincial-type responsibilities in such critical areas as the development and management of natural resources and revenue sharing. Does this set the stage to permit the federal government to have the northern territories forever as their last playground without respect for the rights of Canadians who have established sovereignty for Canada over this land?

### Giant Leap Backwards

Mr. Speaker, I address this House today more in sorrow than in anger because in my view relations with the provinces and the federal government have in many ways never been better. Provincial colleagues recognize the Northwest Territories. Federal Ministers now know this territory and know their territorial counterparts better than ever before. At most federal-provincial-territorial conferences, we are now accepted as equals. They seem to respect us. The importance of Arctic sovereignty and the importance of the Northwest Territories as a critical part of Canada's identity is being recognized increasingly in many ways. I think relations with our Minister of Indian Affairs have been excellent. Our government is being treated as if we were a province or potential province by the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs. There have been more programs devolved and more serious discussion of devolution in the past two years than in decades. Yet, Mr. Speaker, after all this progress the Meech Lake accord seems like a giant leap backwards.

Natural Justice, A Chance To Be Heard

Mr. Speaker, all we want is merely the chance to be heard. We do not expect to be treated equally as a province, we know we are not a province. We know it may well be some time yet before we can become a contributor to Confederation as a province. However, Mr. Speaker, that is not the point today. The point is that since matters are being discussed which affect us, we would like to be there. We would like to have a chance to directly voice our concerns. We have a right to be there. Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental principle of law, natural justice. Natural justice means that no one shall be subject to deliberations which affect them without the right to at least a hearing. Mr. Speaker, all we want is natural justice. All we want is a chance to be heard. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: (Translation) I would like to make a short comment in support of this motion. I know we are quite far away from the South but it seems like the federal government is always in control of us. Whenever anything comes up, they tell us what to do. The same thing has happened here again, we have been excluded. They made up their minds and just excluded the two territories. I am happy that we have brought this to the House here, so we should all support this motion. (Translation ends)

We have always been part of Canada. It appears that we have come full circle back to the colonial days where Ottawa and now, all provincial jurisdictions, will dictate to the Northwest Territories how we will fit in with the rest of Canada without even so much as asking for our participation in those decisions or considering the impact and consequences on the population of the Northwest Territories. To exclude us from even being observers at the proposed constitutional conference is unjustifiable. Mahsi cho.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Curley.

MR. CURLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too, would like to indicate my support to the motion. I would have liked to see that we not only express disappointment and anger over the fact that we were denied -- that we should be insisting that we have continued involvement with the constitutional debate as it affects the institutions of the legislatures in Canada. But I think this is a beginning. I think the actions taken by the Yukon and the Northwest Territories through the courts will probably indicate that we do have a permanent interest in our association with Canada.

The motion I think is timely, but to me I would not like to entertain the assumption that the 10 premiers and one Prime Minister by oversight had extended unanimity rule to the extension of the provinces. I do not think it was an oversight. We should not be even attempting to fool ourselves that this was done by an oversight by the 10 premiers. The 10 premiers at the moment are, as my colleague from Kivallivik said, so interested in power grabbing from the federal government in matters which are under the direct control of the federal government that they will do anything. So I am not convinced that it was done by an oversight. I think it is deliberate. I think it is a deliberate attack on the democracy of the people of the Northwest Territories. We have been denied our rights to take part in Confederation and I think the time has come that we do tolerate that.

The provisions of the text of the accord reached at Meech Lake are very interesting. They call on the Canadian provinces and the federal government to accept the fact that Quebec province is a distinct society. I have questions about what "distinct society" means. Is it distinct because the majority of the people of Quebec are French-speaking? Or is it distinct because the Province of Quebec has recognition of the federal government in terms of the Official Languages Act? I am not sure.

NWT Ahead Of Some Provinces In Recognition Of

My concern is that I think we have been ahead of a number of provinces, particularly provinces like Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. One provision in the text, according to the newspapers, indicated that the recognition that the existence of French-speaking Canada, centred in

but not limited to Quebec, and English-speaking Canada, concentrated outside Quebec but also present in Quebec, constitutes a fundamental characteristic of Canada. I believe that we have done that. We have established a French language act through the House. The provision in the text reads, according to the newspaper, "Parliament and the provincial legislatures, in the exercise of their respective powers, are committed to preserving the fundamental characteristic of Canada referred to in paragraph (1)(a)." This means that provinces shall respect the uniqueness of Quebec. I think we have done that. We have been ahead of some of the provinces. You know, we enacted a law that recognizes the rights of French-speaking individuals in the Northwest Territories. So again, in this particular reference, it only asks that provincial legislatures and Parliament be respectful of Quebec's uniqueness and its rights to have its uniqueness in terms of the French language.

But we are ahead of them. The territories' legislatures are not asked that they exercise their respective powers and commit themselves to preserving fundamental characteristics of Canada, but to encouraging French-speaking Canadians to take advantage of their rights, through the laws and programs of this government. So we are ahead of them. We have a legitimate right. We have a legitimate role to play and I think we have been a proud member of the Canadian identity. We may not have been a proud member of the Canadian Confederation. But in terms of the Canadian characteristics referred to in the document, I think we have been able to perform these. But I think it is time that the federal government and the premiers recognize that democratic rights of this territory are important and they must be protected and that our democratic rights should also extend to involvement through the constitutional process. I think that is what we are trying to do. I wholeheartedly support the motion and I do not like the assumption that the 10 provinces, by oversight, did include a new clause which would involve them with the extension of provinces. I think it was deliberate. We should not even apologize for it. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Nerysoo.

MR. NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the motion. I believe that the comments that have been made by Members in this House today are comments that had to be said. More importantly, they should have been said earlier and I say that the Prime Minister should have been prepared to accept the fact that the North has a certain uniqueness and certain ability to make its contributions to the development of the Constitution of our country. But we were not given the courtesy nor the recognition as an Assembly to participate in the discussions.

I would like to indicate to Members in this House that in terms of being heard, I think we are owed more than just the courtesy of being heard. I think we are owed the courtesy of being part of the decision-making when it comes to making changes that directly affect the political development and constitutional development of our territory.

#### Comments From Premiers

Let me indicate, as well, quotes from the May 2nd, 1987, Globe and Mail, and these were statements by two premiers. One, Mr. Devine, who acknowledged "the lack of interest by most Saskatchewan residents", and this is with regard to the accord. He goes on to say, "I don't think there's many folks in Saskatchewan or in Western Canada that want to hear an awful lot about the Constitution and Quebec and separation. They'd just like to think we're one country." The other quote, Mr. Speaker, is from the Premier of British Columbia, Mr. Vander Zalm, who said that the agreement giving the provinces new rights, powers and responsibilities was an important step toward ending regional alienation.

Those are comments from those individuals who were supposed to be getting rid of the idea or concept of regional alienation and also recognizing that we are one country. The process was intended to recognize Canada as one country. But their accord does not, in fact, recognize that situation. Now they are, in fact alienating the people of the North, the people of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, and not allowing us to participate in the process. So while they may have rectified the situation with regard to the western provinces, they did not in any way recognize that in future the North and its people should be part of any constitutional development process.



Resolution To Allow Actual Participation

I note, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of the motion I would have hoped that we would have had an additional resolution which urged the Prime Minister to allow this Assembly and its Leader and its Executive Council to participate directly in this discussion; not only to be heard but to participate in making the changes that were necessary to ensure that the future of the North was protected in terms of its constitutional possibilities. But that again, might have been a slight oversight. I just wanted to raise that particular point, so that this discussion did not centre around the fact that we ought only, to be heard but rather to participate in the actual discussion itself. Whether or not we were at the table with the rest of the premiers is not an issue, but we are not even a part of the development of the amendment and the appropriate agreement that would be introduced in the House of Commons. That, in fact, is not an oversight in my opinion, but a lack of recognition and irresponsibility on the part of the Prime Minister and the present government. They are not even acknowledging our role in protecting the constitutional and political interests of the North.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate my support for the motion. I hope that we go further than just this discussion, that we go to the extent of ensuring that this fight will not end today but rather, will continue in future, whether it is through the election process or whether or not it is through our own ongoing responsibility of ensuring that the people of the North and the people of Canada recognize the consequences of such an accord. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Scandalous Travesty Of Democracy

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have very little to say that is different from what has been said before, but lest keeping silent be thought of as being acquiescent, I would like to speak as well, in support of the motion.

As has already been noted by other Members, there is nothing more fundamental in democracy and nothing more fundamental in the rules of natural justice than that those who are to be impacted by decisions -- and here, Mr. Speaker, we are not just talking about your average, everyday decision, we are talking about a constitutional determination, a decision that will be binding not only on us, but on our descendants in perpetuity, on our children and our children's children -- as I said, there is nothing more fundamental than that those who are to be impacted by decisions have a right, a right to be present at discussions and determinations and not just to be present but to be heard, so that they can state clearly and forcefully and no one else can state interests more clearly and more forcefully than those who hold them, so that they can put the positions to those who are going to make the decisions. And if that is given that that is a fundamental right to be present and to be heard, then, Mr. Speaker, what is happening on the federal-provincial scene? What is happening with respect to the Meech Lake accord and beyond is arrogant, paternalistic and insensitive just on a human level and it is a scandalous travesty of democracy on a political level.

I do want to encourage our government in its efforts to try to ensure that we can be present and be heard at meetings of this type and I support the government in its decision to support Nick Sibbeston in his efforts to get a court declaration that his rights have been violated and I applaud the government's efforts to work hand in hand with our sister territory, the Yukon, in order to try to ensure that our most fundamental right is observed.

In seeking allies, however, there is some danger, Mr. Speaker. I heard on the radio this morning an implication that our government would be seeking allies and working with others who might have other concerns with the Meech Lake accord and I say there is a danger in that in that it is entirely possible that you can be co-opted in someone else's aspirations, whether or not you agree with them.

Problem Began In 1981-82

I think it is important in making our statements here in this House, Mr. Speaker, to be as fair as possible and in trying to be as fair as possible, I must note that the problem we are facing did not begin at Meech Lake. It began in 1981-82 with the then Prime Minister, Pierre Elliott Trudeau,

and the then Liberal Government of Canada. That is when the erosion of federal powers began and with that erosion of federal powers that is when our future rights began to be eroded as well, and make no mistake about that. That is not just an opinion. We all went to Ottawa and I remember very clearly having had the privilege of speaking on this matter, being given the privilege, by Members of the House, having had the privilege of speaking on that particular matter and pointing out to Mr. Munro, the then Minister of Indian Affairs, and Serge Joyal and Marc LaLonde, the fact that what was being done by the then federal government amounted to an erosion of federal powers. I must say that in the case of each of those three men I felt that our Assembly and the people of the North had a fair hearing from them, that they were sensitive to what we were saying and passed the message further up the line. But I would say that when we reached Pierre Elliott Trudeau and his axeman, Jean Chretien, that they did not have the time of day for us at that point and that is when the erosion began and there should be no mistake about that.

In being fair I want to say something else too, and that is that the problem made itself known to all people of the Northwest Territories at that time and to the Government of the Northwest Territories at that time, yet five years have elapsed and we have done nothing and that includes me. So it is not entirely somebody else's fault and it is not entirely a surprise. Our government has done nothing during those five years to try to ensure that what happened at Meech Lake would not happen and yet the writing was on the wall five years ago that that kind of thing was going to happen.

#### Fundamental Injustice

Having said that and in the interests of trying to be fair, I still say that there is a fundamental injustice occurring when we cannot even be present to be heard and I have to say, what is the reason? Why will they not let us be present? Are they afraid of our numbers? Certainly not. We are few in number. They need not fear that if they let us in the door somehow we are going to overwhelm them with numbers. Are they afraid that we have extraordinary legal power or some other kind of power that might overturn what they are trying to do? The answer to that is, "Not at all", because we evidently do not have that kind of power. So, what are they afraid of? I say that they are afraid to let us be heard because what we would have to say is of great consequence. It may be a small voice but it would be like the voice of a conscience, whispering to them incessantly about the wrong that they are doing because we could point to the instruments of transfer when these Territories did not belong to Canada but when Canada prayed that Her Majesty and the British government would transfer these lands and that they in turn would govern them for the welfare and benefit of the Territories and the people who lived in them.

#### Historical Precedent

We could point to the 1871 amendment to the BNA Act which made it clear that the federal government had the right to create new provinces from territories that were not in existing provinces. We could point to the fact that section 15 of the Charter of Rights in our present Constitution guarantees the equal protection and the equal benefit of the law which would be denied here and we could point most of all to historical precedent by which provinces were created in the past in Canada in a manner that I think was fair and reasonable, where they had to demonstrate to the federal government that in fact they were ready for provincial status but when they were, then their status was not contingent on the good will of any single other province that already had the good fortune of being named to provincial status and in all of this, Mr. Speaker, personally, it is my view that the greatest shame falls on the premiers of and through them the legislatures and the people of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta...

MR. McCALLUM: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: Shocking, that people whose territories were nurtured in the same womb as us should find it not only right but necessary that they proceed to provincial status once born, and they decide that abortion is the correct procedure for anybody else who might have those same aspirations. That is sad and it is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker.

In all that is happening here I recognize there could be many, many different interpretations and certainly I have a much different interpretation than what I consider the crass political anglings that Mr. Wray referred to. I do not interpret things in that same way at all. We could have different interpretations about the role of Trudeau or about the role of Mulroney and his stature in Canadian society and so we will not get into all of those but I think, Mr. Speaker, that there is no disagreement among Members on this point and that is precisely the point of the motion: That

we do have the right to be present and to be heard and we demand the exercise of that right. I think that you will not find disagreement among any Members on that point and so, hopefully, not only this Assembly but the people of the Northwest Territories as a whole, will join us in demanding at least that fundamental right. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Appaqaq.

Premiers Will Never Agree Unanimously

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) I will make a short comment in support of the motion. The temporary leaders will never agree -- will never get unanimous consent and I just wanted you to know that because I was present, as an observer, in March at the First Ministers' Conference when they were trying to agree to the aboriginal rights and self-government. Many times the premiers change during the course of one discussion, like the constitutional accord for example, and even during my term as an MLA for the Legislative Assembly. I do not think I will ever understand. I know I will never understand; whenever they come close to an agreement they tend to quit and then new people take their place and sometimes even people who are not from Canada replace the other premiers.

I know that the 10 premiers will never have unanimous consent on anything. It was also said in Ottawa by one of the negotiators at ICNI and he is from Northern Quebec, Zebedee Nungnak. He said that when we were facing the first premiers or DIAND, he has gone through four Ministers in his time, just during the discussions of the Constitution. Is he going to have to teach another one next year? Is that why there has never been an agreement? Because the new people that come into the positions have to be taught all over again what is happening. This is very detrimental to what we want. When the premiers are going to change that rapidly once they learn what is going on, I do not think the 10 premiers will ever have a unanimous agreement.

So, those of us at the Legislative Assembly, how can we obtain provincial status during our lifetime? If this accord goes into effect we are even further away from becoming a province. We know that our children will have a better education and will be more able, but if it is going to be a requirement that the 10 provinces agree to such a change then I do not think we will ever see another province joining Canadian Confederation. So, I will support the motion which will enable us to say what we disagree on with the Meech Lake accord.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Pedersen.

Freeze On Political Development

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to give my full support to the motion and to agree with what everyone has said so far. At least on the broad basis. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker to me closed by saying that we will never obtain provincial status. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I agree with him. We will not, under this accord. But I am afraid that we may, in fact, be stalled at a much lower level than provincial status. I think that we may be frozen the way we are right at the moment if this accord stands as we understand it now. I am afraid that any move on our part toward obtaining powers of a provincial-type nature, such as the recent forestry or health transfers to our government, any devolution of any sort toward the provincial-type responsibilities can now be perceived by the individual provinces as being provincial-type and leading toward it and, therefore, blocked by a veto by any one of the provinces, large or small. So, it is not whether or not we want provincial status, this is something I think we have not determined yet, but I feel that we are going to be frozen where we are; that we have no further opportunities for devolution toward any greater control over ourselves than we have today.

Mr. Speaker, rather than in governmental terms, I would like to make a few comments in more personal and individual terms. In my opinion the accord reached by what was referred to as the Meech Lake crowd, weakens the Canadian federation. I think it weakens the federal government and by extension it dooms the Northwest Territories to be forever part of this weakened federal structure. Mr. Speaker, I find it totally unacceptable as an individual to become part of a weakened second-class jurisdiction. Particularly when I become so without my consent or indeed without my consultation. I agree very strongly with Mr. Nerysoo when he said that to be heard is not enough. If no one pays attention to what you said, it does not mean much to be heard. We



must, indeed, be involved as participants in any matter that concerns us. Mr. Speaker, I object very strongly to the fact that individual citizens of the NWT are being excluded by this accord from such offices as the Senate of Canada or the Supreme Court of Canada.

#### Provinces Deny Us Equal Opportunity

I also strongly object to the unanimity requirement for all the existing provinces to allow others like ourselves, the NWT or the Yukon, to become provinces eventually, if we do desire. These other provinces, as Mr. MacQuarrie pointed out, did not need this unanimity for them to become provinces. They were treated one way and we are to be treated differently. Again, a clear case of inequality.

In the three provinces Mr. MacQuarrie mentioned, they, in particular, should be able to remember this; it is not that long ago that they were part of the Northwest Territories. I distinctly recall Mr. Roland Michener, a very distinguished Canadian, then Governor General of Canada, in my home community of Coppermine, saying to us, "I was born in the Northwest Territories, in Lacombe, Northwest Territories in 1905." It is such a short time ago that they became provinces and were carved out of the Northwest Territories that it is well within living man's memory. I too find it very unacceptable that they, having achieved their status of provincehood in one way, now deny us the same opportunity to become provinces in the future.

The opportunity to be heard and to be taken seriously has indeed been denied the Northwest Territories as a jurisdiction and us as individuals as a result. My colleague, Mr. Wray, made some references to South Africa and compared the treatment that we are being accorded today with what is happening in South Africa. I would like to point out that in South Africa, their Prime Minister, Mr. Botha, at least met with Bishop Tutu and he at least went to the prison where they are holding Nelson Mandela in order to speak to them. Here, we cannot even get our Prime Minister or indeed any of his officials to as much as return a phone call to our own democratically elected Government Leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Mr. Speaker, I am perhaps a little different from the rest sitting around here, except for Mr. Wray, inasmuch as I did not have the good fortune to have the privilege to have been born in Canada. I chose to come to Canada. I chose Canada as my country and I chose it because of the freedom that was offered in this country and the equality that was extended to all citizens. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that we will be able to effect changes in this accord that will allow me to keep the faith that I have in this country and indeed to live as I chose originally in a country where we are all going to be treated equally. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take the opportunity to speak in support of the motion. The Northwest Territories, and also the area that used to be called Rupert's Land, were turned over to Canada in 1867 from the British government and there were commitments made to the people that lived in that area, by the former British government. There were also particular commitments made to aboriginal people that lived in those lands. What has happened with the repatriation of the Constitution from Britain in 1982 is that things happened that have gone against those people and those commitments made by the British.

#### Territorial Residents Are Second-Class Citizens

The fact that seven provinces have to agree to a part of the territory becoming a province of this country definitely makes us second-class citizens in this country as it exists right now. Previous to that it was strictly in agreement between the federal government of this country, our Parliament, and the people within the territory to be considered for provincial status for somebody to become a province. That happened for Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. During the process that was occurring for our former Prime Minister Trudeau to patriate the Constitution, proposals were made where certain provinces like Quebec and Ontario could have a veto. Other provinces would just be ordinary provinces and we would be territories, so at one stage we had the situation where we could have become third-class citizens instead of just second-class, which we are right now.



I have to hark back to some of the debate in the past when my colleague, Mr. MacQuarrie, and a former Member of the House, Mr. Fraser, made a motion, which I supported, which went against the former Prime Minister and the means by which he was trying to repatriate and amend the Constitution. There were some very interesting things said and we were hooted and howled down by several Members of this House as we tried to make our points. Finally the motion was referred to the committee of the whole where it died because almost all the Members of the House wanted it to die.

Interesting things were said, like this one by Mr. MacQuarrie: "The truth is that the only reason we have a constitutional crisis is because the Prime Minister wants to change the fundamental nature of the country and the provinces have sensed an opportunity to grasp more power in exchange." Well, now this is happening again. We have the same situation where the present Prime Minister, Mr. Mulroney, wants to get Quebec into the Constitution and he is desperate to get Quebec, his own home province, into the Constitution to make Quebec part of our country. And in both cases I would say every Member in this House including Mr. MacQuarrie and myself, back in 1980, supported repatriation of the Constitution, but we just did not like the measure that was being used, that people of the country were being left out, the provinces were being left out. Trudeau was going to do it his way.

Now, we have a similar situation where the provinces want us left out. They are using this honourable objective of getting Quebec back into the Constitution, just as it was an honourable thing to try to patriate the Constitution of Canada so it could be amended at home and we could have our own Constitution. Those were honourable things but in both cases the provinces blackmailed the Prime Ministers of the day into giving up rights and powers in order to achieve these honourable objectives. So I think it is the provinces that are the thugs in this sort of major assault on the authority of the federal government and, in particular, the rights that we, as residents of the Northwest Territories have lost, and that is to achieve provincial status some day and to be equal in this country.

#### Determination Of Provincial Status

The other thing is that what we should have done, and I agree, maybe we should have made more efforts during the last period of time to change the seven out of 10, to try to get that removed from the Constitution where seven out of 10 provinces have to agree before we can become a province. That is what we should be trying to do and we should be sending the message to the 10 premiers and the Prime Minister to consider that on Tuesday, to change the existing Constitution so that only the Parliament in this country can determine if the Northwest Territories and the Yukon can have provincial status, just as those provinces had that same situation before them. That is what we should be trying to do.

I would like to also emphasize that in anything I have ever talked about on things like this -- and the things that went on, you know Mr. MacQuarrie and myself did not give up, or Mr. Fraser. Once again in February of 1981 we proposed a motion going against what was being done. That time there were three of us debating to support this. This time at least the Members let us debate. We actually talked for six or seven pages about it before we were finally resoundingly defeated on a recorded vote, with all the Members of the House except Mr. Fraser, Mr. MacQuarrie and I being against this situation. The tough and courageous Executive Council of the day -- some of them sent me notes saying, "This is a crazy thing you are doing. We are biting the hand that feeds us. Do you not realize we are negotiating a formula funding arrangement with the federal government right now?" So, that is how courageous the government of the day was and we were defeated again. This time they actually let us talk about it, though, without deferring it and putting us into no man's land.

Then finally again in November 1981, Mr. MacQuarrie made a motion again and now we had four intelligent people in the House because Mr. Kane Tologanak seconded the motion this time. By this time people realized what really was happening and a unanimous motion was passed disapproving of what was going on, that we were against what was happening to us as a territory. So I say that this has not been around for just a couple of years, it has been around since 1980. Members in this House and a lot of large "L" Liberal Members at the time were just adamant that we should support their Prime Minister and rally around him without thinking about what would happen to us in the future.

Provinces Seizing Opportunity For Power

I invite some of you who are being critical now of the Prime Minister because of the party he is in right now, to look back at what you said in the past and at what has happened to us. What I think should be stated here is that the former Prime Minister Trudeau and Prime Minister Mulroney have honourable objectives in what they are trying to do. The former Prime Minister was trying to get the Constitution into our country so it would be our own Constitution. The present Prime Minister is trying to get Quebec into the Constitution because it is a shame that one province should be left out. I say the real enemies here are the 10 provinces who are seizing an opportunity to get power for themselves. They are the people we should be going after. They are the ones who are victimizing this Assembly. So I support this motion and hope that the 11 leaders of our country, the 10 premiers and the Prime Minister will listen to this and try to do something to redress the mistake they made by preventing us from becoming provinces. They should go back to the old system where the Parliament of Canada, only, decides if people in a territory get to achieve provincial status. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Paniloo.

People Of NWT Should Have Right To Speak In Any Forum

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to support the motion. The Inuit in my constituency and the people of NWT would like the federal government to know that we should have the right to speak in any forum. I do not know the reason why they are not supporting us at this time. I believe that we have a very good government in the NWT and we should be represented in the federal government. Inuit and the Dene and the white people are represented in the Legislative Assembly and they are working together in co-operation for a better future for the NWT but we are not recognized in the federal government.

I am supporting this motion because I would like NWT people to be able to be recognized in the Canadian Constitution. For the purpose of Yukon and the territorial government, they should believe in and they should support the territorial government. I think they are scared of us, that they think that we might be out of control from the federal system. I support this motion, for this reason. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the motion. In some ways, for me, it is not a surprise that the Government of Canada or the provinces are treating the Northwest Territories the way they are. This is not something new; it is something that has been going on for a long, long time and you know, if we just think back and think of what we are complaining about, there was a time when even this government was treating its own citizens in the same way that Ottawa treats us today.

Right Of Provinces To Extend Boundaries Serious

I am not too worried about the fact that the Northwest Territories will never be able to get Senate appointments because I do not agree with the Senate. I think it should be wiped out. But what concerns me is that this agreement at Meech Lake allows the provinces to extend their boundaries and that, to me, would be serious. I do not know what it means in terms of the aboriginal people of the Northwest Territories because in other parts of the Constitution the aboriginal rights are recognized and so for provinces just to sort of unilaterally together agree to extend their boundary without talking to the people who live there, whose homeland it is, to me is not right. I think that in the world theatre or forum, Canada sees itself or identifies itself as a northern country, a northern hemisphere country and that is how the rest of the world sees it. You know, Canada can go to the rest of the world and brag that it has arctic peoples, and all of that type of thing, but at the same time ignore their rights, deny them freedoms in its Constitution. I think it is hypocritical for the rest of Canada to do that. I think in the strategy that this government decides to use, that central to it has to be the fact that the aboriginal people form the majority of the North. I think southern Canadians are more receptive to that rather than the straight-out constitutional rights of 50,000 people.

You know, my own personal view is that in any strategy that this government uses to take this thing to court, a central focus has to be the fact that the Northwest Territories is a homeland of a majority of aboriginal people and people who are spread over 40 per cent of Canada's land mass, 42 per cent of Canada's area. You know, something like 65 communities. I think a message like that to Canadians would make them more receptive to listening, because I do not think that we have it in our power to force the government to change its will, to change what they see as politically good for them, to include Quebec, and they want to be seen as doing something.

I think it is going to be hard to change their minds. We do not have what it takes, so few people as we are, to force them to change. I think what we have to do is appeal to Canadians in general. Canadians have to see it in their hearts that the Northwest Territories is a different place and that decisions of the people that they elect could change the North forever, could, in fact, sort of change the texture of the whole of Canada, because Canada sees itself as a northern country, and all of those things. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support this motion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Gargan, do you wish to comment on this motion?

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unlike my colleague for Iqaluit, I am not standing here in sorrow or choked up. In fact, I am quite angry that the Canadian government has passed a Constitution and a Charter of Rights and has chosen to neglect this particular area with regard to the Meech Lake agreement.

#### Limited Knowledge Of Canadian Constitution And Charter Of Rights

I have to talk in a context of my own constituency, in which 95 per cent of the people are aboriginal people and have limited or no knowledge of what the Canadian Constitution and the Charter of Rights are all about. When you give them a sort of broad perspective of what we mean by the Canadian Constitution and the Charter of Rights -- rights to the individual, the rights to sheltering and equality under the law, your aboriginal languages -- they tend to view it as great; that it is really something; that we need it. But then the last five years, when the First Ministers meet to define aboriginal rights and Indian self-government -- the last one being in March -- again, nothing is resolved with regard to what we mean by Indian self-government. I thought five or six years ago that the patriation of the Canadian Constitution from Britain was really something great. The people started recognizing that this whole issue of the Canadian Constitution and the Charter of Rights is sort of a joke to the people of my area and, in fact, maybe in most of the aboriginal communities in the North. Really, there is nothing in there that gives special recognition to those people. It does give them aboriginal rights under the existing treaties and occupancy of land, but that is as far as it goes. It does not give them special rights such as Quebec would be given.

#### Powers Given To Provincial Governments

Mr. Trudeau just this week made a statement with regard to the Meech Lake agreement in saying that Mr. Mulroney is letting a lot of the powers go to the provinces and the provinces are playing that down. The premiers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and BC have tried to discredit Mr. Trudeau when he said that on the national news. I agree with Mr. Trudeau when he made that statement. I do not know whether this government realizes the powers that they are giving to the hands of the provincial governments.

I also agree with Mr. Wray when he said that this whole process is nothing more than apartheid and I totally agree with Mr. Wray when he mentioned that, because I know yesterday when I made a statement regarding the Meech Lake agreement, I did use the term "dictatorial fashion" in which the decision was made, like going into South Africa or Cuba, that sort of thing. I thought it was a bit heavy language to be using in this House, but I do not think it is and I think it is exactly what the Members indicate it is.

I also agree with Mr. T'Seleie regarding the extension of boundaries into the North by other provinces. Now the reason, in the first place, the provincial premiers agree that it will take 10 premiers to make the Northwest Territories a province is that perhaps they are looking at extending the boundaries into this area. This is something that I am quite concerned about and I am sure people in the Fort Smith area, the Snowdrift area and even my area, Fort Providence have to be concerned that the Northwest Territories is not up for compromises. I am not willing to let the provinces extend their boundaries to my area. They have to consult with the people that are going to be directly affected by such a move and if they do not, then it is an intrusion in my own area and I will not sit back and allow them to do that.



Mr. Speaker, I also would like to say that I am still quite puzzled about where this Canadian Constitution and the Charter of Rights are as far as I as an individual go, and whether my rights have been depleted to a point where I really do not have any rights and I have to depend on the generality of other people to define those rights to me. I feel that that is wrong. It looks as though I am a nobody now and I would very much like to be a somebody. So, in the context of that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to support Mr. Richard's motion. Mahsi cho.

---Applause

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mahsi, Mr. Gargan. To the motion. Mr. Richard, do you wish to wind up the debate?

Eloquent Words In House Should Be Heard By Prime Minister And Premiers

MR. RICHARD: Mr. Speaker, you have heard, sir, from Members of this Assembly many eloquent words this afternoon. A mixture of emotions and sentiments, Mr. Speaker. Emotions of shock, of disappointment, of anger and sorrow, as Members said. I wish, Mr. Speaker, with all my heart that the Prime Minister of Canada and the 10 premiers of the provinces of this country could have been in the public gallery to listen to these words this afternoon.

Reference was made by Mr. Wray and some of the others to the fact that we are being treated as second-class citizens. Others say in terms more explicitly that we are, because of this treatment, we are second-class citizens. There was a statement made by the former Prime Minister, the same Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Mr. Speaker. You will recall at one point Mr. Trudeau stated that there is no room for second-class citizens in Canada. Mr. Speaker, I hope that if and when the Prime Minister and premiers hear of our words this afternoon, that they ask themselves, "Is there room for them in Canada? Are we going to continue to treat them as second-class citizens?"

Fight Should Continue

I agree, Mr. Speaker, with those who have said that we should not end with this motion. That we should continue the fight. I trust that we will. Mr. Speaker, whatever else we accomplish this week or next week on this battlefield, we must send a message to the Prime Minister of this country and to the 10 premiers and to the provincial legislatures that we demand our right to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you call, sir, for a recorded vote and I ask Members, all Members of this Assembly, to stand, whether they stand in anger or in sorrow, that they stand tall on this issue. Thank you.

---Applause

Motion 24-87(1), Carried

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A recorded vote has been requested. All those in favour, please rise.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Erkloo, Mr. Paniloo, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Gargan, Mr. T'Seleie, Mr. McCallum, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. Richard, Mr. Wray, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Curley.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried. Let the record show that the vote was unanimous.

---Carried

Thank you. Item 15, first reading of bills. Mr. Wray, first reading of bills.

ITEM 15: FIRST READING OF BILLS

First Reading Of Bill 3-87(1): Charter Communities Act

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 3-87(1), An Act Respecting Charter Communities in the Northwest Territories, be read for the first time.

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

---Carried

Bill 3-87(1) has had first reading. First reading of bills. Mr. Wray.

First Reading Of Bill 5-87(1): Cities, Towns And Villages Act

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Pine Point, that Bill 5-87(1), An Act Respecting Cities, Towns and Villages in the Northwest Territories, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 5-87(1) has had first reading. Mr. Wray.

First Reading Of Bill 10-87(1): Hamlets Act

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for High Arctic, that Bill 10-87(1), An Act Respecting Hamlets in the Northwest Territories, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question has been called. All those in favour? Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 10-87(1) has had first reading. Mr. Wray.

First Reading Of Bill 15-87(1): Local Authorities Elections Act

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Kitikmeot West, that Bill 15-87(1), An Act Respecting Elections for Local Authorities, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question has been called. All those in favour? Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 15-87(1) has had first reading. Mr. Wray.

First Reading Of Bill 21-87(1): Settlements Act

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 21-87(1), An Act Respecting Settlements in the Northwest Territories, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question has been called. All those in favour? Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 21-87(1) has had first reading.

MR. McCALLUM: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. McCallum, your point of order.

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister, in putting forth Bill 10-87(1), cited the seconder as being the Member for High Arctic. The seconder would have to be in the House. That is all.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Bill 10-87(1) was seconded by the Member for High Arctic, Mr. Pudluk. Bill 5-87(1) was seconded by the Member for Pine Point. Bill 15-87(1) was seconded by the Member for Kitikmeot West.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The seconder for Bill 15-87(1) has been corrected. Bill 21-87(1) has had first reading. First reading of bills. Mr. Wray.

First Reading Of Bill 33-87(1): Public Service Vehicles Act

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Pine Point, that Bill 33-87(1), An Act to Amend the Public Services Vehicles Act, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question has been called. All those in favour? Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 33-87(1) has had first reading. Mr. McLaughlin.

First Reading Of Bill 4-87(1): Child Day Care Act

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Kitikmeot West, that Bill 4-87(1), An Act Respecting Child Day Care Facilities, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question has been called. All those in favour? Thank you. Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 4-87(1) has had first reading. Mr. Pedersen.

First Reading Of Bill 34-87(1): Public Service Act

HON. RED PEDERSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Pine Point, that Bill 34-87(1), An Act to Amend the Public Service Act, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 34-87(1) has had first reading. First reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

First Reading Of Bill 16-87(1): Maintenance Orders Enforcement Act

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 16-87(1), An Act Respecting the Enforcement of Maintenance Orders, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 16-87(1) has had first reading. First reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

First Reading Of Bill 22-87(1): Statute Law (Canadian Charter Of Rights And Freedoms) Amendment Act

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 22-87(1), An Act to Amend and Repeal Certain Acts Having Regard to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms - 1987, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 22-87(1) has had first reading. First reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

First Reading Of Bill 23-87(1): Statute Revision Act

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Kitikmeot West, that Bill 23-87(1), An Act Respecting the Consolidation and Revision of the Statutes of the Northwest Territories, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Bill 23-87(1) has had first reading. First reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

First Reading Of Bill 32-87(1): International Child Abduction Act

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 32-87(1), An Act to Adopt the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, be read for the first time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Question has been called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? The motion is carried.

---Carried



Bill 32-87(1) has had first reading. That concludes first reading of bills.

Item 16, second reading of bills. Item 17, consideration in committee of the whole of bills and other matters: Bill 9-87(1), Financial Administration Act; Bill 27-87(1), Territorial Parks Act; with Mr. Gargan in the chair.

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

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 27-87(1), TERRITORIAL PARKS ACT

Bill 27-87(1), Territorial Parks Act

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The committee will now come to order. We are dealing with Bill 27-87(1), Territorial Parks Act, with Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In Mr. Sibbeston's absence, Mr. Patterson is prepared to deal with this act.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Bill 27-87(1). We are on clause 2 of this bill, with Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, further to the discussions yesterday in the Legislative Assembly and again this morning when the Executive Council met to review this matter, my colleague, the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism, has asked me to introduce on his behalf an amendment to Bill 27-87(1), An Act to Amend the Territorial Parks Act. This amendment will provide that the Minister may create a natural environment recreation park or an outdoor recreation park only on the recommendation of the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that with this amendment the Legislative Assembly as a whole will be provided the clear opportunity to decide on the creation of any territorial park which involves a significant tract of land.

Motion To Amend Clause 2, Bill 27-87(1), Carried

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I move that clause 2 of Bill 27-87(1), An Act to Amend the Territorial Parks Act, be deleted and the following substituted, and that is being circulated, Mr. Chairman, at the moment. "Establishment of natural environment recreation park or outdoor recreation park" is the description. Clause 2 reads, "The act is further amended by repealing subsection 6(1) and substituting the following: '(1) The Minister may upon the recommendation of the Legislative Assembly, by order, establish a natural environment recreation park or an outdoor recreation park.'" Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Minister. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? This motion is carried.

---Carried

Clause 2 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 3, establishment of territorial parks. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 4, agreements with a province or the Yukon Territory. Agreed? Mr. Minister.

Motion To Delete Clause 3 And Renumber Subsequent Clauses, Bill 27-87(1), Carried

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should listen to some of the things I hear from the other side. If I may, Mr. Chairman, could I go back to clause 3 and further move that clause 3 be deleted and that the subsequent clauses be renumbered? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Your motion is in order. To the motion. Question is being called. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? This motion is carried.

---Carried

Clause 4 will become clause 3; clause 5 becomes clause 4. Clause 3, agreements with a province or the Yukon Territory. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 4, agreements with the Government of Canada. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The bill as a whole, as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Does the committee agree that Bill 27-87(1) is now ready for third reading?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): We will now deal with Bill 9-87(1), An Act Respecting the Financial Administration of the Government of the Northwest Territories and Public Agencies, with Mr. McLaughlin. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Executive Council would prefer to wait for Mr. Butters to be here before proceeding with the Financial Administration Act. As there is no other business, we wanted to move Bill 4-87(1), Child Day Care Act, ahead today but the Members of the standing committee wanted to have a chance to look in some detail at the regulations which I tabled today. So, I would suggest that we report progress at this time.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): This completes the business in the committee of the whole. I will rise now and report progress.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 18: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILL 27-87(1), TERRITORIAL PARKS ACT

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Bills 9-87(1) and 27-87(1) and wishes to report that Bill 27-87(1) is now ready for third reading as amended.

Motion To Accept Report Of Committee Of The Whole

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Members have heard the report of the chairman of the committee of the whole. Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Carried

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, orders of the day, please.

ITEM 20: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Orders of the day for Friday, May 29th, at 10:00 a.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: Bill 9-87(1)
18. Report of Committee of the Whole
19. Third Reading of Bills
20. Orders of the Day

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. This House stands adjourned until May 29th, at 10:00 a.m.

---ADJOURNMENT

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