



LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

2nd Session

10th Assembly

HANSARD
Official Report
DAY 8

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1984

Pages 215 to 263

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., XOE ORO
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.
XOE 1JO
Phone (403) 360-7141 (Hamlet Office)
(Kitikmeot East)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sorensen, Mrs. Lynda, M.L.A.
P.O. Box 2348
Yellowknife, N.W.T.
X1A 2P7
Office (403) 873-7920
Home (403) 873-5086
(Yellowknife South)

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

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

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

Officers

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

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

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

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

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

Sergeant-at-Arms
Mr. Max Rispin
Yellowknife, N.W.T.

TABLE OF CONTENTS
THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1984

	<u>PAGE</u>
Prayer	215
Members' Replies	
- Mr. Gargan's Reply	215
Oral Questions	216
Written Questions	226
Tabling of Documents	226
Notices of Motion	226
Motions	227
First Reading of Bills	
- Bill 10-84(2) Public Health Ordinance	232
Second Reading of Bills	
- Bill 10-84(2) Public Health Ordinance	232
Consideration in Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 9-84(2) Official Languages Ordinance	232
Report of Committee of the Whole of:	
- Bill 9-84(2) Official Languages Ordinance	260
Third Reading of Bills	
- Bill 9-84(2) Official Languages Ordinance	261
Assent to Bills	
- Bill 9-84(2) Official Languages Ordinance	262
Orders of the Day	263

YELLOWKNIFE, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1984

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

ITEM 1: PRAYER

---Prayer

SPEAKER (Hon. Don Stewart): Orders of the day for Thursday, June 28th. Item 2, Members' replies. Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 2: MEMBERS' REPLIES

Mr. Gargan's Reply

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the Members for the opportunity to raise matters of concern for the residents of my constituency of Deh Cho. I will mention just three things that I would like your special attention for.

The first is a proposed egg production in the Hay River zone, as mentioned in Fort Smith by the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism. His officials met with the Canadian Egg Marketing Association, or CEMA, as he mentioned, and I too attended that meeting. The marketing association was very negative about the prospect of the Hay River Reserve getting involved. It seems that there were very strict controls over the number of chickens in the country and over who can get involved in the egg production so things are not quite as encouraging as Mr. Curley indicated in May. This is very disappointing to the people of the Hay River Reserve who were looking forward to this as an opportunity for employment and greater economic independence. But CEMA did not completely close the door on us. They indicated that there was a shortfall of chickens across the country now and that another 600,000 chickens were going to be distributed across the country. So although I am assured that Mr. Curley's department is negotiating now to involve the Northwest Territories in egg production, I would encourage them to redouble their efforts and to lobby both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Northern Development to ensure that the Northwest Territories gets a fair hearing on this matter. I would also stress that it was the Hay River Reserve which did the initial work and negotiating on this arrangement and that if the Northwest Territories does get into the quota system, the reserve should retain the highest percentage of it.

Stemming from this discussion about eggs, I would add my voice to those who are encouraging an agricultural policy for the Northwest Territories. We must be prepared in a positive way against the possibility that the anti-trapping, anti-hunting lobby in the rest of the country will remove the livelihood from the people. Various agricultural endeavours are viable alternatives to the people in my constituency and others. The government must be prepared with a well-constructed policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

Management Of Bison Herd

MR. GARGAN: My second concern is with the draft management plan for the Mackenzie Wood Bison herd, which has grown to more than 1000 animals. Part of the plan calls for selective harvesting of the animals which have always been protected. The Fort Providence Dene band agrees with this harvest of surplus animals but wants to work closely with the government on the management plan and then wants complete control of the herd management, not token control. It wants first access to the herd to be for the native hunter, which the plan agrees with, then another percentage of the bulls to be available to trophy hunters and resident hunters of the Northwest Territories. The band supports the idea of a slaughterhouse for butchering the animals. It could double as a facility for slaughtering the Hereford cattle herd in my area. The band wants no accessibility to the bison herd by road and would want the cows left alone and only a percentage of the bulls available for hunting. The other problem, Mr. Speaker, that we have in my constituency is that the game officer that is designated for Fort Providence is now stationed in Hay River and it makes it a lot more difficult to get some kind of a management system going.

Finally, I want to call the government to task for talking about devolving health and social services to the communities but not doing it. When are the bands, the communities, going to have control over the health and social services workers who work in the communities? The only way this can happen or will happen is when the bands pay the salaries of the workers which is not happening now. What is the territorial government policy on devolution and what kind of schedules are we working to? What is the government's position on taking control of federal government responsibilities in the health and social services area and, for that matter, why cannot some programs be transferred directly from the federal government to the communities instead of through the territorial government whose procedures we often feel are more of an obstacle than anything else? I would ask the Minister of Health and Social Services to give serious thought to these issues and to make his time in the department one of real progress in devolving responsibility to the communities.

Finally, I would give notice that I will be moving that this Assembly reconsider its decision to deny a request from the Hay River Reserve for a multipurpose hall to be built. The hall has been denied and has been placed on the back end of the five year forecast. Mr. Speaker, I would request unanimous consent to that motion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Gargan. Members' replies. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to bring a few words of greetings from the still movie capital of the Northwest Territories and the...

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Mr. Patterson, it has been brought to my attention that your name appears on the list of having spoken in reply to the Commissioner's Address, so you will have another opportunity to make a statement under Ministers' statements. Sorry, you are out of order, Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: It is the public's loss, Mr. Speaker.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: That is one man's opinion, Mr. Patterson. Members' replies. Are there any further Members' replies?

Item 3, Ministers' statements. Mr. Patterson.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I think one of my colleagues learned at the session in Fort Smith that Ministers' statements are not the place for political comments, so I will ask the Members to hold their breaths until the fall session where I will make my reply. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. Item 4, oral questions. Mr. McCallum.

ITEM 4: ORAL QUESTIONS

Question 75-84(2): Funding For Overture Concert Series

MR. MCCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Mr. Sibbeston. It concerns the request of the group that are responsible for the overture concert series that has

been in existence for some years. The request was made of the Minister for assistance. It is my understanding that the Minister has indicated by letter that he is not prepared at this time to provide assistance so that this very worth-while program can go on. It has taken place, as I say, over a number of years in a number of communities in the North. I wonder if the Minister would reconsider his decision not to provide assistance to this group and deny the possibility of having this concert series continue. I wonder if the Minister would indicate to me whether he would be able to reconsider his earlier decision and hopefully provide some assistance to this project.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of an oral question has been badly stretched. Mr. Sibbeston, if you care to reply?

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, just a point of order. Could you indicate to me how I overstretched an oral question?

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: We would take up all of the afternoon, Mr. McCallum, evidently. You have been sitting long enough to know what a proper oral question is. If you wish I'll see you in my chambers later when I have more time. Mr. Sibbeston.

Return To Question 75-84(2): Funding For Overture Concert Series

MR. SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, my department recently decided not to provide any more funding to the overture concert organization. I can say that the decision was made after a great deal of consideration of all the requests for cultural type matters that were occurring throughout the North and I'll certainly take the Member's concern and will reconsider the matter and will advise him in due course of my decision.

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

Question 76-84(2): Canadian Championship Dog Derby

MR. BALLANTYNE: I would like to pose a question to the Minister of Local Government and it concerns the Canadian Championship Dog Derby. In 1985, it will be the 30th year of the dog derby and with your indulgence, if I could just give a very brief little history on it, is that stretching it?

MR. McCALLUM: That's stretching it.

MR. BALLANTYNE: No, it's nice, it is sort of for everybody, it is for history and posterity.

MRS. SORENSEN: Minister's statement!

MR. BALLANTYNE: Anyhow, I will be very, very brief. It was won in 1955 by Alfred Drygeese, Joe Tobie has won it, Danny McQueen has won it over the years and in 1972 the Yellowknife Rotary Club took it over and increased the purse to \$15,000. In 1978, there was a concern that the trapping teams were not being competitive so they changed the rules to encourage trapping teams. The problem now is that the prize money has not gone up for so long, they are having a difficult time attracting anybody. I wonder if the Minister would consider a grant from this government to get that interest back in it because at one time it was a world renowned race and because of the fact that there are so many other races going on, there is not the prize money really available to attract the best teams from Canada and the States. If the Minister could take it under advisement, I'll be bringing it up again, but I just wanted to give him some advance warning. Would the Minister take that under advisement and perhaps look sympathetically at the concept of supporting this great event? I apologize, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't apologize.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, do you wish to attempt to answer that? Mr. Sibbeston.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, we treat all matters raised by Members as serious concerns and I certainly will consider the matter that the Member has raised.

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

Question 77-84(2): Proposed Sale Of Northern Transportation Company Limited

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I have a genuine oral question. This is for the Minister responsible for transport. We have been made aware recently that the federal government is thinking of disposing of the Northern Transportation Company Limited. Could I ask what our government is doing with respect to that sale? Is it attempting to have any input into the conditions of the sale or is there any thought of this government taking over that transportation company or any other considerations that have gone into it?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 77-84(2): Proposed Sale Of Northern Transportation Company Limited

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is doing more than thinking of disposing of NTCL and its two subsidiaries. It is moving to do that and it is anticipated that within a week or 10 days there will be an advertisement in the national press and local papers indicating the requirement for proposals. I believe there are estimated some eight proponents. I have been in touch with Mr. Axworthy and have indicated to the Minister the interests and concerns of the people in the NWT with regard to the sale. I have indicated to him also that there is a number of organizations in the North which would be interested in participating and proposing purchase of either part or all of the company as it now apparently stands. I have indicated to the deputy minister of the federal Department of Transport, Mr. Ramsey Withers, who is chairing a facilitating committee that this government would like to be part of that committee so that we could be part of the process and examine the proposals that come in. So we are monitoring the process that has occurred to date and with regard to whether or not we would seek to be a proponent ourselves, that decision has not been made. I would be putting to the Executive Council at probably the next meeting all the details that currently exist and seek some direction at that time as to what action this government would take in regard to the proposed sale of NTCL. It is not anticipated that the proposals will have been accepted before, say, the end of October or September and if the sale occurred, the final decision may be made in November or December, so that the process is some six months in length.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Mr. MacQuarrie.

Supplementary To Question 77-84(2): Proposed Sale Of Northern Transportation Company Limited

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister indicated that this government had corresponded or perhaps not corresponded but communicated with Mr. Axworthy and detailed the interests of the people of the NWT in this matter. First supplementary, if that communication was in a written form, could Members have access to the detail of those interests as they were expressed by the Minister? Secondly, he mentioned that he had asked whether this government could have some input into the task force or whatever it was that Mr. Withers would be handling. As a response to that, is it indicated that we will, in fact, have some input or some participatory role?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 77-84(2): Proposed Sale Of Northern Transportation Company Limited

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Speaker, the communications at this time have in the main been oral, and I can provide the Member with a summary of what has occurred to date. With regard to Mr. Ramsey Withers' committee, my understanding is that it will not really come into action until the consulting firm which is operating for the federal Department of Public Works has made its report and made its recommendations to this committee. To date, the only thing that has occurred to my knowledge, is that the consultant has developed an evaluation assessment of the company and has made this available to the federal department. Nothing has gone beyond that stage at the present time. We will be involved and I will provide the Member with a summary.

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

Question 78-84(2): Marine Rescue Auxiliary, Yellowknife

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question I would like to pose to the Government Leader as the Minister responsible for Justice and Public Services. In Fort Smith, I brought up the idea of the possibility of some support from this government to the marine rescue auxiliary in Yellowknife. I understand that their boat has just arrived. They do not have a motor, the boating season is upon us and I wonder if there has been any action taken on that request?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Nerysoo.

Return To Question 78-84(2): Marine Rescue Auxiliary, Yellowknife

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just want to indicate to the honourable Member that the request that was raised by the honourable Member in Fort Smith, was addressed by the Executive Council. The Executive Council forwarded the request to the Departments of Renewable Resources and Justice and Public Services to inquire whether this could be funded from either of these two departments. The Executive Council expects to consider this matter at the next regular meeting, which is scheduled to be held shortly, at which time the Council will be in a position to respond to the request that Mr. Ballantyne has made.

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

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Services. Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I would beg your indulgence. I have just been informed by Nellie Cournoyea that the final agreement in principle on the legislation has been passed by the Senate and I personally would like to take the opportunity to congratulate Nellie Cournoyea, Peter Green, Bob Delury and all the board members of COPE, for a successful and well-done job.

Question 79-84(2): Provision Of Standards For Day Care

My question is for the Minister of Health and Social Services. Mr. Minister, one of our most important resources, as you know, is the children of the Northwest Territories, and more and more of our northern children are being cared for in private and public day care centres and private homes. As a result, there is a rising lobby from those who have the welfare of the child in mind and from those involved in the business of day care to establish standards and a licensing provision on behalf of the government. Has the Minister considered the issue of standards and if so, what measures are you taking, sir, to begin the process of consultation with those offering and those receiving this important service, and if you have not considered standards, I wonder if you could explain to the House why not?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 79-84(2): Provision Of Standards For Day Care

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The issue of day care policy is something that has to be looked at. It shows how much our government helps out various groups in communities with the provision of day care and it varies from community to community. In some cases, the community is provided with a facility, maybe a building that the government no longer has use for. In some cases, the utilities are also included in that and in some cases, not. In other communities such as Yellowknife, there is a mix of that as well as private people offering day care in a commercial manner, who receive no subsidies. So where I have come across it so far in the department, we are looking at what other jurisdictions do to subsidize day care. What I have found is that in most cases the facilities would not be subsidized unless the regulations which the Department of Social Services in that jurisdiction would require.

For example, in Saskatchewan, I believe they give \$600 per space when an organization, possibly even a private organization, offers day care. Then they give \$100; that is a one time only thing, on a new facility and then subsequent to that they offer \$100 per space each year to help the operation. I mention that to you because that is dependent upon those facilities following the policy set down as to how a day care centre should be run. My only dealing so far with this issue is the fact that we have no policy on how we help subsidize facilities and while I was looking at it I also realized that we do not have any policy on the quality of day care in the Northwest Territories. I do intend to bring both the subsidy and the quality issue policies before the

Executive. I believe the last time it was dealt with by Mr. Braden, when he was the Leader, as the Member for Yellowknife North then, and Mr. McCallum because he was the Minister of Public Works at that time, as it related to one of the day care groups in Yellowknife requiring subsidies for their heating. I believe nothing since then has been done on the policy. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. An oral question and no more politicking, Mrs. Sorensen.

Supplementary To Question 79-84(2): Provision Of Standards For Day Care

MRS. SORENSEN: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I guess I did not quite have an understanding of what the Minister was saying. I recognize that we do not have a policy with respect to subsidization and that is going to take some time to develop because there is a whole process that we must go through as a northern society to discuss how we are going to provide our tax dollar for the subsidization of day care and I can appreciate why we do not have a policy as yet. It is going to be a difficult discussion and I would hope that we could get to that discussion soon.

But what I am talking about is something that is even more urgent and that is the lack of standards for the provision of day care in centres and in private homes. We do not have standards with respect to worker/child ratios, fire standards, health and safety standards, experience and training for workers, space per child. Every province has established some minimum standards. I believe even the Yukon has them and I would see these as absolutely crucial for this government to develop. My question was, have you considered the development of those standards and what process for consultation do you plan to take over the next few months if you see them as an urgent requirement as I do and as the people who are involved in the provision of day care and receiving day care do?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Further Return To Question 79-84(2): Provision Of Standards For Day Care

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason that I went into the subsidy part, is that we are in fact presently spending some of our funds subsidizing some of these operations, not necessarily with cash but at least with facilities which we maintain. So, it is important and the reason that I also mentioned that, is because that is one of the tools that the government would be able to use to ensure that operators followed any policies that we set for the quality of the operation of day care, because they would not be able to obtain our grants if they were not following our guidelines. So the things do sort of go hand in hand in that manner. I cannot say that we have a plan in the next couple of months to put an emphasis on this, but certainly I realize that there are groups in Yellowknife that have come forward with some proposals as to what they feel the standard should be. We also have to, in dealing with that, realize that in some of the smaller communities those standards may not be able to apply because of lack of facilities and the more general use of private homes for providing day care in the smaller communities. So there have been a mix of both situations, but I would certainly be happy to receive any type of proposals from any groups. I do hope to address the subsidy issue hand in hand with policies because I think the one can be used as a tool to make sure that the quality is followed, because otherwise they will not be eligible for the subsidies. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question 80-84(2): Local Hiring For Road Construction, Fort Providence

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Public Works. Last winter, before they were designing the construction of the old winter road in Fort Providence, DPW promised the community of Fort Providence that it would hire local people to do the chain work and the rough work on that highway. This morning I heard that the department has gone and hired some people from Yellowknife to do work on that road, when they had promised that to local people. People in my constituency that were waiting, hoping to get on the survey crew are now told, "I am sorry but we have some other people." Could the Minister look into it, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can certainly assure the Member that I will look into it and hopefully be able to provide him with some kind of answer before he leaves town on the weekend. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Oral questions. Mrs. Lawrence.

Question 81-84(2): Upgrading Of Sidewalks, Fort Resolution

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Local Government. A few years ago the government built sidewalks in Fort Resolution. The sidewalks have never been maintained or upgraded, and are in very poor condition, and it just seems that we have to wait until something drastic happens to do something. The community is very concerned. Will the Minister consider allocating some funds to upgrade the sidewalk?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 81-84(2): Upgrading Of Sidewalks, Fort Resolution

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mahsi. (Translation) My department has allotted funds for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Will the person speaking please try and remember to turn their sound equipment off their receivers, so we do not get the whistling? A supplementary, Mrs. Lawrence.

Supplementary To Question 81-84(2): Upgrading Of Sidewalks, Fort Resolution

MRS. LAWRENCE: The roads in the community have been in poor condition in the last few years. Therefore, it is in very poor condition. If the fund has been given it would have been looked into.

Further Return To Question 81-84(2): Upgrading Of Sidewalks, Fort Resolution

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I have just been under the general impression that moneys for roads, sidewalks and things of that nature are given to a community to spend as they need it and as required in the community. If there has not been any money specifically given for sidewalks, I am surprised, and I will look into the matter. If, indeed, the community has not had money for sidewalks I will provide moneys for the community for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Appaqaq.

Question 82-84(2): Location Of New Correctional Centre, Frobisher Bay

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) A question to the Minister of Education or Social Services. After a meeting this month of the Baffin Region Education Society in Frobisher Bay, representatives of Sanikiluaq were concerned that the new Baffin Correctional Centre was too close to the Ukkivik residence, and therefore there may be fewer students this coming year. Is the Minister aware of this concern and can something be done soon about its location?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Patterson.

Return To Question 82-84(2): Location Of New Correctional Centre, Frobisher Bay

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will try to reply to this question. It is certainly true, Mr. Speaker, that the new Baffin Correctional Centre will be built near the Ukkivik residence. In fact, this was a decision that was made in consultation with the town council of Frobisher Bay and of course available land is a consideration in these matters. Also, as I recall, the Baffin Region Education Society, too, was consulted. The location of the new correctional centre near to the federal building, as it is called, in Frobisher Bay was very carefully planned for inmates of the correctional facility who should be given opportunities to acquire skills and education while they are in custody so that they can reform themselves and obtain employment in future. The centre will give inmates access to what is planned as a developing college facility. To my knowledge the Baffin Region Education Society at their recent meeting has expressed no concerns about that particular problem or that particular issue that the Member raises. There may be some concern in his community but it has not been communicated to me through the regional education authority.

I would also just comment, Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Education that the long-range plans in my view for the residence facility in Frobisher Bay would be that eventually it would become an adult facility which would hold students who would be attending the regional college and that in the long run we would likely find another place and other arrangements to board high school students closer

to the high school and in town itself. In the meantime, I have received every assurance from the Department of Social Services that in no way will inmates of the correctional facility have unrestricted access to the student residence while high school students are there. In fact the residence is supervised 24 hours a day and female and male students are segregated and I am completely satisfied with the security arrangements that are in place, both for our students and as well as for inmates of the correctional centre.

But I would just like to again stress, Mr. Speaker, that in my view young people who are incarcerated in a medium security facility like the Baffin Correctional Centre, are not all dangerous criminals, they are ordinary people from ordinary communities who need rehabilitation and help and education the same as our students and people who do not get into trouble with the law. So, I would urge the Member from Sanikiluaq to recognize that these people deserve access to educational facilities and the possibility to improve their lives as well as anyone else. And it may be not in their best interests to isolate them from the communities. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Oral questions. Mr. Wah-Shee.

Question 83-84(2): Return To Written Question 69-84(2)

MR. WAH-SHEE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Leader of the Government. I wonder if the honourable Member could indicate to me when he intends to reply to my written Question 69-84(2) that was raised in Fort Smith in regard to the Department of Justice and two of my constituents who were held in the correctional institute without trial?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Nerysoo.

Return To Question 83-84(2): Return To Written Question 69-84(2)

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I can respond right now. I would just like to indicate to the honourable Member that I have given instruction to my department to review the situation, to report back the circumstances under which that particular incident happened and to suggest a recommendation and a solution so that in the future the situation that occurred in his particular constituency and to residents within his constituency does not happen in any other constituency again. There are things to look for and a solution and I guess a recommendation as to how such situations occur and how the police might be better able to handle that type of situation. So, we are dealing with the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. You recognize, of course, that that was a written question and will require a written answer for the records. This answer does not take the place of the written reply. Thank you. Mrs. Lawrence.

Question 84-84(2): Dust Control On Highway, Little Buffalo River

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Public Works -- because of the dust and before any accident happens. I was really surprised to see on weekends how many people utilize that highway into Little Buffalo River for fishing and all that. Would the Minister consider doing something about that highway, either pave it or put on blacktop, anything to keep the dust down. Mahsi cho.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

HON. GORDON WRAY: I will take the Member's concerns to heart and look into the situation and see if in fact we might have some work planned. There is so much work planned for the highways this year that I am not really sure if anything is planned. But if there is something I will let her know.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: I presume the Minister is taking this as notice and will reply. It has been one of those kinds of days. Are there any further oral questions, please? Mrs. Sorensen.

Question 85-84(2): Treasury Board Submission, Stanton Yellowknife Hospital

MRS. SORENSEN: My question again is for the Minister of Health and Social Services. Mr. Minister, given the fact that we may be going into an election soon and given the fact that the...

---Laughter

...that the House of Commons will be recessing for the summer, I wonder if you would have had an opportunity to find out what the status is of the Treasury Board submission on the Stanton Yellowknife Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: That was a fairly good recovery. Mr. McLaughlin.

Return To Question 85-84(2): Treasury Board Submission, Stanton Yellowknife Hospital

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to inform the Members that Mr. Munro in Indian and Northern Affairs and the Hon. Monique Begin in Health and Welfare Canada have both advanced the proposal for the Stanton Yellowknife Hospital Treasury Board submission to the Treasury Board. I was in contact yesterday with officials in Ottawa and it is on the agenda for today at Treasury Board and hopefully we will hear good news tomorrow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question 86-84(2): Assistance For Second Mortgages

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of either the House Leader or the Minister responsible for Housing and it concerns the apparent raise in mortgage interest rates. Today being Thursday, the Bank of Canada may very well increase the rate. I know this is something that has been discussed in this House on different occasions, that is, the government itself providing second mortgages to people at a reduced interest rate or trying to do something to help people who are already tied into interest rates that may be up for renewal very quickly. It has been estimated that the five-year term mortgages may pass 16 per cent within the coming year and remain there, and as well one-year term mortgages may go on beyond 14 or 15 per cent. Since the government has sold some of its own housing and these revenues have gone into the consolidated revenue fund, I am wondering if either the House Leader or the Minister responsible for Housing would seriously take a look at providing second mortgages to people or to make sure the people do not have to give up their housing in the coming year or to set up a program as such.

So my questions are to either of the two gentlemen opposite, would the government look at the possibility of setting up a program and a special account based on the revenue that it receives from the sale of government owned housing and secondly, would they set up a mortgage plan similar to a plan that was in effect for the government some years past at a lower interest rate, either on a one year term or a five year term? I think it is something that home-owners in this part of Canada and the Territories would welcome, not only the present home-owners but people who are contemplating buying homes which in effect is a direction of the Government of the Northwest Territories, that is, promotion of home-ownership. So the questions are, will they set up a program to provide second mortgages at a rate much less than what is being contemplated and secondly, would they direct revenue from the sale of government owned homes into a special account?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Nerysoo.

Return To Question 86-84(2): Assistance For Second Mortgages

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Speaker, I will answer part of the question that was posed by the honourable Member and then defer further to the Minister responsible for the Housing Corporation. I want to indicate to the honourable Member that we are in the process of developing priorities for this government. One of the items that was raised as a priority that this government should deal with, is to establish some mechanism or some idea by which we could in fact suggest a second mortgage proposal and the details to that have not been developed yet, but that is a priority item, to encourage further home-ownership in the Northwest Territories. The actual decision or the mechanism, we have not come up with. I would just like to indicate to the honourable Member, that that is a priority that has been suggested at the moment and hopefully we will come back with further suggestions. I would like to defer further response to the Minister of the Housing Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Mr. Wray.

Further Return To Question 86-84(2): Assistance For Second Mortgages

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question raised by the Member is a good one, because one of the things that bothers me, just to show how fair I am, is the problem that we have with the housing market in Yellowknife and some of the larger centres in the West. I am quite frankly surprised that the private sector has not taken a greater interest in this area. I had to push CMHC to see if I could get Yellowknife and some of the larger communities included in some CMHC programs. However, they are extremely reluctant to do so because of what they consider to be a private sector market. So, I have asked the corporation and they are in the process right now of developing a second mortgage policy, which will be coming to me probably within the next three to six weeks. I will then be taking it to the Executive for further consideration.

This policy will hopefully address more the concerns of the larger communities than the smaller communities, because as you know, in a place like Yellowknife where houses are going at an average for \$110,000, \$120,000, a lot of families can perhaps make up \$60,000, \$70,000, but it is that extra \$30,000, \$40,000 in there that they are having trouble with. So, we are seriously looking at a second mortgage plan that would assist particularly Yellowknife, Fort Smith and Inuvik home-owners in that area. We are working on it and hopefully by the fall session, I can report to the Member and to the House on what we are doing in that area. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Wray. It is rather peculiar, but the question based on supposition is out of order, but nobody happened to raise the point that this is the position. I wonder if the trend of the times is such that we have kind of come to expect certain types of things. Are there any further oral questions? I can't hear very well from that end of the room today fortunately.

---Laughter

Are there any further questions? Mrs. Sorensen.

Question 87-84(2): Transfer Of Responsibilities For Labour Relations And Prosecutions

MRS. SORENSEN: Question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Justice and Public Services. A long time objective, as you know Mr. Minister, of this government has been to take on the responsibility for labour relations and as well the responsibility for prosecutions, both now held by the federal government, as and when we were ready. There are indications that we are ready in both areas and I understand that there has been some discussion with the federal government and the departments in these two areas. I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to advise the House on the status of those negotiations and when can we look forward to the formal transfer of these very important responsibilities to our own government?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Nerysoo.

Return To Question 87-84(2): Transfer Of Responsibilities For Labour Relations And Prosecutions

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the actual formal transfer of the responsibility will hopefully come after the elections but I would just like to indicate that the initial contact was made with the Hon. Andre Ouellet and he is in agreement with such a move to transfer the responsibility for labour relations. However, there are still necessary mechanisms to be put into place such as a territorial labour code, the transfer of person years, the actual financial resources that are required to carry out that particular responsibility and I can assure the Member that work has begun on these matters. We are in the process of looking for a labour law expert so that we can develop the necessary legislation. There has been contact made at the official level by my deputy minister and other officials in my department and there certainly are intentions to seek the transfer immediately upon resolution of all those particular outstanding issues. I can assure the Member that there is no doubt that we want to assume that particular responsibility for labour relations and also for prosecutions.

For prosecutions, the actual contact was made with the Minister by myself, the Minister being Mr. Kaplan, and the deputy minister of Justice and Public Services also made contact with the deputy

minister of Justice and raised the particular issue and we are continuing to pursue it. We will be pursuing later this year, the necessary readjustments to the functions in our department, the Department of Justice and Public Services. Once this is carried out, I can assure the Member that we have every intention to transfer the responsibility for prosecutions or at least, negotiating that particular transfer. That is an important item, we feel, that is necessary to carry out the total responsibility of justice in the North and certainly a vital part of carrying out justice in the North and therefore, I can assure the Member that we will continue to pursue that.

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

Question 88-84(2): Review Of Northern Preference Policy

MRS. SORENSEN: Just begging your indulgence, I do have one more question, seeing that no one else seems to have any. It is for the Minister of Public Works. Mr. Minister, shortly after the winter session, the three Yellowknife MLAs and members of the construction industry got together with yourself to discuss the northern preference policy and the problems associated with the present limits within that policy and the definitions. You made a commitment at that time to further consult with other businessmen across the Northwest Territories and to, in fact, review the terms and conditions contained in that northern preference policy. I wonder if you can give this House a status on that consultation that you did say you would conduct and whether you are now ready to either confirm the policy as it is or to open it up for revision in the near future.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wray.

Return To Question 88-84(2): Review Of Northern Preference Policy

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Member will remember, one of the problems that I was encountering at the time was getting a group that was representative of all northern business that could give me proper advice because we were getting independent advice from the construction association, from the Keewatin Chamber of Commerce, from separate businessmen in Baffin, from other businessmen in Inuvik and there was really no one collective body which we could go to for advice. So, in consultation with the Minister of Government Services and the Minister of Economic Development we decided to give it to the newly formed business council which is representative of all northern businesses and I believe that this was the first item of business on their agenda at their meeting two weeks ago. Minutes of the meeting and their recommendations are presently being prepared for the Executive by the Department of Economic Development and once we are in receipt of their recommendations then some movement will be taking place on it. I think I can say that if their recommendations are acceptable then changes will be made to the preference policy because we do recognize the weaknesses that presently are within that policy. Changes will be made but I cannot indicate what those changes will be until such time as we have sat down and looked at their recommendations and made a decision in the Executive. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Question 89-84(2): Status Of Recommendations On Northern Preference Policy

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to Mrs. Sorensen's question. I am pleased to hear that the Executive Council will be looking very seriously at this matter but I wonder if the Minister could give us some form of a time frame. When do you expect that these recommendations could come forward?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister.

Return To Question 89-84(2): Status Of Recommendations On Northern Preference Policy

HON. GORDON WRAY: Mr. Speaker, we hope to have the recommendations and the changes made no later than the fall of this year. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. That appears to conclude oral questions for today. Are there any written questions? Mr. McCallum.

ITEM 5: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Question 90-84(2): Rural And Remote Housing Program Fund

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, I guess this may be on supposition and it may stray from it so I have given up on the oral questions. I have put it in writing. I apologize for not giving the Minister prior notice of it but this is notice. I have a written question for the Minister of Housing, Mr. Wray. Will the Minister indicate the status of the rural and remote housing program fund as regards the availability of moneys for the purchase of housing in the NWT? If the fund is depleted, will he urge a transfusion to it by CMHC and also if it is depleted, could he explain how this occurred so soon into the fiscal year? Mahsi cho.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. McCallum, that is a question properly put in the written form. Thank you very kindly for abiding by the rules. Are there any further written questions?

Item 6, returns.

Item 7, petitions.

Item 8, reports of standing and special committees. Item 9, tabling of documents. Mr. Appaqaq.

ITEM 9: TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Tabled Document 21-84(2), Recommendations of the Sanikiluaq Education Committee meeting on June 12, 1984. This is supplementary to my oral Question 82-84(2) and is for reference. I just have the Inuktitut copy.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Appaqaq. The matter is being tabled or will you be tabling that document in English at a later date? You are tabling the Inuktitut version at this time. Is that correct? Thank you. Tabling of documents. Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to table two documents. I wish to table Tabled Document 22-84(2), Enhancement of GNWT Native Language Services. Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Tabled Document 23-84(2), Bill 9-84(2) in the French language.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Tabling of documents. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table Tabled Document 24-84(2), The NWT Alcohol and Drug Co-ordinating Council and Regional Advisory Board to NNADAP, a review of their structure and functioning and suggestions for their future operation, prepared by Torrance Consulting Limited, March 30, 1984.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Tabling of documents. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to table Tabled Document 25-84(2), a set of Draft Day Care Standards, prepared by a committee of concerned citizens involved in the provision and receipt of day care services. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Tabling of documents. This concludes that matter. Item 10, notices of motion. Mr. Pudluk.

ITEM 10: NOTICES OF MOTION

Notice Of Motion 11-84(2): Ivory Market In NWT

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a notice of motion which I will move on July 2. Now therefore, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Foxe Basin, that this Assembly urge the Minister of Renewable Resources and the Executive Council to take the necessary measures to preserve this important industry including exploring the possibility of developing new markets for ivory and urging the United States to remove its ban on importation of Canadian ivory. And I will be asking unanimous consent later on this afternoon to deal with this motion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Notices of motion. That appears to conclude notices of motion.

Item 11, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent at this time to give first reading to Bill 10-84(2), a bill to amend the Public Health Ordinance.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Minister, I understand that you gave notice of that bill yesterday. Really you are looking for Item 13, first reading of bills, to get unanimous consent to proceed with first reading of bills. I will go back to Item 11, notices of motion for first reading of bills. Item 12, motions. Mr. Gargan, motions.

ITEM 12: MOTIONS

Motion 9-84(2): Multipurpose Hall In The Hay River Reserve

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to get unanimous consent to deal with my motion with regard to the multipurpose hall in the Hay River Reserve.

MR. SPEAKER: Unanimous consent is being requested to deal with Motion 9-84(2). Are there any nays?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

MR. SPEAKER: You may proceed. You have unanimous consent.

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

WHEREAS the Government of the Northwest Territories has recognized the Hay River Reserve as a separate entity from the town of Hay River;

AND WHEREAS the government has not made any significant contributions to the Hay River Reserve since its establishment;

AND WHEREAS the Hay River Reserve has the required population base as set out in the government's policy for a multipurpose facility;

AND WHEREAS the government has identified in the five year capital plan a multipurpose hall for 1989;

AND WHEREAS at present the Hay River Reserve find it difficult to find time in the town of Hay River schools;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Yellowknife South, Lynda Sorensen, that this Legislative Assembly recommends to the Executive Council that it consider bringing forward the planning for the proposed multipurpose hall in the Hay River Reserve from the fiscal year 1989 up to an earlier date;

AND FURTHER that the planning and design be 1985-86 with construction to follow as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: You have added the word "consider" in your "now therefore". With that word in, your motion is in order. It is not in the copy that I have. I understood you to say that the Executive Council "consider" bringing forward the planning. That is what you said, this is not the way my document reads, but if the word "consider" is in there, then your motion is in order. So, I will take it as read, that the word "consider" is there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed, Mr. Gargan.

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there were letters written to all of the MLAs from the chief of the Hay River Reserve, Pat Martel. Along with the letter that was given to me was also a letter written by the principal of the school there with the justification for a multipurpose hall. I do not want to go through all of the details and take too much time, but I just wanted to say that the Hay River Reserve at present has a new school being built, but if they

look at all the schools across in the town of Hay River, every school has a gym and so bearing that in mind the reserve is requesting that the construction of the school should be done within the next year and that it would be good at that time then to start the planning of the new multipurpose hall that could be utilized by the students at that school. During the evenings it could be utilized by the younger people and the older people of the community. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say more than that at this time, but basically that was the reason and right now they do have a community hall but hardly big enough for the students to use it as a recreational area. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Would the seconder wish to speak at this time?

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes. I was very pleased to be asked to second this motion, Mr. Speaker. I, along with all 23 other Members of the Legislature, received a letter from the Hay River Dene band dated May 22nd, 1984 in which they appealed to Members of this Legislature to strongly consider prioritizing their multipurpose hall. That letter indicated to me that they were quite serious in this matter. They had done their homework and their research in it. They had demonstrated through the fact that their existing community hall only fits 65 to 70 people, it has a fire limit applied to it. They talked about the fact that they had to go into Hay River for major recreational facilities. They said that they are a community of 270 Dene people without a proper indoor facility.

As a result of that I happened to be travelling to Fort Smith at the time and I met with Mr. Stilwell and discussed the situation and found that, as Mr. Gargan has indicated, there is a new school being built. However, the new school is being built by the Department of Education and the addition to the school which would contain what all our schools have, a gym and recreation facilities, was and is the responsibility of the Department of Local Government and the Department of Local Government did not have such a facility in the immediate range plan. So I felt that given the fact that this community is a fairly large community in the West, that it has been somewhat neglected with respect to facilities and that may be due in part to their own problems of getting their act together and I am certainly not criticizing the former MLA in any way, but I would say that as a result of that strong lobby, as a result of the information that I was able to glean through talking to Mr. Stilwell that I felt very comfortable in being able to support Mr. Gargan's motion to prioritize this multipurpose hall. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. To the motion. Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, am supporting this motion and I want to bring it up. It highlights, I think, a very serious problem in the North. It is a problem of smaller communities that are in close proximity to large communities. People seem to feel those smaller communities will be using the facilities of the large community. I have the same problem in Detah and Rainbow Valley with Yellowknife. Many, many times they are forgotten and I know there are other communities around the North where this problem happens. So I am supporting this. I think we have to recognize these smaller communities stand on their own. They have their own charm, they have their own special way of perceiving things. I think it is up to this Assembly to be able to protect their right to exist as a community. So I support Mr. Gargan in this motion.

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

MRS. LAWRENCE: (Translation) Thank you. I will support the motion. In small communities like Fort Resolution it is sometimes difficult to hold events because we lack a place to hold them, so there are not enough activities to occupy our children.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mrs. Lawrence. To the motion. Question is being called. Mr. Gargan, you have the right to conclude the discussion. Do you wish to speak again?

MR. GARGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request a recorded vote.

Motion 9-84(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: A recorded vote has been requested, Mr. Clerk. All those in favour, please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Erkloo, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Paniloo, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Gargan, Mr. T'Seleie, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Wah-Shee, Mr. Ballantyne, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. Wray, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Butters, Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Pedersen.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed, please stand. Abstentions, please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Sibbeston.

MR. SPEAKER: It is quite apparent that the motion has been carried. Let the record show that the motion has been carried; 19 for, with two abstentions.

---Carried

Motions. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for unanimous consent to table my motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any nays to proceed with Mr. Pudluk's motion? You have unanimous consent, you may proceed.

Motion 11-84(2): Ivory Market In NWT

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker:

WHEREAS the renewable resources economy including the sale of narwhal tusks is an essential source of gainful employment for Inuit in Nunavut;

AND WHEREAS the market for narwhal ivory is seriously depressed this year and an important source of livelihood is now threatened;

NOW THEREFORE, I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Foxe Basin, that this Assembly urge the Minister of Renewable Resources and the Executive Council to take the necessary measures to preserve this important industry, including exploring the possibility of developing new markets for ivory and urging the United States to remove its ban on importation of Canadian ivory.

MR. SPEAKER: Your motion is in order.

MR. PUDLUK: (Translation) There are some people that are unemployed in the Baffin Region and they are going to have to work very hard to get some wages because they are unemployed. So, for that reason, the government should do some kind of a study as to how the people can get more assistance to the people that are unemployed because the only reason why they get wages is through selling their products and we know that they put a ban on seal products and some of the communities had hardship due to that. Right now, up to today, they do not want to purchase any of those ivory tusks and the communities are going to suffer because of that. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Pudluk. Mr. Erkloo, as seconder to the motion, do you wish to speak now?

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My good friend, Ludy Pudluk, has just mentioned what I wanted to say so I will not elaborate on it too much but ivory tusks right now are banned from being sold and nobody wants to buy them. They probably have the reason that the Inuit people are just hunting the narwhal just because they want to get the tusk but I want you to understand in the Legislative Assembly here that is not the way we see it. It is true that the people hunt the narwhal for the tusk in Arctic Bay and Pond Inlet or wherever there are narwhals, but you have to remember that only male narwhals have the tusk. For that reason they are hunted more and the female is not required as much. So there are more females than males. You have to understand that. If the narwhals are not wanted as much by the market the female is going to be hunted more because the female muktuk is more of a delicacy to us Inuit people. That is what I want you to know and I would like you to support the motion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Erkloo. To the motion. Question is being called. Mr. Patterson, to the motion.

HON. DENNIS PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly, I would like to speak in support of this motion because it does affect my constituents. Really, narwhal ivory is a very important source of income in the Eastern Arctic. As well, the muktuk and meat are a very

important source of nutrition and a delicacy for many of our constituents. It rose up to \$20 per pound this year from its present level, which would bring the total income from the narwhal hunt in Baffin down approximately 70 per cent. My own constituency of Iqaluit has a smaller quota than most Baffin communities and last year only one narwhal was taken. That represented approximately \$1000 worth of income to one hunter. In some communities such as Arctic Bay, Pangnirtung, Clyde River, Broughton Island, Pond Inlet and Resolute Bay, up to 100 hunters may be involved representing over \$80,000 worth of income in each community not including the value of muktuk and meat. This is extremely important and of grave concern.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great potential for developing this market in the United States. I am aware that the previous Government Leader had lobbied in Washington, DC, to attempt to have a change made to allow Canadian ivory to be imported to the US. Maybe we have to now continue these kinds of efforts and perhaps engage the services of a professional lobbyist to see if we can develop a new market. The market in Europe seems to be gone or seriously threatened. So, I am pleased to support this motion, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Patterson. To the motion. Ms Cournoyea.

Issue Of Concern To All Residents Of NWT

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge everyone to take advantage of supporting this motion. I realize that there are a couple of statements that have been made in support of the motion stating that "It is a concern of my constituency." Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to all of the Members of the Legislative Assembly, that it may be in this particular instance a concern of a particular constituency. But let us all remember when we as a Legislative Assembly at one time thought that the whitecoat harvesting of the St. Lawrence Seaway was a problem of the people who harvested whitecoats. It is not and it should not have been at that time the problem of those particular people, but a problem of all of us, because the efforts of the groups of people who are totally against the harvesting of renewable resources such as fur-bearing animals, seals and other ways of making a living that the aboriginal people have in the Northwest Territories, are gaining momentum and it is a serious crisis for the ability of the Northwest Territories residents to continue their lifestyle in dignity and respect.

I would like to say that the Northwest Territories Department of Renewable Resources and the Government of the Northwest Territories has co-operatively with the aboriginal people taken a stand of joint management on the renewable resource harvesting and the management of these resources. I would like to say to everyone and every Member of the Legislative Assembly, this is not understood. It is not understood in Canada generally, it is not understood in the United States of America and it is not understood in the European Common Market. In order for us to represent our people, we must take an active stand whether the resources that are being penalized are from Arctic Bay or maybe tomorrow the beaver from the Mackenzie Valley. It is a critical situation, and I think on this mark we should group together, not thinking of those isolated experiences as being isolated, but being one of a trend that is going to be happening in Canada and our responsibility with the other nations -- you have the ability to do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. NELLIE COURNOYEA: I realize that and I am not prepared right now to make a full report of the last three weeks that I have been travelling with agencies and meeting with agencies and the other provincial governments on the matter that is raised today as it relates to the harvesting or the taking of ivory. We have a big job to do as a group of people to gain understanding and our efforts in that area have so far only been realized in terms of developing and funding the use of the humane trapping device and some educational programs for hunters and trappers so that they are aware of the circumstances that we are facing today. We have not been able to raise the necessary funds to educate the consumers of the products that come from the Northwest Territories and allow the aboriginal people mainly to continue to operate in dignity in harvesting the renewable resources and I would say in a proper management level of co-operation between government and harvesters. I would like to say that when we are supporting this motion that once a motion is passed -- and I am sure it will -- that it affects each and every one of us. Because of the effects of the groups gaining momentum in the places that we are able to market and having a great deal of success, I would like that we all support the motion and as well not forget about it once the motion is passed. Thank you.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Ms Cournoyea. To the motion. Mr. T'Seleie.

MR. T'SELEIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the motion. I would just like to say that I am pleased to hear the Minister of Renewable Resources saying what she has just said. I think we all know that in the Northwest Territories the vast majority of native people really depend on country food, on getting their main income from the land in one way or the other. I have been aware of this trend in the South that seems to say that the aboriginal people are cruel for wanting to live this way, for wanting to draw their livelihood from the land and it has been a concern of mine because many of the people that I represent still draw their main livelihood from trapping and from hunting. Therefore, I would be supporting this motion but in the future I would hope that we would come forward with more resolutions like this that would help our people be able to combat this trend in the South that says that aboriginal people should not be able to live the way they have lived. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this motion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. T'Seleie. To the motion. Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be supporting the motion. Although there are no narwhals in my community, the narwhals are very well used and it is good for the income and sometimes they send the muktuk to Frobisher Bay and other communities. The other communities are also able to use the muktuk. So, before we vote on this I want to just make a comment and support the motion. We are quite aware too that most of the northern game is decreasing and we seem to be losing our culture. So, I will be supporting this motion and I would also like the Executive Members to be supporting this and to think about it if they want to see the sale of the narwhal tusk. The Inuit people will not have very much income from the land, from the animals or the game they get from the land. I just wanted to make this short comment before we voted on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Arlooktoo. To the motion. Are you ready for the question? You have the right to sum up, Mr. Pudluk, but it appears to me you have won your case.

MR. PUDLUK: Mr. Speaker, I do not have further comments but I am asking for a recorded vote.

Motion 11-84(2), Carried

MR. SPEAKER: A recorded vote has been requested, Mr. Clerk. All those in favour will please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Erkloo, Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Paniloo, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. Gargan, Mr. T'Seleie, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Ballantyne, Mrs. Sorensen, Mr. Wray, Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Butters, Ms Cournoyea, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Pedersen.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Let the record show that the vote was unanimous with those present in the House. Motions. Are there any further motions for today? Mr. McLaughlin, you are coming pretty soon.

---Laughter

Item 13, first reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

ITEM 13: FIRST READING OF BILLS

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to seek unanimous consent at this time for Bill 10-84(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Public Health Ordinance, to be given first reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. According to the rules of this House, you have given notice, so the matter is before this House. Two nays would be required to deny you consent. Are there two nays for the first reading of this bill? It appears you have the consent of the House to proceed, Mr. Minister.

First Reading Of Bill 10-84(2): Public Health Ordinance

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 10-84(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Public Health Ordinance, be read for the first time.

MR. SPEAKER: Ready for the question. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Bill 10-84(2) has had first reading.

---Carried

Item 14, second reading of bills. Mr. McLaughlin.

ITEM 14: SECOND READING OF BILLS

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In order that this bill could proceed in committee of the whole today, as we may be finished today, I would like to get unanimous consent to proceed with second reading of Bill 10-84(2) as well today.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the new rules, two nays are required. Are there two nays in opposition to second reading of this bill? It appears that you have consent, Mr. McLaughlin.

Second Reading Of Bill 10-84(2): Public Health Ordinance

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit, that Bill 10-84(2), An Ordinance to Amend the Public Health Ordinance, be read for the second time. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to amend the Public Health Ordinance to provide for the appointment of a chief medical health officer and to allow for the appointment of one or more health officers for each health district in addition to the medical health officer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. To the principle of the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. SPEAKER: Question being called. All those in favour? Opposed? Bill 10-84(2) has had second reading.

---Carried

Mr. Clerk, would you now see that Bill 10-84(2) is put into committee of the whole for today? We are going to have trouble this afternoon with the chairman for part of the committee of whole work. I will at this time, however, put in Mr. Gargan as chairman of the committee of the whole. We will have to make some decision, somebody will be required later probably to take that position other than the named chairmen of committee of the whole later on in the proceedings. Resolving in the committee of the whole for Bill 9-84(2) and Bill 10-84(2), with Mr. Gargan in the chair. Thank you.

ITEM 15: CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILLS AND OTHER MATTERS

PROCEEDINGS IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSIDER BILL 9-84(2), OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ORDINANCE

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): The committee will now come to order. We will take a 15 minute coffee break.

---SHORT RECESS

Anybody who wants to make a comment now? Mr. T'Seleie.

Bill Does Not Go Far Enough In Recognizing Native Languages

MR. T'SELEIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This issue of languages and the bill that is before us, has been a pretty difficult issue for most of us. I know that I do not like the idea that French is going to be declared official in a part of the country where the majority languages are not

recognized. That is wrong. For the Canadian laws to say that we have to have French in a section of the country that is entirely different from the rest of Canada is wrong. For the federal government to say "All right you people, if you do not accept it, we will go ahead and implement it anyway because we have the legal power to do that", that is wrong. What most of us ordinary MLAs are looking at are ways to give our languages a much higher status than what they have had until now. There has been very little attention paid to native languages. The ordinance does not state specifically that we should have translation even in the Assembly. It states specifically that debates will be translated into French and into English but it does not state specifically that this kind of service will be provided for aboriginal languages. That is not in law.

The section of the bill that deals with aboriginal languages is weak. I can appreciate that the Executive has spent a lot of time and I do not want the Executive to feel that what I am saying is any reflection on them. They have had to struggle with this thing within time constraints and I think the Executive has done the best they can under the circumstances. So, I would like to commend the Executive on the way they have handled the negotiations and so forth, but I still feel that the ordinance is not satisfactory to me. It is not satisfactory on aboriginal languages. The ordinance gives no rights to use aboriginal languages specifically anywhere, which means that if a man who could not understand English or French went to court, that man has really no rights, on paper, that the laws have to be translated to him in Inuktitut or Slavey. He could not talk to his lawyer and say, "Well, I did not really understand the charge." His lawyer has no legal weapon to declare something like a mistrial.

So I think that the ordinance could read differently. I would like to see the ordinance read that aboriginal languages are recognized as official for the following purposes, and I would like to see it stated in detail which today, it is not. My information is that we cannot change this ordinance, that the federal government has said that we may not change the ordinance, otherwise we cannot give you the \$16 million. That is also wrong. I do not see that the federal government has to take a position like that. I think they are being unreasonable when they take a position like that. So, Mr. Chairman, my position on the bill is that I will be voting against the bill at this time, because it does not go far enough in recognizing aboriginal languages. Thank you.

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

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the difficulty that some Members are having in reaching a decision about this bill, particularly native Members, as expressed by the honourable Member for Deh Cho yesterday, and the honourable Member for Sahtu just now. I must say that my own support of the bill is not without some reluctance and some regret. I will not go into that; I expressed that at the Fort Smith session. With respect to this issue, I really feel that it is a mistake merely to ask, is voting for this bill desirable or undesirable, when I compare the substance of the bill with something that I have in my mind about what should be right and what should be true about the situation in the Northwest Territories, or rather, should the question in our minds be, is voting for this bill desirable or undesirable when I compare it to the practical alternatives that are available? I think that it has to be the second way, that what should help to shape our minds are the practical alternatives that are available.

Alternatives Available

These were outlined in a letter that was sent to us by the Dene Nation at one point. It said in essence, you should not vote for the bill; you do not have to vote for the bill. One alternative is that you should persist in insisting that if French and English are to become official languages in the Territories then aboriginal languages must also be official and have the same status as English and French. Or they say another alternative is if you are unable to attain that, then simply refuse to co-operate and say to the federal government if you are going to impose it, then impose it, but we will not have anything to do in co-operating with that. So those seem to be the two alternatives and I think the question then that has to be asked is, are those realistic alternatives, are they productive alternatives? And it seems to me when I compare them with the bill that we have, that they are not. That is why I am able to support the bill. Taking the alternative of going for the big "0" for aboriginal languages as well, it appears from the facts that are available to us that that is not a realistic alternative.

We have just yesterday received a clear and concise communication from the Secretary of State, indicating in essence that the federal government over these past couple of months had changed from its initial position on bringing Bill C-26 into the federal Parliament where it was simply a bill

to establish English and French as the official languages of the Territories and in that bill there was no substantive recognition of aboriginal languages. And the federal government has said we have changed from that position, we are giving recognition to official aboriginal languages. They have modified a provision in Bill C-26 that had certain requirements with respect to the public service, and they are willing to provide \$16 million for the development of native languages. And in Mr. Joyal's communication he indicated, "That's it! We are not prepared to go any further than that. We are not prepared to give big 'O' status to aboriginal languages in the Territories." The message said very clearly that if we were to insist upon it and try to go further, that the agreement that had been tentatively reached would be null and void, meaning that we go back to square one and have to start all over again. So, it is clear from that point of view, that that alternative is not realistic, it is not open to us.

And from the other point of view, there are practical difficulties in the way of doing that anyway. Because from our point of view if we were to do it then we would assume some very significant legal obligations in respect of native languages which we simply are not prepared to fulfil. I hope that we will be, at some time in the future, but we are not at the present time and that is another reason why that alternative is not realistic.

So, what about the other alternative then? Just let's say we are going to refuse to co-operate. We won't have anything to do with it, we think it is wrong and if you are going to do it, you do it but we are not going to help you to do it. Well, in some ways that might be a noble stance, but it is absolutely not productive at all. Not productive, because it is clear, for example, I mean somebody might take that position in the hope that another party or another government, another federal political party might take a different approach. Yet the information that we have from these parties is that they would not be willing to take issue with the federal government in respect of this matter. And both major parties rely very heavily on support in Quebec and they are not willing to take issue with the federal government in respect of this.

And so if we were to simply say that we are not going to co-operate, that measure would be imposed and it would be imposed with no benefits whatsoever. We would still be bound by the provisions and have received no benefits whatsoever. If there is some other alternative to these, I do not know what it is. But in the light -- if these are the only alternatives -- in the light of this, the fact that neither of these alternatives is satisfactory, it seems to me to make sense to take some significant benefits at this time but also to go for more in the future. I think that there might be a case for standing on principle, for saying there will be no official languages in the Territories if there is not also official status for aboriginal languages, if, number one, the gains were merely insignificant, or there were no gains at all. Yet, that is not the case. There are significant benefits resulting from this bill. Or it might make sense to stand on principle if, number two, the step we are taking now were an end step that precluded any further change in the future. But that is not the case. Neither of those is the case. There are significant benefits resulting from the bill and it is not an end step. The way is still open to further developments in the years to come.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MacQUARRIE: When I say it is significant I am referring to the fact that for the first time in Canadian history, in law, there will be recognition of aboriginal languages. I say there is significant benefit because there are \$16 million allocated to the development of native languages and when I see the impressive work that has been done over the past three years with the language development fund, three million dollars over three years, I am very encouraged and optimistic about what will be done with \$16 million in the forthcoming four years. I believe there is significant benefit because that kind of language development means that there will be opportunities for real use in practical ways for native languages, if not in official ways. Those are all important benefits.

A Beginning Not An Ending

I say that this is not the end step, it is not an end that prevents anything further from happening because it is clear that regulations are going to be introduced immediately that will begin outlining ways in which native languages can be used in this territory. It is clear that by the fall or by next year, or two years time, when we see what competence we do have to introduce the practical use of native languages, that some of the measures that are in regulations now can begin to be put into this legislation and in that way can begin to work toward official status. I say that what is happening today is not an end step because both the Nunavut Forum and the Western Constitutional Forum are trying to shape new constitutions for new territories and will attempt to

entrench those features of those governments that are one in respect of aboriginal rights, and certainly they aim to try to entrench languages to make sure that they have significant status in each of these territories. This will be an important issue that is dealt with in both of those forums. It is not an end step at all and so since you cannot say that there are not significant benefits, you cannot say that it is an end step, then it does not seem to make sense to say, "But I am going to stand on principle anyway." To do that, I think, might give someone, you know, a personal feeling of satisfaction. All of us sometimes have a perverse way of feeling good when we have done something out of spite. Unfortunately, we feel that way.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): I am sorry, Mr. MacQuarrie, your time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is good, let him continue.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Let him continue? Is that agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Continue, Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, you know, it may give a person that kind of feeling of satisfaction but what does it do for the people, what does it do for the Territories? Nothing at all. So, it does not make sense to do it. I really hope that the honourable Member for Deh Cho, who had expressed doubt earlier and other Dene Members will find it possible to support the bill and I hope that, because the greater unanimity there is in this House in supporting the bill, the greater will be the opportunity for productive results coming from the bill, if there is co-operation in implementing it. So, I really would urge Members to consider that, that there is a great opportunity in front of us.

The honourable Member for Rae-Lac la Martre yesterday in an eloquent and very strong speech, spoke against the bill, and he insists that native languages must be big "O" official languages if English and French are to be recognized in that way. Now, as I said, there are already arguments presented by the Government Leader, by Mr. Patterson, by other Members of this House, as to why that is not possible. So, while the honourable Member for Rae-Lac la Martre insists that this must be brought to reality, he does not show us how it is possible to do so in these circumstances and at this time.

Further, I noted in his argument that when he was justifying why such a move was necessary, he talked about, for example, feeling -- rightly so -- that in his area it ought to be the situation, that people could approach their government in their language. He talked about an elderly woman who had gone to see a doctor and was not even able to find out what was wrong with her and what was needed for a cure because she did not have support in her own language. Well, it is interesting that the very kinds of things that he is pointing out as necessary, are the kinds of things that this bill will address even if it does not give big "O" official status to the native languages. It will help to take care of things like that and I hope that he and other Members who have doubts will finally accept the passage of the bill as being significantly more beneficial than either of the other alternatives that are available.

Even if there are some Members who feel in conscience finally, that they cannot support the bill, the manner in which that opposition is expressed and the actions subsequent to the closure of this House, I think are very important, because it ought to be recognized by every Member that language issues -- and we see this from history -- have the potential for generating a great deal of ill-feeling and acrimony and they have the potential of being very divisive. I would urge Members to recognize that, and to recognize also that if there is no realistic or productive alternative that is available to us, what will be the point of attacking publicly what has been done, and of fomenting discontent? I feel that there will be no point in that at all and that the consequences would be very regrettable.

We see that the government, which is comprised of Members from all groups in the Territories, has brought this bill forward. We have heard some Dene, some Inuit and some non-native people speak in support of the bill, which means that the potential is there for harmony, the potential is there for making significant kinds of gains together in the advancement over the years of native

languages. I guess what I am saying, is that I would just urge all Members not to play on the emotional aspects of this issue, because it can be very, very divisive and I hope that that will be avoided if this bill passes, and that all Members will try to the best of their ability to explain to people in the Territories why it appeared to be necessary to do this and the kinds of benefits that result from having done it.

In the end, it has been said before that politics is "the art of the possible". It is not a process of refusing to accept reality or of asserting or insisting on some dream in place of reality. It is a process of recognizing reality whether you like it or not, whether it is satisfactory or not; recognizing it and then working from that base trying to change it to something that is more satisfactory, using opportunities that are open and making opportunities where they are not open. And I believe that our Executive Council and particularly our Government Leader, Mr. Nerysoo, have practised that art as skilfully as it can be practised in responding to the federal initiative in Bill C-26. They are to be commended for their efforts and it is because I believe that sincerely that I will support this bill.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In my constituency, there are about 2000 people. When we met in Fort Smith, this was the first information I got on the Official Languages Ordinance. I felt that I should give this information out to my constituents and bring it back to the House, but I had to go to numerous kinds of meetings when I got back from Fort Smith and my constituents are not informed on this. But some of my constituents have heard and informed me not to agree on this. But for myself, as an MLA, I have to have the power and understanding to agree on things that would help my people. So for that reason there are land claims -- Nunavut land claims are going on right now and seeing that, the Inuit wishes will be coming up in those land claims. I would like to agree on this bill because right now, when Nunavut comes into reality they are going to want to use their own language. So, for that reason, I feel that I should agree to this. If I do not agree to it, my constituents, if they find out later on that I did not agree to this, they are not going to be happy and they are not going to be able to do something else afterwards. They are going to want their languages recognized when the land claims are settled. So I am going to be in support of this for that reason.

I know that I should abide by my constituents' wishes, but I am going to go on my own and try to help the most I can help them. I know that my people are not going to be happy with me and I also know that in the future they will be happier that I make my decision this way, when their language is recognized or their culture. But yesterday I heard from the native organizations, they said that we have to represent our people, but for myself I could not say anything. I have not really informed my people so I just wanted to say that I wanted to be in support of this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Paniloo. Mr. McLaughlin.

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would first like to start out saying that when this issue first came to us, I was very upset at the fact that French would be imposed on us like this, by what I thought was an intrusion into our constitutional area. It also seemed very impractical because really all that the French community wanted -- and in my own community there is a fairly large number of French-speaking people, for many of whom it is the only language they speak -- what they were asking us for basically was a pretty limited service, that our government would basically put some brochures out in French and maybe have a telephone number to call where people could inquire into our services with a bilingual person and use that person to help them if they had a problem with our bureaucracy. Once the bill came down in Ottawa and we responded in Fort Smith by giving first reading to our bill, I was still personally under the hope that possibly with an upcoming change in Prime Ministers, which we all know is going to happen and a general election which will result in another party governing the country...

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you really think the NDP has got a chance?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not a snowball's chance in...

HON. BRUCE McLAUGHLIN: Anyway, I was hoping that the issue might actually go away from us. But with the negotiations by Mr. Nerysoo, it became very clear to him and he transmitted that to us, that this issue was not going to go away, that the federal government was determined to have bilingualism, French, English in the Territories which is a federal territory, and that they felt that it was within their jurisdiction to do that and they were bound to do it.

Reality Of Situation Is That Moneys Are Needed

So the reality is, and I do not want to belabour this, especially after Mr. MacQuarrie spoke and he covered all the points I think very well, and I would just like to be very succinct in what I think about it. It has come down to, we have a choice of becoming bilingual, French, English, big "0", and nothing for the native languages or we can pass this legislation and become big "0" French, English but also have the \$16 million which is absolutely necessary to this government to put programs in place so that we can develop native languages, to put those languages into a position where they will be able to be made official in the Northwest Territories, so that we can translate laws from English into the native languages in a sort of perfect system so that what something says in an ordinance in English can be clearly spelled out in a native language in the same manner. In that way you can make a native language official. We require this money to take the first step toward making native languages official up here. I do not, and I do not think anybody in this House wants to say, that this is enough. What we are saying is this is an essential first step for us to get the federal government to acknowledge that there is a special role in our jurisdiction for native languages and to give us the funding to put native languages in a position and to develop them and enhance them so that they can eventually be put into the place as official languages. Until we do this, we will not be able to pursue the long-term objective which is to have big "0" official languages in the Northwest Territories for the aboriginal languages. Until we take this \$16 million and do this work which is absolutely necessary in the field in the communities and to upgrade the languages so that we can produce official documents in the native languages then, then we cannot get to our ultimate objectives.

So, I really hope that the Members who have spoken against this bill, will reconsider the position and realize that this is the first step to the ultimate objective and I think we have to take advantage of the situation that we have the opportunity, though it is coming to us through a manner which none of us, I don't think, a year or so ago, ever thought might happen. I mean, I don't think any of us sitting around here, would ever have thought they were speaking in favour of making the NWT bilingual French and English so that they'd get \$16 million to enhance native languages. That is the position we are in and I think that is a reality we have to deal with and I would urge Members who opposed this bill, to reconsider and look at the realistic situation. We require this money to take the first step to the long-range goal which is to make native languages official in the NWT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since the bill has been tabled and it has only been a few weeks and because of our commitment and involvement, I was unable to consult closely with my constituency. But I have spoken to some of the people and they were very concerned that the English and French were going to be the official languages of the Territories. I was only sorry that the fund was never made available to develop our native language and I am sure it is not the lack of trying by our Minister. It should have been made available so that we can develop our native languages. My language has no price tag on it and it is not for sale. What will happen after that \$16 million is gone? The first thing they are going to throw in our face is that because it has never been an official language of the Territories, and there is no funding, and there will be no more development on our native language. I wish I could say that I will be so happy, or I'll be happy, when the French signs come up into my community. I am afraid I am not going to be as happy as some of our Members seem to think that they will be, happy to see all these French signs coming up. It will be of no use in my community, believe me. I do not understand why our native language was not introduced officially the same time as French and English of the Territories.

(Translation) All the written work should be done in the native language before the French language. (Translation ends)

I feel the federal government is placing French and English above the aboriginal language of the Territories. That is not my priority, therefore, I will not support this bill on languages as presented. Mahsi cho.

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

MR. APPAQAQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be making a short comment regarding this ordinance. When we were first discussing this language bill, I think we were sort of in a rush when we first got into it. I think it is a very important ordinance and I think we were sort of pushed to respond to this. From my understanding I think it was started because of this Yukon court case.

First of all, I think we have to do a study of the Northwest Territories with what the people think. I think we have to see their needs first of what they want, the things they would like to see. Even though we are greatly discussing this right now today and yesterday, it has not been mentioned to the public in the Northwest Territories, we have not even heard about this through the local radio or through CBC or any form of information was not given to the public. It has not been discussed with the public at all in the NWT.

Although it is not discussed among the NWT too much, my community is quite aware of what we are reading about now because I have been keeping them informed of what we are talking about. My community is not a very large community so it is easy to inform them and I am able to get their concerns, not over a period of time but through a short period of time. My people are thinking that if we say no to the French language, I think we are going to be sort of behind. So, for the concerns that I have raised I will be supporting the motion, and in the future we will be dealing our own languages through the Government of the NWT.

I think that if we do not agree with this right now, the people that are working on the land claims will have no work to do in the future, and it will just delay the land claims. I have asked about the concerns of my people, I have asked the standing committee on legislation about this. The people in my community are not able to speak the French language. The people on the Executive Council are not able to speak their first language and I think once the French language is recognized in the NWT, there will be no more Inuit Members in the Executive Council or the hamlet council. I am not talking only about Executive but also the Inuit members in Sanikiluaq hamlet council. I am not talking only about Sanikiluaq, but also about the other communities. I think they will be taken over by French-speaking people. The way I understand this, I think only the French-speaking people and the English-speaking people will be having jobs in the NWT. So, I will be supporting this motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you, Mr. Appaqaq. Mr. Ballantyne.

MR. BALLANTYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the outset I want to say I am supporting the motion but with a certain amount of reluctance. I think some of the problems have already been discussed but I will go through them briefly. Obviously, none of us were pleased that the federal government, without any warning, decided to impose French as an official language upon us and I think we are all agreed that was very poorly done. I think we can all also agree that our government has been negotiating under very heavy pressure from Ottawa with a very tight timetable hanging over their heads. So, it has been very difficult for them to negotiate. There is the reality that there will soon be a new Prime Minister in a couple of days and possibly a new government in a few months. So, there is all the uncertainty that goes with that.

The Minister of Education has explained how he has tried very hard with little success to increase federal funding for the development of aboriginal languages over the last two or three years. It has been frustrating, and so the possibility of getting money is a real incentive. Now, I think John T'Seleie made a good point yesterday that perhaps there has not been enough political will in this Assembly to have allocated funds from other programs to develop of aboriginal languages in the past. So, perhaps we, as a government, have to take some responsibility also. I think that is a good point. There is another reality that if we do nothing, not respond, all the information we have in Bill C-26 would be imposed upon us with no recognition whatsoever of aboriginal languages.

More Public Knowledge Needed

I guess there is another reality that we all have to recognize, that there is all-party support in the federal Parliament and in the Constitution, that French and English will be official languages, are official languages, in all parts of Canada. Now, some people may not like that but that is in the Constitution and it has been agreed to by all the parties. So, I think it is the reality that we have to accept. Now in retrospect and it is always easy to judge in retrospect, I think our government could admit to making some honest mistakes in their approach and in their strategy.

Obviously, this timetable made it very difficult. So, I am intending this as a constructive criticism because I do not know if any of us could have done any better. But I think that, again in retrospect, that once our government heard of this federal government initiative, I think it probably should have sat down with the native groups and with the chiefs and tried to develop a joint strategy with the different native organizations immediately. I hope we all learned a lesson from this one.

I feel that the MLAs should have been a lot more involved. Sometimes, for any number of reasons, the sixth floor becomes a little bit too insular and I know that many of the people that are there now used to say that. I feel it happens by osmosis. I think a lot of time and effort was spent in explaining this complex situation to Ministers and you have said you spent literally dozens of hours. That effort was not spent in explaining it to the MLAs. Now I know a lot of the MLAs felt very uncomfortable to try to absorb all these complex and legal details in a short period of time and felt really rushed and felt that they were making a decision with really profound implications for generations to come in a matter of hours, I think that probably the government could have improved its approach. Again, it is a constructive criticism and I hope we all learned a lesson. The public had really very little information about this matter.

I know Mr. Patterson said yesterday that the public has a responsibility. I think for something this important we had a responsibility within the tight timeframe to get as much information out about this. I do not think we did nearly enough in that regard. Mr. Patterson also said that perhaps some of the MLAs did not do their homework in their constituency. I took a little offence at that statement. After the Fort Smith session I had a meeting with the band council in Detah and Rainbow Valley. I spent quite a productive couple of hours with them and I said I would be getting back to them. But Tuesday night was the first time I had a chance to look at the amendments and to learn of the new things that have happened. So, there was no opportunity for me or for any of the other MLAs to really consult with their constituents in order to get some reading. I think we have an educational function to fulfil also to explain the bill. I think that put a lot of the MLAs in a rather tough situation.

Now, to give credit where credit is due, I think that our Government Leader and his officials did a masterful job of negotiations. Ottawa is not always the easiest place to be. I think the \$16 million, even though there are those people that may perceive it as a sellout, it is real, it is tangible, it can be very, very positive. I mean, people can ask what are the future implications of us accepting that \$16 million and of us accepting this bill. I mean, honestly, we do not really know. We do not know what would happen if, as the Dene Nation suggested, that we negotiate with the new government leader, or the new government. Again, we do not know. We do not even know what really is going to happen if the federal government does not pass their legislation this week. We are playing really a high-stakes poker game and we do not have all the cards. No matter what we do, somebody is going to say sometime in the future, "Well, you made a mistake." It is very, very difficult and I think that the positive response of Mr. Nerysoo and his officials got from Ottawa with support of the Executive Council, definitely should be well-appreciated by us. We heard the Dene Nation put across the concept that perhaps we could treat money for the development of aboriginal languages as a separate issue from this bill. We got a telegram yesterday from the Secretary of State which was unequivocal. It said, "No." What they have said to us, although I do not agree with it -- it is a package deal, you cannot negotiate one part of the package apart from the other part.

Looking at the positive side of what is actually in our legislation, it names several aboriginal languages as official aboriginal languages in our own legislation and, as Mr. MacQuarrie said, I think for the first time in the country, aboriginal languages will be formalized in federal legislation. Now, on one hand that is not nearly as far as we want to go, but on the other hand I think we should be proud of the fact that we are breaking ground in this country. If you read our legislation, if you look at Part I, clauses 6, 7 and 18, if you read that there is really no limit to what we can do with aboriginal languages in the Northwest Territories. What it means is the responsibility falls on us, on the Executive Council, and on the Members. We have the power, as I read it, to take it further than the rights enjoyed by French and English as official languages. It means the power is there and it means that it is a very heavy responsibility but we have the power to do it if we have the will to do it. I think we should look at that as a reality.

Positive Support From Francophone Community

I think one part of this whole process which I found very positive is the support that we have got and the government has got from the Francophone community, who have been extremely positive and extremely supportive. We have not had those very ugly situations which have happened in other parts of the country, in Manitoba for instance, where the Francophone community was caught in the midst of politics between the provincial and federal governments. We have not had that. I think the Francophone community deserves our thanks and appreciation for the support they have given us.

---Applause

It is really nice for me to feel that we can go through this without that hatred and ugliness that has happened in other parts of the country. It was also very clear from the Government Leaders' position and from the Executive Council's position, that this is perceived as only a first step. Now, nobody in this room would agree that we have got what we want. We have not. I think again that it is our responsibility to work with the native groups and to work with other people in the Territories to make sure that we do attain the things that we are looking for. We all want aboriginal languages to have full official equality in law and in practice. I would say that no one wins or loses here on this issue.

I think we all agree on the basic principles or objectives. We have differences of opinion on the method or the strategy. After the process here is completed, you know, whether this bill has been passed or defeated, I think it is really demonstrated how vulnerable we really are to the whims of Ottawa. I think many of us had illusions about how powerful we really are. I think that this should have taught us a lesson on how important it is for all of us to work together if we are to achieve our ends. So, again, I will say that I am voting for this bill with a lot of reluctance. We have all learned a lesson from it and it can be a positive step forward and we can achieve what we want to achieve. Thank you.

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

MR. ANGOTTITAUURUQ: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (Translation ends) I do not know what language to use, and I cannot speak French.

---Laughter

Well, anyway, it has been two days now since we have been talking about these languages -- French and English. I too have feelings as a native, but thinking and hearing a lot of things going on since it was first introduced to us in Fort Smith. I commented a little bit -- a very short comment, I said I was going to support it. What happens after the negotiations are done? I said to myself, that will be my final decision, after I find out what is happening.

To me there seems to be a hope. It is written on the paper and there is \$16 million toward the language. I really do not think I can go against the bill. There are schools that are in English and French in the Northwest Territories, and our children are hoping to use them if they wish. But then again, as being a native, we would want our language also recognized. The money is spent for French and English. There are teachers that teach, and I think these few dollars that is given to us by the federal government for the four years, is a start in a way. While I know if I talk in support of the bill, some of my native people in my constituency would not like me at all. But, I am hoping that it is my decision. I hope in a way that something would be recognized.

We know for sure that some people do not like to change once they put their mind into something. I could see in my constituency if the people were properly -- with all the time given the chance to talk about French and English, I do not think there would be real fast agreements. I know it is a very short time. A lot of us MLAs, we could not talk to our people in our area as we were doing a lot of things, and when we put people together in meetings there are times that we just do not like to change into a subject. That is one part of it, that we could not talk to our people, because we did not have time. That is one part of it that really hurts me.

Anyhow, I am going to be in support of the bill in hope that something develops in the years to come. I am afraid to really turn against it. I am also afraid to turn against French-speaking people. I think the only way we could do it is to work together and if one is too strong opposing the other side, I do not think any good result will come out. There are ways that you could do

it. To fully turn against it you could get good results. But to the federal government we are just children. We know that they could shove it down our throats very easily and we have to try to be nice to them in a way if we want something done, I guess. I think that is what they are really saying.

---Laughter

I went to school and took only half an hour of French and I quit everything, and I do not even know how to write my own language and I cannot even read it. I could speak it all right but I cannot read syllabics. That is a shame for me. Maybe I would learn French faster. Anyhow, I really cannot talk too much about this because I am confused. I want to turn against it but my tongue is saying, accept it. That is all I can say.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): Thank you. We will have a coffee break for 15 minutes and then we will come back and continue with general comments with Mr. Wray.

---SHORT RECESS

Mr. Wray.

HON. GORDON WRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not say too much on this issue because I think most of the points have already been covered by various speakers today and yesterday. However, I think it has to be understood that what is happening here is something that is not by our choice or our design. We have been forced to take a position that none of us really wanted to take. However, I guess it came down to the simple choice of doing something or doing nothing and in many of our minds we are now satisfied that to do nothing would be to make the situation even worse than what it already is. So, because of that choice we have decided to take the course of action that we did take. Somebody asked me yesterday why Executive Members have such a sad or a glum look on their face over a piece of legislation that we are introducing and I say to them, "Well, perhaps for the first time we have had to run up against the reality of big politics and a federal government which has dictated to us a course of action that we did not want to take and we have to recognize the limits of our responsibilities and the limits of our power and I guess that is not an easy thing for us to swallow, particularly when we are dealing with an issue in which we feel that we were morally right." When the Leader went to Ottawa we very soon found out that the federal government were more concerned with the Italians in Toronto than they were with the aboriginal languages of the Northwest Territories and I guess very quickly that put it all into perspective for us and the hard fight that we had ahead of us. I have to join those, in congratulating the Leader for the job that he did do, because to move from a position of no rights and \$750,000 to almost all rights and \$16 million in the course of six weeks was nothing short of miraculous.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

HON. GORDON WRAY: Particularly when you are dealing with people, and I have to say this, who, in the 16 years that we have had a Liberal government, one of the major thrusts of that government has been to establish French as a second language, as the other language in this country, and I guess we were naive in thinking that when we went down there to talk to them they would understand the emotions and the problems that we were facing and who would understand the position that we were coming from. We did not, we found a very unsympathetic government who decided, as the Leader said, who did not want to muddy the waters any more than they were already muddied.

However, I think we have succeeded in muddying the waters and I think we have succeeded in convincing the federal government that there is more than two languages in this country and that in this jurisdiction those two languages really do not count for much -- we have other languages which are more important. That is why I view this legislation as a step toward greater things because to me, if you are going to build a castle then you have to start off with a foundation and it is no good trying to build the roof or the walls first because it is going to collapse in on you. I take the view that standing on principles in this issue is trying to construct a roof of a house before you have got the foundations laid. Sometimes we have to accept reality and I know that perhaps in this part of the country it has been more difficult for people to accept.

Eastern Arctic People Have Learned To Compromise

In 15 years in the Eastern Arctic, if I have learned anything from the Inuit people, it is the art of compromise. That sometimes you have to swallow your pride and swallow your principles to get ahead and to further the long-term goals and the long-term objectives that you set. Perhaps that is why we in the East, have always presented a unified front, because we have learned to compromise. It has not been easy at times, sometimes we have had to make very difficult decisions and this is one of them. I guess we are going to run into more in the future but I do not know if we will run into one that has caused me to go through the emotional gamut that I have, because I know when on an infamous Sunday afternoon when this was dropped on us, our position, quite frankly, at that time, was one almost identical to that of the Dene Nation. We wanted nothing to do with it. But as we got into it and as we discovered what we were up against, we originally, to be quite candid, thought that this was a leadership ploy by John Munro. That was what our initial thoughts were, and the more we dug into it and the more we got into negotiations, we discovered that John Munro had nothing to do with the leadership campaign. This issue was coming from the Prime Minister's office; that was who was directing this whole issue. The federal government were determined to push ahead with what they were doing. That is why I have no compunction in thinking that the federal government will go ahead with C-26 if we do not do anything about it. The will is there and let's not deceive ourselves. I am not willing to gamble that the federal government is not going to go ahead. I think that this issue is far too important for us to start taking chances on.

The other problem that we have is, from time to time we have commented that perhaps we did not do our homework, perhaps we did not consult with our constituents, perhaps we did not consult with the native organizations. Well, until five days ago, I did not know what our final position was going to be. I had nothing to consult with, because on a daily basis it was changing, and it is very hard to go to your home community and say, "This is what is happening", when two days later the whole situation changes again. We are in a situation that we would have almost had to bring all the people into Yellowknife and brief them on a daily basis on what was happening in order for us to get any kind of consensus.

One of the results of that has been a lot of misinformation, a lot of misunderstanding. Just a short while ago, the Member for Tu Nede made a statement that fairly soon we are going to see French signs in her home community. My only reply to that is that if those signs show up, then the Member herself is going to have had to put them there because this government will certainly not be putting them there, and there is no intention in this legislation and no intention of this government to do it. The rights that we are extending to the aboriginal languages in this legislation are far more, and far more encompassing than any rights we extended to the French or English. We have left their legislation so open ended as to have a free hand almost totally in any rights that we extend to the aboriginal languages. But, if you read the legislation, English and French are very restricted in what we provide.

So, I have heard from time to time of people saying, "Well it means that we are going to have to get rid of all our native people in the schools and hire bilingual English and French people", that French is going to become a major course in the schools, that they are going to have French shoved down our throats. That is just not true. It is not going to happen. I think that notion has to be dispelled immediately. There is no intention, there never was, and there will never will be.

The other comment that I would like to make is that some people have said, "Well you are giving away rights, you are trampling on rights of native people." To me a right is only a right if you can exercise that right, and to do nothing in this situation and to make some symbolic gesture toward making native languages big "O" official is nothing more than symbolic, because in practice and in reality we cannot do it. What good is giving somebody a right when they cannot exercise it. We are only deceiving people if we do it, and I am not here to deceive people. I am not here to give them something one day and then tomorrow tell them "Well we gave it to you but there is nothing you can do with it because we do not have the systems and we do not have the language in place to be able to extend that right to you."

Only Working Languages Will Survive

The other thing I have to say is that when you are dealing with languages, the key to the survival of any language is that that language has to be a working language, it has to be a language in daily use. Because when that language is common and when it is a working language, no government,

no matter how powerful they are, can deny the existence of that language. That is what has happened to Inuktitut. We do not have big "O" official for Inuktitut in the East, but then Inuktitut is used in 90 per cent of all of our meetings. It is used in all official government purposes. Our civil servants are becoming more and more bilingual. No matter whether we get big "O" or small "O" for Inuktitut, nobody will ever deny the existence of that language and it will always be there. It will build on its strength. That is why we need that money, because we want to make it stronger.

So let's not fool ourselves that not making native languages big "O" is going to spell disaster. I put it to you, that if we did nothing, that would spell disaster, because by the time a land claims process would be worked out or any kind of process was worked out through First Ministers' Conference, I suspect that we would be faced with a situation where some Dene languages would have disappeared or at the point of extinction where they could not be brought back.

I have no fears for Inuktitut, I have nothing to lose by voting against this legislation because Inuktitut will survive. We will make sure Inuktitut survives. We will put it in the schools and we have put it in the schools. We will put it in the government offices and we will put it further into government offices. We will make it the common language and we'll make it the working language. It doesn't matter what any government says, that language will always be there.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Erkloo): I am sorry your time is up. Will we let him continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

HON. GORDON WRAY: So I put it to those Members who are opposing this language bill. On this issue, forget principle, because you cannot win on principles, we are dealing in a real world and in a real situation and if you don't let reality strike home here then you could be condemning the people that you represent to something that perhaps you don't want to give them. The reality is that we cannot get the federal government to move any further. It is as simple as that. We have tried our best, everybody has tried their best. We can't get them to move, therefore we have to take what is the next best offer. I know it is not what we want but then nothing in this life is ever easy to come by.

So I put it to you that if you want your languages to survive, make them working languages because that is the only way they will survive. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

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

MR. GARGAN: Yesterday I had the opportunity to talk to my constituents about the situation with regard to this legislation and I have also talked to the chief at the Hay River Reserve. I told him the pros and cons of this whole paper that is in front of us. One thing that is keeping this culture alive right now, within the Dene people, is the old people. The now generation of Dene that are growing is now basically on principle and pride.

Just recently this government started to allow culture to be practised in the schools. It started off with native crafts. I suppose it is because this was a commodity. There was profit in native crafts. Second came the songs and story-tellings in the schools and finally the development of the aboriginal language program, a step by this government in the right direction.

I guess I am in the same situation as a lot of the other Members where I do not want to vote against the bill, I would like to support it. I am in what they call a situation of ethics and morals. On the one hand you have to talk about the past, the present would be myself and being in a situation, and the future which is my children. Our elders are slowly dying off and so if I take a position on principle what do I have to offer my children in the future. I realize that it would be a hard decision for me to make, but consulting with my own, my leaders in the communities, have made it lot easier for me to make decisions. I just also want to say that in working with the native organizations a lot of the themes they use such as shaping the future for our children, the ways of our people, or our elders are all things that were used by native organizations and to date these themes still exist. I am almost afraid that it will not exist too much longer.

Yesterday I was a bit confused, basically because on the one hand I guess I was taking two issues and trying to combine them. But after looking at the two issues separately I realized that the federal government is the one that is wrong and that this government is trying to cushion the

impact of French being shoved down our throats. For this reason, I feel that the federal government is the villain and we are the good guys. I also feel that this government has done its best for its aboriginal people. It has been long overdue. Now I would be in a position to support any issues in the future if this is done in consultation with the people before implementation. I do not mean that just like politicians running into you in the streets and tell you, "How are things" and now, "Okay, I have consulted with the person, everything is okay." You have to go out there, tell the people the kind of legislation you are implementing before implementing it. I have placed my principles now. I will not be sure whether a language, a culture, would be guaranteed. It just might mean 20 years down the line I will have no principles to cling to. Mr. Speaker, this is the extent of my presentation with regard to the language program. I am not voting against it. I would also like to make a motion at this time, Mr. Chairman.

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

Motion To Create Special Committee To Lobby Ottawa On Aboriginal Languages, Carried

MR. GARGAN: I move that this committee recommends to the Executive Council that it creates a special committee, to include native organizations, to double its efforts in lobbying Ottawa to give the aboriginal languages the same standing as English and French in the Northwest Territories.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

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

---Carried

Mr. McCallum is next.

MR. McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Obviously as other Members have spoken to the bill, I also would want to indicate and to put forth some comments to indicate what I think of the proposed piece of legislation. I am very impressed with the very pragmatic approach to the problem that is being taken by those opposite on the government side, who are obviously open now to the reality of things so that there will be a betterment of languages. I am not too sure, were this bill to have been put before the House two years or more ago and given the oratorical talents of the then MLAs, now turned Ministers, to talk to the bill that it would have received the kind of support that it obviously has now, I think it would have been a much greater task. Nevertheless, I think it is a mark, or at least I hope it is a mark of, again I had better be careful, I was going to say statesmanship, I am not sure I should say stateswomanship or whether it should be statespersonship, rather than being politicians regardless. I hope that this is a change of philosophy that is not ulterior but it is the acceptance of a new role by the Members opposite, obviously those in government, to try to bring together really what is a reality and what one would hope for. I think the reality is, as has been said by many people, that Canada is a bilingual country. We are part of Canada, though not of the Confederation, and we do not have the wherewithal to do anything about the Constitution at the present time. We are not part of the amending formula and there is little that we can do about changing the Constitution and even were we in a position to do so, given the extent of the numbers to the South, I am not sure that we could do very much about changing the bilingualism of this country. If in fact it should be.

I think it would be very nice and that may be too soft but I think it would be a great advantage to people to be more than unilingual. I guess I can be accused of being bilingual. I speak some kind of English and mostly Maritimese and with my own jargon at times but I attempted to learn languages before. I attempted to learn French, and though I can use a few idiomatic expressions at times, most of the things I can say in French would not be very nice repeated. I failed miserably at that attempt, so much so that I found it much easier to study a dead language, like Latin, than a living language.

NWT Legislature Far Above Others

It would be very nice to be bilingual. I don't think that I would ever be able to speak another language, as I say, not that I haven't tried, but I wouldn't be able to. I think that we in the

NWT are so far above and beyond other legislatures in this country, at least in North America and in a number of other places, we use languages to get things across, not bilingual, the use of languages in this House, in our committees, but we have the languages of the Dene as well. We have people who speak in Slavey, Chipewyan and in Dogrib, we have Inuktitut and we have English. There are times when one can make a few phrases in French. I do not think we would want to be in the position that four of the present provinces are in -- Manitoba, with their court situation; Quebec with its Bill 101; and of course we have New Brunswick who have in the Canadian Constitution recognition of French and English; and of course recently you have Ontario, the premier of Ontario saying no to the French language as well.

I think that what we have here is an attempt to do what we can to bring forth and utilize and put to a greater use the aboriginal languages. I don't think the question is English and/or French, but how do we get more recognition, and as has been said by previous speakers, the utilization to a greater degree and therefore the continued recognition of the aboriginal languages? I think that though there may be some consternation about the way this whole subject was brought to the attention of this government and the people of the Territories, I would expect that we have a situation where the federal government in trying to get recognition of its particular concept of French and English across the country, was hit by a number of provinces saying, "Look, you can't even get your own back yard in order about English and French. How do you expect individual provinces to recognize that?"

So I think there have been a number of things laid on us, but I think the fact of the matter is that Canada is a bilingual country. We in the Territories haven't the wherewithal to do much about the Canadian Constitution. We don't want it forced on us unless we get increased recognition and utilization of aboriginal languages, the total recognition of such and the continued use of those languages in the Territories. I think that what has been accomplished, in order to attempt to bring about those goals, those hopes of the aboriginal peoples, as regards their languages, can be done under this particular bill, that gives us the moneys upon the passage of the bill, not so much upon the proclamation of it. So that I would be in favour of the bill and I will support the bill because I have hopes, as has been said by a number of people, that there will be a greater utilization and a greater recognition of all aboriginal languages in the future and that this is what this government and everybody here should be working toward.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. McCallum. Mr. Arlooktoo.

MR. ARLOOKTOO: (Translation) I would like to comment briefly concerning the bill. We all know that what we want as individual MLAs but we cannot always get them. Maybe being MLAs we could all work together concerning the legislation before us. I think I understand some of the comments from the other Members. Following my understanding of the other Members I think I am going to be in support of the legislation. Some of my constituents have expressed that they have been informed on this and some of them have not been informed on the language bill. But they are quite aware of it. Even if the legislation had been passed we will hope that the Inuit language would eventually be recognized. The ITC delegates were talking about this legislation too and they were in support of it and I also will be in support of it. I know that I would have to represent my constituents myself and their only language is Inuktitut. From my understanding of the discussion going on around the table I am going to be in support of the legislation and maybe some of my constituents would not be happy with my actions but I know some would be happy. For the sake of the future, I am going to be in support. That is all I wanted to say about the proposed bill. I would like to help all my constituents, so for that reason I am going to be in support of the legislation from my understanding of the discussion around the table. That is all I have to say for now, Mr. Chairman. I would like to say thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Arlooktoo. General comments. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, would like to speak in support of the bill that is before us today. I, too, have many of the feelings that others have expressed of being somewhat sad that we have not been able to take that very major step of making the aboriginal languages official, big "O" official. Many of you will remember a very emotional, but fundamental debate which took place during the Ninth Assembly, May 26, 1981, where the finance committee brought a motion to the floor which was designed to force the Executive Committee, and the Legislature, to address the whole question of how committed we were to the enhancement and preservation of native languages in the Northwest Territories.

Over the past two days I have been reviewing that debate and one of the major concerns that arose out of that debate was the concern about the commitment of money. I notice, too, in reading that debate, that Mr. Wah-Shee placed before us the whole question of the official languages being the aboriginal languages and made his own statements with respect to the fact that he felt so strongly about it that he would continue to work toward it as he had since he first established the Indian Brotherhood way back in the late 60s and early 70s. So, Mr. Wah-Shee's comments yesterday with respect to principle and the official languages being aboriginal languages have not arisen out of an attempt to be political at a time when politicians could exploit, but in my estimation arise from his own fundamental belief that his languages must be first in the land in which he lives. So that the comments that I have heard about his speech yesterday have no merit, if they are a criticism of him trying to politick, because I have read the debates and his position has been long standing.

NWT Leaders In Canada

I would like to turn now to my own position and that is that someone very important said as he took the first step on the moon, "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind." Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill is only one small step for the aboriginal languages but it is one giant leap for Canada. For the first time, Mr. Chairman, in history, the aboriginal languages will receive a measure of status, a federal blessing, so to speak. I would like us to think for a minute about the impact of this bill when we pass it. The impact that it is going to make on the provinces and on the politicians in the provinces and on the native people who have been lobbying their provincial politicians for a recognition of their aboriginal status, aboriginal languages. Think of the inroads that this is going to make to force the provinces to treat seriously the question of native languages. We, again, are leaders in Canada, even though we do not belong to the Confederation, we are leading that Confederation in its recognition of the people that have come to this land, been in this land first and foremost. If we were to refuse to pass this bill and say all or nothing, then I think not only would we lose, not only would the people that we represent lose, not only would all the aboriginal people of the North lose, but Canada would lose as well. We know that the entrenchment of French and English would take place anyway tomorrow, that the federal government has Bill C-26 as a priority to pass tomorrow. If they proceed without our proceeding with this bill they will only entrench French and English and will not give any recognition or status to the aboriginal languages. Mr. MacQuarrie articulated why we should support this bill for that reason very well.

But, I would also, Mr. Chairman, like to take the opportunity today to speak to the French Canadians who are in my constituency, and I have a number of them, just as I have a great number of Newfoundlanders and people from all over Canada. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank them for their patience in this matter. There has been a great number of years when they have been aware of what their rights were in the Northwest Territories. When the Canadian Constitution was on their side with respect to the granting of services from an institution of Canada, and we indeed seem to be an institution of the federal government, when they could have demanded services in French, and did not. When they could have made it difficult for our government and did not. When they could have challenged us in the courts, and did not, it was indeed someone in the Yukon that did, not any of our French Canadian constituents.

The fact is they are and were very sensitive to the aboriginal languages and the feelings of the people of the North. That is one reason that they did not proceed with a right that they know that they have when they live in the Northwest Territories. I believe that the French Canadians who live here and indeed who live in Quebec are true friends of the aboriginal people of the Northwest Territories. And, as a minority in Canada, they know what the aboriginal people are feeling right now, because they too have experienced what it is to feel that your language and your culture is not important in the country in which you live. They have gone through the same process that we are going through. But look where they are now, look where that minority in Canada is now. Look what the power is that they have. It is because they use the process. And that is what we are doing today, using the process. Not standing outside and refusing to bargain and compromise, but using the process to make inroads.

I think we have to learn from the French Canadians' success and we have to gain them as allies in our plight. I will tell you one thing, if we have the French Canadians from Quebec, those 70 or 80 or 100 seats in the next government, on our side, we are going to make inroads with respect to the Constitution, if we do our part, and if we have them as our allies. While I cannot guarantee that they will be our allies, I think that they will be.

Mr. Chairman, everyone here believes absolutely that aboriginal languages should be of equal status and as official as the French and English. No one argues the point. Others have spoken of the reality of the situation, so I will not. Again, others have said that it is a matter of approach. Mr. Wah-Shee has said, "All or nothing" and Mr. Nerysoo has said, "Take what we can get and work from there." It is a matter of approach. I have to side with Mr. Nerysoo's approach and the approach of the Executive Council, because I do see a light at the end of the tunnel and I do see us making inroads with respect to official languages for our aboriginal languages.

But, I would also not want us to forget the hundreds of aboriginal men and women who have paved the way for what is going to happen today or tomorrow when, and hopefully if, we pass this bill. Native men and women who started the native organizations a few years ago at a time when all odds were against them, and if you can use that as an analogy, we have just today heard about the settlement of a claim that involves millions of dollars, of hundreds of square feet of land and subsurface rights to those lands, when a few short years ago it seemed like an impossible odd for 2500 people to make that kind of an inroad, and yet they did.

I can assure you that the same thing will happen a few short years from now, perhaps even months, but a few short years from now with respect to our languages. Because Canada will be made stronger if it not only has French and English but aboriginal languages recognized too. Because that is what will make us unique in the world. That is what will separate us from the United States and will give us an identity -- our languages and our culture. And Canadians will come to see that, not without any awful lot of lobby from us and support from the French Canadians, we have to do our part, but it will come, I am absolutely confident. As the land claim in the COPE area was settled, when all odds were against it, so too will aboriginal languages become an important feature of the Canadian mosaic.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mrs. Sorensen, your time is up. Does the committee wish her to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Go ahead, Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: So with respect to men and women who have paved the way for this, the northerners who have been out there in the trenches, so to speak, I would not want us to forget their contribution. And before we wreath ourselves with bouquets and give too much credit to the Executive Council, I would like us to take a moment to remember the people: the Georges Erasmus' of the world, the Stephen Kakfwis of the world, the John Amagoalik of the world.

SOME HON. MEMBER: A minute of silence.

MRS. SORENSEN: Maybe three cheers would be more appropriate. Because they were working on this, long before the Ninth Assembly and long before the 10th Assembly. And that is not to take away from the work that Mr. Nerysoo has done, and his officials. But only to recognize that nothing can ever be achieved alone, we must work together and we must include the people of the North. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very pleased to have been a part of this debate today.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. General comments. Mr. Erkloo.

A Beginning For Aboriginal Languages

MR. ERKLOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Most of the comments I wanted to make were already raised, but I will make one short comment regarding this bill. I think the bill is very, very useful to me. Perhaps it is very useful to me because I do not have an English education. I was not taught English in school. I have been employed for 23 years with the federal government and then after that with the GNWT. I have been involved with the Inuktitut language and I have been involved with the new Roman orthography in Ottawa. When it was transferred over to the NWT government, they just let it go, nobody was working on it too much then. We realize that we cannot separate the cultures and the native languages, we have to keep them together. If one goes then both of them have to go. For example, we will be trying to keep our old ways and once we stop using our language, we lose our culture at the same time. For this reason, sometimes in English you cannot come up with an Inuktitut word just like you cannot come up with an Inuktitut word for an English word. For example, I will be talking about snow. You can say the word "snow" in 10 different ways. I realize we use a lot more different types of snow because we live up in the colder climate.

Today the Inuktitut language is not put into legislation. Yet I have heard comments about the Inuktitut language being used in the education system and they teach in Inuktitut in the schools in the NWT but I think we have to realize that they are not following the bill or the ordinance when they teach Inuktitut in the NWT. If you follow the ordinance or the bill you will not find anything that says anything about the Inuktitut language or teaching the Inuktitut language and I believe the bill will be the way it is. If we do not agree with this bill that we are talking about right now, if we do not agree with it, I believe we will never see the Inuktitut language in the bill. I agree that everybody would like to put in their concerns and problems into this and have it out in the open. For example, we would like to have all our concerns along with this bill but I do not think we will solve anything if we disagree with the bill. I am going to use this for an example. When we met yesterday I was talking about Item 3, there was no translation of this, I believe it was an English copy. Some people have mentioned this as just the beginning. I believe it is just the beginning and I believe we will not see the Inuktitut language right away put into the bill.

If I were not to support this motion my constituency will not like it very much and for the longest time the Inuit people have been asking to have their language recognized. I do believe that this is going to be the beginning, if we support the motion. I just wanted to say under the comment, talking to the people who would not be supporting this motion, I would like to understand why they are not supporting it. If we do not support this motion, I think that the only language in the NWT will be the French language and the English language only. If they support this bill, for French and English language, then we could also involve the aboriginal languages. So I would like to ask some of the MLAs to support this motion. Thank you very much.

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

Motion To Extend Sitting Hours Of Committee Of The Whole, Carried

HON. TOM BUTTERS: Mr. Chairman, as permitted under Rule 7, I would move that the sitting hours of the committee of the whole be extended beyond the hour of adjournment today for the purpose of concluding consideration of the matter currently under discussion.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Okay, this motion is debatable. All those in favour? All those opposed? This motion is carried.

---Carried

The session will go on. General comments. Shall we proceed clause by clause?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Okay. I understand there is a motion to amend the preamble. Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if in dealing with the bill, I could maybe seek clarification from the legal counsel whether or not I can proceed with reading the total amendment to the bill, since all the new bill, as amended, has been given to all Members in this House?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): We will just take a five minute break here.

---SHORT RECESS

Mr. Nerysoo, I understand you have a motion to amend the bill. Proceed.

Motion To Amend Bill 9-84(2)

MR. NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I will read the total motion to Bill 9-84(2), An Ordinance to Recognize and Provide for the Use of the Aboriginal Languages and to Establish the Official Languages of the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 9-84(2), An Ordinance to Recognize and Provide for the Use of the Aboriginal Languages and to Establish the Official Languages of the Northwest Territories, be amended by deleting the word "committed" in line one of paragraph two of the preamble and substituting the words "being committed".

I further move that clause 6 be amended by deleting the words "The Commissioner" and substituting the words "The Commissioner upon the recommendation of the Executive Council".

I further move that the opening words of clause 7 "The Commissioner, upon the recommendation of the Executive Member may make regulations" be deleted and the following substituted "Without limiting the generality of section 6, the Commissioner upon the recommendation of the Executive Council, may make regulations."

I further move that clause 8 be amended by adding immediately after the word "language" in the fifth line of the clause, the words "in addition to the rights and services provided in this ordinance and the regulations".

I further move that clause 11(2) be deleted.

I further move that clause 11(3) be deleted.

I further move that clause 11(1) be renumbered as clause 11.

I further move that the following clauses be renumbered as follows: clause 12 as clause 13; clause 13 as clause 15; clause 14 as clause 16; clause 15 as clause 17; clause 16 as clause 18; clause 17 as clause 21; clause 18 as clause 22.

I further move that the following clause be added immediately after clause 11: Margin, "Instruments directed to public. Clause 12. Subject to this ordinance all instruments in writing directed to or intended for the notice of the public, purporting to be made or issued by or under the authority of the Commissioner in Council or government of the Territories or any judicial, quasi-judicial or administrative body or crown corporation established by or pursuant to an ordinance of the Commissioner in Council, shall be promulgated in both official languages."

I further move that the following clause be added immediately after clause 13: Margin, "Decisions, orders and judgments. Clause 14(1) All final decisions, orders and judgments, including any reasons given therefor, issued by any judicial or quasi-judicial body established by or pursuant to an ordinance shall be issued in both official languages where the decision, order or judgment determines a question of law of general public interest or importance or where the proceedings leading to its issue were conducted in whole or in part in both official languages." Margin, "Idem. Clause 14(2) Where a body by which any final decision, order or judgment including any reasons given therefor is to be issued in both official languages pursuant to subsection (1) is of the opinion that to issue it in both official languages would occasion a delay prejudicial to the public interest or resulting in injustice or hardship to any party to the proceedings leading to its issue, the decision, order or judgment including any reasons given therefor shall be issued in the first instance in its version in one of the official languages and thereafter, within such time as is reasonable in the circumstances, in its version in the other, each such version to be effective from the time the first is effective." Margin, "Oral rendition of decisions not affected. Clause 14(3) Nothing in subsection (1) or (2) shall be construed as prohibiting the oral rendition or delivery, in one only of the official languages, of any decision, order or judgment or any reasons given therefor."

I further move that clause 16 be deleted and the following clause substituted. Margin, "Interpretation. Clause 16(1) In this section 'Gazette' means the Northwest Territories Gazette authorized pursuant to the Public Printing Ordinance." Margin, "Publication in Gazette. Clause 16(2) Any ordinance and any rule, order, regulation, by-law or proclamation required by or under the authority of an ordinance to be published in the Gazette is of no force or effect if it is not printed and published in both official languages." Margin, "Status of previous legislation. Section 16(3) Any ordinance, and any rule, order, regulation, by-law or proclamation required by or under the authority of an ordinance to be published in the Gazette that is made before the coming into force of this section, is of no force or effect if it is not printed and published in both official languages before January 1, 1988." Margin, "Idem. Clause 16(4) For greater certainty, before January 1, 1988, no ordinance, rule, order, regulation, by-law or proclamation made before the coming into force of this section is without force or effect by reason only of its having been printed and published in only one official language."

I further move that clause 17(1) be deleted and the following clause substituted: Margin, "Authority to defer or suspend immediate application of Part II. Clause 17(1) Where it is established to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that (a) the application of any provision of this Part to any department or other institution of the Legislative Assembly or government of the Territories hereinafter in this section called an 'authority' or in respect of any service provided or made available by it (i) would unduly prejudice the interests of the public served by the authority, or (ii) would be seriously detrimental to the good government of the authority, employer and employee relations or the effective management of its affairs; or (b) it would be in the interests of the orderly implementation of the Part, the Commissioner may by order defer or suspend the application of any such provision to the authority or in respect of any such service for such period, terminating no later than December 31, 1987, as the Commissioner deems necessary or expedient."

I further move that clause 18 be deleted and the following substituted: Margin, "Rights and services not affected. Clause 18. Nothing in this part shall be construed as preventing the Commissioner, the Commissioner in Council or the government of the Territories from granting rights in respect of, or providing services in, English and French or any aboriginal language in addition to the rights and services provided in this ordinance and the regulations."

I further move that the following clause be added immediately after the heading "Part III Miscellaneous": Margin, "Enforcement. Clause 19. Anyone whose rights under this ordinance or the regulations have been infringed or denied may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances."

I further move that the following clause be added immediately after clause 19: Margin, "Agreements. Clause 20. The Executive Member or the Commissioner, upon the recommendation of the Executive Member, may, on behalf of the government of the Territories, enter into agreements with the Government of Canada or any person or body respecting the implementation of the provisions of this ordinance or the regulations or any other matter related to this ordinance or the regulations."

I further move that clause 21 be amended by deleting the word "Member" in the opening words of the clause and substituting the word "Council".

I further move that clause 21 be amended by deleting the number "12" in paragraph (a) and substituting the number "13".

I further move that clause 22 be deleted and the following substituted: Margin, "Coming into force. Clause 22(1) Sections 11 and 16 shall come into force on December 31, 1986." Margin, "Idem. Clause 22(2) All or any of the other provisions of this ordinance shall come into force on a day or days to be fixed by order of the Commissioner, but all such other provisions shall come into force no later than December 31, 1987."

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Your motion is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

Motion To Amend Bill 9-82(2), Carried

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Question being called. All those in favour? Opposed? The motion is carried.

---Carried

Members already have amendments passed out to them. We will now go through the clauses. Preamble as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 2, interpretation. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 3, continuation of existing rights or privileges. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 4, municipalities and settlements. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 5, aboriginal languages. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 6 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 7 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 8 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 9, official languages of the Territories. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 10, proceedings of Legislative Assembly. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 11 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 12 as amended. Agreed? Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Yes, I would like clarification from the government on that, especially in the light of something that the Member for Kivallivik said earlier in the day. I read that to mean that any public signs that are prepared by the Government of the Northwest Territories would have

to be in both official languages. I recognize then that, because we have deleted municipalities from this bill, a community's signs would certainly not have to be in English and French, but it seems to me that any territorial government signs in that community would have to be in both English and French. I would just like that clarified please.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am not quite clear on the legal interpretation, but I do not believe signs are considered instruments according to law. That is a very, very different situation. It is public notices -- that require public hearings for instance. That in itself is an instrument that requires a hearing process. A notice of construction probably. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if there are going to be any further questions, because I would like to let my legal counsel be involved here, if there are any questions because...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Is this agreed by the committee?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Okay, Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. Lal, would you please go to the witness table? Mr. Lal, your opinion on clause 12.

MR. LAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Clause 12 refers only to instruments and proclamations and would not therefore cover road signs or any other signs of the type that I presume Mr. MacQuarrie is referring to.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Mr. MacQuarrie. Clause 12 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 13 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 14 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 15 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 16 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 17 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 18 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 19 as amended. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Remedy For Infringement Or Denial Of Rights

MR. MacQUARRIE: I would like another legal opinion here and that is with respect to the word "remedy". The clause says that anyone whose rights under this ordinance had been infringed or denied, may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just to the circumstances. I am wondering whether that word -- again I don't know of the legal significance of the word and I would like that clarified. Does that include the concept of penalty or punishment or does it purely imply in a legal sense a corrective measure, that is if someone has failed to meet an obligation out of this, that the court can order that it be met but that there would not be an additional penalty or punishment imposed?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, the language of this provision is quoted verbatim from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Although the language is in fairly wide terms, it is my view that "remedy" in this case would not imply punishment but more a corrective measure as Mr. MacQuarrie referred to. As an example, if for instance, a public instrument or notice were not issued in both official languages, and that infringed the right of a French-speaking resident of the Territories, he could seek a remedy from the court to force the government to put out or publish that notice in both official languages but I do not believe that it will go beyond that and impose a fine on the government for having done that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Does it not then make it much easier for the government then to ignore its own legislation or individuals to ignore their own legislation, because there is no penalty associated with it rather just a remedy?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, with due respect to the honourable Member, I very much doubt the courts would see this legislation as a type of legislation which would give rise to criminal sanction or to punishment. The entire legislation in my view is more in the nature of a constitutional statute in that it accords certain language rights and if those language rights are not granted, the court has the authority to provide appropriate remedy and ensure that those rights are granted. I do not believe that the government will determine whether or not to carry out these obligations based on the factor of whether or not this will result in punishment to the government. And as I indicated it is a provision which is identical to a provision that is found in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Mrs. Sorensen.

Alternative To Court Action Preferred

MRS. SORENSEN: Well, I guess, Mr. Chairman, with respect to clauses which say that people who wish to seek remedy for injustice must go to the courts, my experience has been that they don't tend to go to the courts. The court action is expensive, it involves a degree of sophistication and there is a fair amount of time that is involved and the ordinary person does not have much time. From my perspective, I would much rather see a commissioner of languages who would have the status not unlike an ombudsman who could actually impose the same kind of remedy to an individual who felt his or her rights had been infringed upon. I would see that as much more productive than forcing individuals into the court system -- a court system, by the way, that might be seen to be already overpacked with other things that might be seen to be much more important. It is a suggestion that I would throw out and would strongly recommend that we look at immediately rather than forcing people into the courts. I would like a response from the government on this, because it is an alternative that is, in my opinion, much better for northern people.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just to respond to the Member. The clause in itself does not necessarily mean we are not going to look at alternatives. The reality is that the clause offers one mechanism by which an individual can find a solution to, I guess, the question of having his rights infringed upon or denied. Now, there was always the option of having the government look at alternative solutions and if those alternative solutions can be a part of future amendments to the ordinance, then we could come forward with them. But I believe that it is important that we have an opportunity to allow for this particular clause to remain in the bill at the moment and to seek suggestions and maybe other ideas or other methods or solutions or have people find other mechanisms to solve their problems.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: I guess I just do not find that that is quite enough of a response. I have a concern as I have had concerns about the Landlord and Tenant Ordinance which has the same type of clause which forces people into the courts, and we have an ordinance that sits there but very seldom do people complain because they have no mechanism that is easy for them to complain. We have already a situation where one of our own ordinances causes problems to the little consumer. Here we are dealing with people who are not only little consumers, but who have problems with language anyway. They do not necessarily speak good English which is the language of our courts at the present time. They have to have a mechanism whereby they can easily complain to other than their MLA. I know that the response by some individuals in the House might be, "Well, you can go to your MLA." But MLAs are already overburdened with a great deal of work and cannot always act as an ombudsman in circumstances such as these. What they can do is redirect people to an official person who would be in charge in assisting with the enforcement of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if a motion would be in order with respect to this at this time. I will read it and you can make that decision. It is that this House recommends that the Executive Council consider the establishment of a commissioner of languages to enforce this ordinance and to take complaints.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mrs. Sorensen, we are going through the bill, clause by clause and there could only be motions made to amend the clauses of the bill, but you could bring your motion after we have gone through the clauses. We are on clause 19 as amended. Agreed? Mr. MacQuarrie.

No Penalty Or Punishment Imposed

MR. MACQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a final clarification then on what I was concerned about earlier. I realize that the government cannot be fined but if there is some negligence in following the terms of the ordinance, it may be some individual who did not do what he was supposed to do and that is what I was concerned about. There is no penalty or punishment imposed, it is in the nature of remedy even with respect to individuals.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, "remedy" is usually not a term which is used when it is intended to give the authority to a court of law to punish individuals. The term "punishment" is used and it would seem to me that what the court, if court is going to be directed under this legislation, would do is to remedy the matter, to correct it, rectify it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Lal. Clause 19 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 20 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 21 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Clause 22 as amended. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Short title. Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just before we do the bill as a whole, one general kind of question. It is kind of a complex bill. There could have been oversights, there could be amendments required in the future or near future, yet under the negotiated agreement I understand that we cannot amend this ordinance without the concurrence of the federal government. We know how difficult it is at times to get the attention of the federal government and to get them to introduce things in the federal parliament that concern the Northwest Territories. Has there been some discussion about what might be done if we should approach them with amendments?

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the section that protects us or binds us in regard to amending the aboriginal rights section, binds us from making any amendments at all. The matter was specific and clear, I believe, in trying to assure and ensure that no parties could or no legislature in future could unilaterally amend the services and the obligations that this House and this government would have to the aboriginal people. That was the intent. I think that that is pretty clear in the bill itself. Now I could ask my legal counsel maybe to provide further comment on that.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Mr. Lal.

MR. LAL: Mr. Chairman, under the proposed agreement any substantive amendments unless they fall within section 45(2), the subsequent section, would require the concurrence of the Parliament of Canada before an amendment could be made. However, it would not be necessary to have that amendment made through the Northwest Territories Act. The federal Parliament from time to time passes miscellaneous statutes correcting errors and omissions of a non-substantive nature as a matter of routine and such a correction could be incorporated in one of those statutes, should that become necessary.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Lal. We are on short title. 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 9-84(2), as amended, is now ready for third reading?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make some comments prior to concluding the discussion on this particular item, if I could.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Is this agreed by the committee?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Proceed, Mr. Nerysoo.

Appreciation Expressed

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to express my appreciation to a number of people in this process. Firstly, to the Executive Council. I know that it has been a difficult process and time-consuming and at times very difficult to deal with. I think that I would also like to express my appreciation to Mr. Stien Lal, Mr. Bob Pilot, the staff of the Department of Justice and Public Services and all those other departmental officials who participated in developing the position. To the man in Ottawa, the Secretary of State, Serge Joyal, who really took it upon himself to try to find a solution and try to ensure whatever we required or requested could be obtained from the federal cabinet. To the Members of the Assembly. I know it has been an ordeal for you all. It has been an ordeal in the sense of the way in which this thing came upon us and the way we had to deal with it. But I still appreciate the fact that you took the time to talk about your feelings and your concerns.

There is no doubt in my mind that there is a lot of work to be done, but I believe that the work requires the involvement of the aboriginal organizations as well. In my opening statement on this issue, I indicated that I was prepared to establish a commission or a task force and I extend to them my open arms in the sense of wanting them to participate in that process. I also did not indicate here but I indicated to a meeting with Steve Kakfwi that as a Government Leader I would be prepared to sit down with the leadership of the aboriginal organizations to strategize on the process as to how we could resolve either the direction we are going or to come up with a strategy on how we could proceed to convince other people across this country. We have a long, tough fight ahead of us if we are to proceed and to have the other jurisdictions and the premiers -- and we must not forget that fact, the premiers are very important -- convinced of amending the Constitution.

Media Criticized

I want to say to the people here and to the people out in the Territories, that I began this process with the idea of not creating controversy, not creating a fight between people in the Territories. At no time had I ever wanted that situation to occur. With regard to the principle of having aboriginal languages recognized as official languages, I want to make it clear to the press here, particularly the written press and CBC, because I believe that CJCD -- and I must commend them -- carried some very good interviews, whether they were in support of the bill or against it. They did a commendable job, and I must express my appreciation. But the rest of the press, I believe, created a lot of confusion. They created what many people thought was a conflict between myself and the leadership of the aboriginal organizations. I do not believe that that existed. By creating that confusion, all the information that was supposed to be getting out to people, did not get out to the people. That, in my opinion, causes that kind of conflict to occur. I think that if the media are going to live up to their responsibility, they had better carry out the role and the responsibility and the obligations they have to the general public of the Northwest Territories.

---Applause

It is kind of strange that people in this Assembly did not hear what I had to say and did not find out a lot of the things that I had to say, did not find out a lot of the kinds of concerns people expressed. Because, in my opinion, they were not carrying all the information. The people say that I did not speak to them. Well, I can assure you I spoke to them, and was clear about the position I took, clear about the ideas and the concerns that I was expressing. I am pretty sure that people here in this Assembly were clear.

So, with that, I would like to conclude by expressing again my appreciation to the Members of the Executive Council. It has been a long tough struggle -- three months of it, and every day of it, but none the less it was worth it. We have come to this table here, and we are going away with some results. But it is not the end of the argument and it is not the end of the debate. I can assure the Members here that while this issue may not have received as much community consultation as probably people expected, no doubt any other issue that will be before us and the issue now that we have dealt with, will require more consultation.

I have indicated already publicly here in this Assembly in my statement that there is a public process that we can establish. There is a public process that we can participate in. I think that that is important. Whatever priorities we wish to establish with regard to the funds, the way we wish to go in establishing the rights in aboriginal languages in the Territories, that public process, in my opinion, is to be established to deal with that. I hope that all Members of the Assembly and those organizations and the leadership of the organizations participate in that process. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

---Applause

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. Does the committee agree that this bill as amended is now ready for third reading?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Agreed

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you. Mrs. Sorensen.

Motion To Consider The Establishment Of A Commissioner Of Languages

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like now to make the motion that I made earlier, and it is the following: I move that this House recommend to the Executive Council that it consider the establishment of a commissioner of languages to enforce the Official Languages Ordinance and to hear complaints.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: The extension that was granted at 5:30 p.m. was to deal, Mr. Chairman, with the matter at hand and that was the bill that was on the floor at that time. So I believe this motion at this time would be out of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. I believe when we were on clause 19, I did agree with Mrs. Sorensen that we would deal with this motion after we had dealt with the clauses of this bill. To the motion.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Just one moment. Just going back again to that clause, I did agree that Mrs. Sorensen could proceed with this motion at the end of that bill. I guess it is up to the committee to decide whether we could deal with this motion at this time. Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Point of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Point of order. Mr. Pudluk.

MR. PUDLUK: I thought we already agreed the bill as a whole. I think that motion is out of order.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mr. Lal, do you want to come and sit beside me for a while?

---Laughter

Okay, going back again, I did say that Mrs. Sorensen would be able to deal with this motion after we went through the bill. Now, I would proceed on that basis that I did say that Mrs. Sorensen could go ahead and deal with this motion when we did finish the bill. We will proceed on that basis now. If anybody else wants to challenge it, then we will let the Speaker decide. Mr. MacQuarrie.

MR. MacQUARRIE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. My point is not that she should not have the right to make such a motion. My point is that her motion is asking the Executive Council to consider appointing some public servant. Now, she is not proposing an amendment to the bill. What I am saying is that when we were dealing with the bill, Mr. Butters moved that the session be extended to deal with the matter at hand. Our rules say that it is the matter at hand, and that was the bill. Therefore she is proposing some other motion that does not have to do with an amendment to the bill, and I say that it is out of order according to our own rules.

MRS. SORENSEN: No way.

MR. MacQUARRIE: We can do no other business today, unless by unanimous consent of this House...

MRS. SORENSEN: Oh, no way.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. I understand the situation, but it was at the time when we were dealing with this bill that I made a ruling that Mrs. Sorensen could deal with the motion. So, it is not as if the bill has been finished with. We were dealing with it at the time that I made that ruling. I am only going on that basis. So, Mrs. Sorensen, proceed with your motion.

MRS. SORENSEN: Mr. Chairman, clause 19 states that anyone whose rights under this ordinance or the regulations have been infringed or denied may apply to a court of competent jurisdiction to obtain such remedy as the court considers appropriate and just in the circumstances. Mr. Lal, in response to the question that Mr. MacQuarrie put to him, said that the court would probably not fine the individual or the government that had infringed upon the rights of the individual going to the court, but rather, if it was a sign that was not in an aboriginal language and that we had considered was to be a right under a regulation, if the court made the decision that the right had been infringed, it would simply say the sign must be or the order must be in whatever language.

Simpler Mechanism Needed To Deal With Infringements

Now, you are going to have examples of infringement of these rights over the next few years and perhaps months. For a small little consumer who does not understand the courts, who does not have the money to hire the lawyers, who is inhibited somewhat by the surroundings of the courts, to expect that person to take his or her complaint to the courts, is somewhat unrealistic. It has been my experience, the experience of the consumer advocate with respect to our Landlord and Tenant Ordinance which is also enforced through the courts, that people simply do not complain.

It appears to me that we could make it far simpler for people who might feel that there is an infringement on their rights, by establishing an ombudsman-type person, whether that would be called a commissioner of languages or a language commissioner or whatever, it does not matter, the title does not matter. But, the mandate would be to enforce the legislation, so that if individuals felt that their rights had been infringed upon, that they were not receiving information or did not have access to civil servants in their own language and that indeed was a right that they were entitled to, then they complain to another individual. They would not have to go to a lawyer, they would not have to go to a court, they could go to an individual and say, "My rights, I feel, have been infringed upon." They could do it over a cup of coffee, as simple as that.

MR. BALLANTYNE: A Scotch too?

MRS. SORENSEN: Or, as my colleague says, a Scotch, although I do not know whether I would agree with that. But it would be easy for them to complain. There would be an office rather than a courtroom where they could go to. We have the experience of the past in that the courts are very imposing. We know that the federal government established a commissioner of languages. He was up here constantly saying, "Why are you not printing your annual report in French?" and "Why are you not providing more services in French?" I watched that man coming and going over the last 10

years. So I know that there is a commissioner of languages for the federal government. He constantly goes into the crown corporations. He acts like a watchdog on behalf of the people, on behalf of the law. He makes reports to the House of Commons through the Minister responsible for the Official Languages Act. He points out where the government is falling down on its own legislation and I say that that is precisely what we need to make this legislation meaningful. It is not meaningful if you do not have a mechanism whereby people can complain in a normal fashion about any of their rights being jeopardized. I really do feel that it is important that we understand -- I am not trying to thwart the government, I am not trying to go against what they are trying to do here with respect to the courts. I am just trying to speak on behalf of the little person in the community who needs an easy way to complain. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Mr. Nerysoo, to the motion.

Role Of Task Force

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to have to say with regard to the motion itself that I could not support it at this time, because I think one of the roles and responsibilities of the task force or the language commission is to make recommendations to the government on the manner in which we will create priorities with regard to services, programs and the way in which we are going to carry out the legislation. That is the work and the role of that task force. I would suggest that directing us to establish such a commissioner would be presuming that that is exactly what the task force would recommend and I would suggest that I would have left it up to the public process to determine the manner in which the legislation is dealt with rather than to suggest now a specific type of a mechanism.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. Nerysoo. To the motion. Mr. MacQuarrie.

Need Not Demonstrated

MR. MacQUARRIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not support the motion. I prefer not to add to the bureaucracy if there is not a demonstrated need for it and certainly that need has not been demonstrated yet. I do not particularly want, without that kind of need, to create a watchdog and somebody who travels around making reports, although in this year of 1984 that might be an appropriate kind of thing. I feel that comparisons with consumers and landlord and tenants ordinances are not fair parallels in a sense, because in respect of those you have parties who may have an interest in violating the terms of those ordinances, to make more money or to serve a private interest in some way. Whereas here we are dealing with an ordinance that places obligations on the government and it is this government which is establishing that ordinance in the first place and therefore obviously does not have an interest in violating it. If the provisions of it fail to be carried out, it will be because of negligent officials and so on and if that proves to be the case then at some future point there might be worth in looking at a person who would ensure that all of the arms of our government fulfil the obligations of the ordinance. But until that need is demonstrated in time I would prefer not to support this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mr. MacQuarrie. To the motion. Mrs. Sorensen.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to have an opportunity to respond to both what Mr. Nerysoo had to say and to what Mr. MacQuarrie had to say. I would say...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mrs. Sorensen, stick to the motion.

MRS. SORENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am speaking to the motion. I would say that the whole legislation...

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Mrs. Sorensen, you have to talk to the motion, not respond to other people.

MRS. SORENSEN: That is what you do in debate, Mr. Chairman. You respond to the points to continue the point of the motion. It is perfectly acceptable.

---Laughter

AN HON. MEMBER: Nice try, Sam.

MRS. SORENSEN: The whole legislation that we are dealing with today is presuming. Mr. Nerysoo said it would be presumptuous to impose some sort of a new enforcement body. The legislation already does impose that and he is asking me to accept that the courts will be the enforcement agency. He is asking me and this House to accept that even before he has discussed who shall enforce it with this new task force that he is to set up. That is a new provision; the fact is that was not there in May. It was put in there as a result of someone telling the government between May and now that they needed a clause with respect to enforcement. The task force did not recommend it. There was no task force. Someone recommended it to you. I am simply saying that my recommendation as a representative of my constituents is that the court is not, in my estimation, the proper enforcement body. I have a right to do that and I do not at all think it is any more presumptuous than what you have done by putting in clause 19, for me to say that I would like you to consider, I am not directing you in the motion, but rather to consider that we establish a commissioner of languages rather than the courts to enforce this. You know, Mr. MacQuarrie said there has not been a demonstrated need. It has been my experience that the government is sometimes the biggest offender of its own laws. Not willfully, but because it is not even sometimes aware of its own laws out in the regions, and government more than any organization in this country needs watchdogs to watch over it because it is so big, because it is so imposing, and because it has so much power. That is why ombudsmen are created, to be that go-between between that imposing government and the little person.

AN HON. MEMBER: An ombudsman, or a watchdog?

MRS. SORENSEN: But in any case I would ask Members to remember that the motion does not tell the government to set up a commissioner of languages but rather that it consider the establishment of a commissioner of languages to enforce the Official Languages Ordinance and to hear complaints and the government will have the option, if this is passed, to come back to us as a result of its task force input and as a result of this motion and tell us why it feels that it must amend this legislation to create some sort of a new enforcement body or not. I am not trying to impose something. I am just saying that I, as a representative of a constituency who has very much an interest in this would like to have a different type of enforcement body than the courts. And I would like the government to consider that and I would like support for this motion today. Thank you.

Motion To Consider The Establishment Of A Commissioner Of Languages, Defeated

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Thank you, Mrs. Sorensen. Do I hear question? Question has been called. To the motion. A recorded vote. All those in favour please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mrs. Sorensen.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): All those against please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Erklou, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Ballantyne, Mr. MacQuarrie, Mr. Wray, Mr. Nerysoo, Mr. Butters.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): Abstentions, please stand.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Mr. Pudluk, Mr. Paniloo, Mr. Appaqaq, Mr. Arlooktoo, Mr. T'Seleie, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Sibbeston, Mr. Angottitauruq, Mr. Pedersen.

CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gargan): This motion has been defeated, eight to one, with nine abstentions.

--Defeated

I will now rise and report progress. I would like to thank Mr. Lal.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Gargan.

ITEM 16: REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE OF BILL 9-84(2), OFFICIAL LANGUAGES ORDINANCE

MR. GARGAN: Mr. Speaker, your committee has been considering Bill 9-84(2) and wishes to report that this bill is recommended for third reading as amended.

Motion To Accept Report Of Committee Of The Whole, Carried

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

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Mr. Gargan. Members have heard the report of the chairman of the committee of the whole. Are you agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---Carried

Then I declare that Bill 9-84(2) is ready for third reading. Mr. Butters.

HON. TOM BUTTERS: On a point of procedure, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if after we proceed to third reading and assent, we might return to committee of the whole and cover Bill 10-84(2). It is a very minor item and it would probably save us sitting tomorrow morning, sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is suggested that we extend the sitting and go back into committee of the whole to deal with Bill 10-84(2), which is an amendment. Do I have unanimous consent to do that because unanimous consent would be required?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

---Laughter

MR. SPEAKER: I have a nay so we will meet in the morning at 9:30 a.m.

---Laughter

With regard to Bill 9-84(2), it is now ready for third reading. Mr. Nerysoo.

ITEM 17: THIRD READING OF BILLS

Third Reading Of Bill 9-84(2): Official Languages Ordinance

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: I move, seconded by the honourable Member for Iqaluit that Bill 9-84(2), An Ordinance to Recognize and Provide for the Use of the Aboriginal Languages and to Establish the Official Languages of the Northwest Territories, as amended, be read for the third time.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. It has been moved that Bill 9-84(2) receive third reading. To the motion. All those in favour? Recorded vote being requested?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: A vote had been called before there was a request for a recorded vote. I did not hear until I had asked for the vote, so the vote has commenced so a recorded vote is not in order at this time. All those in favour of the bill as amended? Opposed? The bill is carried.

---Carried

---Applause

Mr. Clerk, will you ascertain if the Commissioner is available for assent to bills?

MR. McCALLUM: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could you indicate to me whether the rest of the orders of the day are to be considered now or whether in point of fact, today's sitting hours were extended only to fulfil the requirements of the committee of the whole? On Bill 9-84(2), was that to include giving it third reading and now assent? Or was it to finish the business of Bill 9-84(2) in the committee of the whole? I just would want some clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: You extended the sitting of the day to conclude the bill in committee. Now, we are proceeding to complete the orders of the day that are done every day and it is just part of the function. So, I believe that it is in order to call for assent, although your point is well taken but the orders of the day, I believe, still stand.

Is the Commissioner available for assent, please?

ITEM 18: ASSENT TO BILLS

COMMISSIONER PARKER: Please be seated. As Commissioner of the Northwest Territories, I assent to Bill 9-84(2).

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any announcements from the floor this evening? Mrs. Lawrence.

MRS. LAWRENCE: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to congratulate and say thank you to the Minister responsible for Local Government, for his quick response. He has given \$2000 to Fort Resolution to repair the sidewalk. I do not have to ruin my high heels now, hopefully the Minister of Public Works will act as quickly too. Mahsi and thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. That is really not the type of announcement that I had in mind. Mr. Sibbeston.

HON. NICK SIBBESTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond very quickly to that with respect to the matter.

Mrs. Lawrence was in Fort Res doing her MLA duties,
walking from house to house in her high heeled shoes.
Lo and behold she stepped in a crack in a sidewalk
and broke her high heeled shoes.
Mrs. Lawrence fell and bruised her chin and cheeks
and resolved to throw away her high heeled shoes
and here ever after used moccasins in Fort Res.
This is the way that a lady, Elize,
moved this government
on the way the sidewalks of Fort Res came to be repaired.
The people of Fort Res lived happily ever after.

---Laughter

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid to ask for any more announcements.

---Laughter

Mr. Nerysoo.

HON. RICHARD NERYSOO: Yes, I think Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the Members here that I have received a message from Roger Collet of the Secretary of State that they intend to proceed with Bill C-26 tonight, when the House sits again. The information that was requested of me, was to indicate whether or not we have assented to our bill. So, I just wanted to inform the Members of that recent information that I just received.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to indicate to people here that we will be proclaiming sections in the ordinance as it refers to the aboriginal languages and I also have the agreement with the Government of Canada that I did not sign and I am prepared to sign now, so I can conclude that section. We have regulations as well that will be signed by the Commissioner that will be recognizing the right of Members in this House to have services provided in the aboriginal languages to Members in this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

---Applause

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Are there any further announcements from the floor? Mr. Paniloo.

MR. PANILOO: (Translation) Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to inform the MLAs that I will be leaving tomorrow morning. I would like to thank all the MLAs that I was able to come and meet with you. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further announcements? Mr. Clerk, announcements and orders of the day.

ITEM 19: ORDERS OF THE DAY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE (Mr. Hamilton): Orders of the day for Friday, June the 29th, at 9:30 a.m.

1. Prayer
2. Ministers' Statements
3. Oral Questions
4. Written Questions
5. Returns
6. Petitions
7. Reports of Standing and Special Committees
8. Tabling of Documents
9. Notices of Motion
10. Notices of Motion for First Reading of Bills
11. Motions
12. First Reading of Bills
13. Second Reading of Bills
14. Consideration in Committee of the Whole of Bills and Other Matters: Bill 10-84(2)
15. Report of Committee of the Whole
16. Third Reading of Bills
17. Assent to Bills
18. Prorogation

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. This House stands adjourned until Friday morning, at 9:30 a.m., June the 29th.

---ADJOURNMENT